

million



leading the
university agenda

UNIVERSITIES AND INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION PARTNERSHIPS: MAKING A DIFFERENCE



**Research team from Kingston University:
Steve Woodfield & Robin Middlehurst
(with Heather Forland)**

**in partnership with
CHEMS Consulting:
John Fielden**

January 2009



Foreword

Million+ commissioned this report from Kingston University to address the serious lack of comprehensive information and analysis of the activities of UK universities that have developed a wide variety of international links and collaborative arrangements with overseas partners in terms of teaching, research and knowledge transfer. The research team were also asked to assess the extent to which policy makers were aware and took account of the expertise and opportunities offered by universities with extensive experience of developing and sustaining wide-ranging and comprehensive international partnership agendas.

The report concludes that much of the international partnership activity of these universities has gone unnoticed at sector level and by policy makers in spite of its scope, extent and the value placed upon it by partner institutions and countries. This is a missed opportunity not only for UK higher education and its representative bodies but also for UK plc. The varied and wide-ranging partnerships of these universities extend across the globe – in developing and developed countries – and many are in priority countries for the UK. For example, the universities surveyed have particular expertise in China, India, the Middle East, Europe and Africa and institutions are using regional offices as ‘hubs’ for further expansion.

These links provide financial and educational benefits to the UK but they also provide benefits that are sought by overseas countries. Within universities, the arrangements provide students with study and volunteering opportunities, offer staff a diverse portfolio of teaching and, importantly, the activities promoted within these partnerships embrace the total business of the university – teaching, research, knowledge transfer and consultancy.

This report sets out clear recommendations and a platform for action for universities, Government and the range of agencies that are involved in key activities such as market intelligence, funding, regulation, information provision, overseas promotion, and developing government to government and intra-regional relationships. In comparison to other countries there is a serious lack of co-ordination in international HE strategy in the UK and there are implications for the presumptions and hierarchies which continue to influence the UK’s HE funding regimes which we would urge Government to recognise.

This report confirms that the international institutional partnerships that have been developed by UK universities make a significant contribution to a UK-wide reputation for innovation and sustainability. They should now be promoted strategically by the Department of Innovation Universities and Skills, by Government on a cross-departmental basis, by the higher education sector and by related agencies.

Professor Les Ebdon CBE Chair
Pam Tatlow Chief Executive

Participating Universities

University of Abertay Dundee
Anglia Ruskin University
Bath Spa University
University of Bedfordshire
Birmingham City University
The University of Bolton
Buckinghamshire New University
University of Central Lancashire (UCLan)
Coventry University
University of Derby
University of East London (UEL)
Glasgow Caledonian University
University of Greenwich
Kingston University
Leeds Metropolitan University
London Metropolitan University
London South Bank University (LSBU)
Middlesex University
Napier University
The University of Northampton
Roehampton University
Southampton Solent University
Staffordshire University
University of Sunderland
University of Teesside
Thames Valley University (TVU)
University of the West of Scotland
The University of Wolverhampton

Executive Summary

1. This report presents the findings of an important project commissioned by Million+. For the first time, data and information have been systematically collected on the range of international institutional partnerships in which the 28 universities which subscribe to Million+ are engaged; available evidence was also sought on the educational and economic impact of such partnerships. The study also examined the barriers and enablers that supported or inhibited the development and sustainability of such international partnerships, based on the practical experiences of institutions and the perceptions of policy makers in government departments and policy agencies. In addition, the findings from the UK were informed by a brief comparative analysis of the strategies for supporting the internationalisation of higher education in Australia and the USA.
2. The Universities surveyed are all 'post-1992' universities' ranging in size from large universities with more than 25,000 students studying for higher education qualifications to smaller institutions with around 3,000 students. Four Universities are located in Scotland and the remaining 24 are in England.
3. It was already established that these universities teach more than 70,000 international students on their UK campuses, so the survey focused particularly on the range and extent of international partnerships, the different types of partnerships in operation and where relevant, the range of delivery modes for trans-national education. The survey findings are indicative of the type and range of activity rather than being comprehensive; the survey also serves to highlight innovative and potentially interesting examples of the Universities' international partnerships.
4. The picture that emerges is of a wide range of partnerships for teaching, knowledge transfer and research in over 70 countries. Based on survey responses from these universities, we estimate that over 50,000 non-UK students are studying on HE-level award programmes outside the UK. From these figures we further estimate that these enrolments had an economic value in excess of £47m (at 2003-4 rates), assuming a proportionate spread of programme types.
5. These international partnerships have clear economic and educational benefits for both the UK and overseas countries. There is already significant evidence of the positive benefits that international students bring to the region and community in which universities are situated, to the academic staff involved, to the curriculum which all students benefit from and to the university itself. Universities that took part in this research, because of their close links with their communities, are particularly well placed to develop collaborative partnerships overseas that can bring commercial as well as academic benefits. Our findings have shown that some cities, regions and local companies are being helped by these Universities to do business overseas; we also estimate that the inflow of international students to the Universities is bringing at least £0.6bn to their local communities.
6. As the global education environment becomes ever more complex and competitive, international partnership activities are of increasing strategic importance to these institutions. Many of the Universities have identified – as a key strategic objective – the task of increasing the number of overseas partnerships or further developing (by broadening or deepening) their existing international partnerships. For others, such partnerships represent an important means of achieving strategic objectives related to international education including increasing on-campus recruitment (particularly at postgraduate level), developing research capacity, engaging in development-focused projects overseas or developing an international reputation and enhancing prestige.
7. All the Universities are involved in international partnership activity of some kind, particularly bi-lateral partnerships related to student or staff exchange or informal agreements related to the promotion of academic links, which are normally developed and managed at faculty level. The Universities differ in their level of involvement and experience in formal institutional-level partnerships focused on collaborative teaching provision, joint research activity, and knowledge transfer.
8. While it was not straightforward to collect information about participating Universities' international research partnerships - since this information is not commonly held at institutional level - there is evidence that some of the institutions are engaged in significant international and multi-national research projects with highly-regarded education and business-sector organisations. These projects are often in highly-applied fields (such as robotics, materials engineering, soil science and new energy sources) that directly address global issues and problems. These Universities are currently successful in generating multi-partner research funding from the EU, and research income from overseas government agencies and organisations in niche areas of research expertise. It is clearly important for these institutions to

retain government funding that supports the necessary research infrastructure that enables them to continue with this research activity.

9. The majority of the Universities are engaged in well-established and mutually beneficial teaching partnerships involving both professional and technical disciplines (such as Business, ICT and Engineering) whilst research and enterprise partnerships can involve both technical and applied disciplines, many in STEM subjects. Teaching partnerships enrol large (and growing) numbers of students, sometimes in multiple locations in one country. These worldwide partnerships facilitate student and faculty mobility and exchange, and enable UK students to gain vital overseas experience. The teaching partnerships of these Universities are likely to become an increasingly important mechanism to ensure the continued flow of international students to UK institutions, particularly at postgraduate level.
10. Although information is not always held at central levels, we also found evidence of engagement by the Universities surveyed, in significant international knowledge transfer partnerships. These range from entrepreneurial and commercially-orientated partnerships where member institutions provide particular expertise (e.g. CPD, educational testing, and quality assurance) to capacity-building and development-assistance for developing countries.
11. Some of the Universities have developed 'broad' international partnerships that have more than one dimension, and which may cover teaching, research and student mobility, for example. Others have developed, or are developing such partnerships with more than one institution via network or consortia agreements.
12. Due to a lack of comprehensive, systematic and regular data collection both within universities and at sector level, much of the international partnership activity undertaken by Universities that took part in this study goes unnoticed at sector and policy level. This represents a serious missed opportunity for institutions themselves, their representative bodies and UK Plc not least because these varied and wide-ranging partnerships extend across the globe – in developing and developed countries – and many are in priority countries for the UK. These Universities have particular expertise in China, India, the Middle East, Europe and Africa and the motivations for these partnerships in these countries range from income-generation to capacity building. There are also a number of examples of the Universities using regional offices as 'hubs' for further expansion in China, India, Europe and the Middle East.
13. Universities surveyed engage with many different types of overseas partner organisations ranging from highly-regarded research universities to small private colleges. The majority of collaborative teaching provision includes partnerships with private HEIs or businesses, although this is not the case in every country. Other types of academic partnerships include public sector universities. Research and knowledge transfer partnerships involve government bodies, research agencies, private companies and private universities. This wide range of partner organisations assists the UK institutions to develop expertise in building and managing successful partnerships with many different kinds of partners.
14. Income-generation, although a major driver, is not the only motivation for international partnership activity. Although many collaborative teaching partnerships have an objective of generating a surplus (for both partners), others take time to become self-sufficient and require significant initial investment and cross-subsidy from other activities. Other academic and research partnerships simply seek to cover their costs, whilst development and capacity-building partnerships may rely on cross-subsidies from other international activity or external funding (e.g. from PMI2 or other government sources in the UK and overseas). Often the main basis for an international partnership is mutual benefit or capacity-building, including widening access overseas, as well as building capacity in emerging fields (such as Chinese medicine).
15. International partnerships also appear to offer more mutual benefits than might have been the case in the past, as those that began as teaching links evolve into broader partnerships that facilitate student and faculty exchange and joint research activity. Broad and deep partnerships based on student, faculty and programme mobility, and joint curriculum development are likely to become even more crucial in maintaining and enhancing research capability and staff development.
16. Although government funding schemes which support international partnerships related to teaching, research and capacity-building are welcomed by member institutions, the amount of funding is often small and most partnerships are only viable if they are self-financing. Not all partnership activities make a surplus, and in some cases it can take time for partnerships to become sustainable.

17. Some of the Universities are improving the central co-ordination and support for their international partnership activities, particularly partnerships that are identified as directly contributing to their wider strategic agenda. In many cases this has resulted in the development of bespoke management structures related to partnerships, improvements to the quality assurance of such partnerships, and a tactical approach to the development of their overseas partnership activity (such as targeting particular regions, withdrawing from risky or unregulated markets, and replicating successful teaching partnership models in different countries).
18. Many of these institutions now have substantial experience in international teaching partnerships – in many cases over 10 years. What might have been regarded in the initial stages as ‘risk-taking’ international activity, has now become more tightly managed, with improved quality assurance arrangements and closer alignment with the wider institutional strategy and mission. In such instances, the Universities surveyed are contributing to a UK-wide reputation for innovation (and sustainability) in international institutional partnerships. In particular, these institutions have gained expertise in teaching partnerships involving distance learning, supported franchises, and twinning arrangements.
19. International partnership activity is not necessarily a competitive activity between UK institutions. Within our study, there are examples of co-operation and joint ventures to deliver benefits to overseas’ and UK partners alike.
20. From interviews with relevant policy makers, we concluded that while international institutional partnerships (particularly for teaching) were welcomed, there was no firm or continuing policy commitment to supporting partnerships per se. Nor does government see these as a high priority for funding, since they should be self-financing, or ideally profitable, enterprises. Policy objectives are therefore based on removing barriers, helping to secure entry to target countries (such as India or China) or promoting good practice.
21. Another clear message from the policy interviews was that there is little co-ordinated policy-level activity related to international education in the UK. A range of agencies are involved to different degrees in key activities such as market intelligence, funding, regulation, information provision, overseas promotion, and developing government to government and intra-regional relationships. This lack of co-ordination acts as a barrier since, unlike other countries (such as Germany, France, Sweden, and Australia) there is no single source of assistance and intelligence about international activities for UK institutions or their potential partners overseas.
22. Policy agencies appear to focus principally on ‘the Russell Group universities’ in relation to overseas partnerships, especially related to research partnerships and researcher mobility, because of a perception that overseas governments are most interested in developing partnerships with ‘elite’ institutions. A general lack of awareness of the range of international activity in UK HEIs and limited policy engagement at institutional level is likely to hinder effective support for the development of international partnership activities overseas for the Universities surveyed.
23. The absence of a consistent or coherent agenda for internationalisation between government departments and individual institutions, the sector as a whole, and sector groups prevents a clear and well-informed message being given to overseas’ interests about the diversity of the sector (despite the rhetoric). There is also evidence of potential conflicts between individual institutional goals and those of different government departments; however, there is more coherence in Scotland than England.
24. By comparison, Australia exhibits a co-ordinated approach to international education, with a single agency (Australia Education International) acting as the co-ordinating body for all international education activity. While the Australian HE sector is smaller than the UK and there are some activities in common in relation to quality assurance, there are still useful lessons to be learned from Australia. For example:
 - the Australian HE sector has agreed a Transnational Quality Strategy, focusing on providing information to stakeholders and protecting and promoting the quality of Australian higher education overseas;
 - the Australian HE sector also undertakes systematic data collection at federal-level related to overseas teaching provision and all institutional-level audits cover overseas programmes;
 - the Australian Government promotes and financially supports other types of academic partnerships related to student mobility and curriculum development and joint research;
 - Australian HEIs take international education very seriously, with clearly designated leadership responsibility for international development at top management level.

25. The US, our other comparator country, still appears to be a 'sleeping giant' in terms of targeted international student recruitment and the extent of programmes delivered overseas. However, despite limited support at federal or state level, there are signs that more US institutions are focusing on overseas teaching provision, particularly in China, India and the Middle East. The American Council on Education (ACE) and NAFSA (The Association for International Education) have begun to publish reports on international partnerships which will be of interest to UK institutions.

Chapter 1: Introduction

1. Introducing the research

This report presents the findings of an important project commissioned by Million+. For the first time, data and information have been systematically collected on the range of international partnerships with which the Universities which subscribe to Million+ are engaged. The picture that emerges is of a wide range of partnerships for teaching, knowledge transfer and research in over 70 countries, and the authors discuss the potential or actual impact of these partnerships on educational and economic goals. The report will be of interest to policy makers and national and international agencies, not least because some interviews undertaken for the project reveal a lack of knowledge and appreciation of the international contributions of these Universities. They are a significant component of the UK's higher education sector and demonstrate the richness, enterprise and innovation that the UK can offer to international partners and stakeholders alike.

The research encompassed a survey of all 28 institutions which subscribe to Million+ covering their core activities of teaching, research and knowledge transfer. These Universities are all 'post-1992' universities' ranging in size from large universities with more than 25,000 students studying for higher education qualifications to smaller institutions with around 3,000 students. Four Universities are located in Scotland and the remaining 24 are in England. It was already known that these Universities teach more than 70,000 international students on their UK campuses¹, so this survey focused particularly on the range and extent of international partnerships, the different types of partnerships in operation and where relevant, the range of delivery modes for trans-national education. From this survey, innovative and potentially interesting examples have been highlighted in more detail.

In parallel with the survey, desk research was undertaken to identify both hard evidence, where available, and insights into how international partnership activity can have a positive impact educationally and financially on the UK higher education sector and on partner countries. Given the resources and time-scale for the project, this did not involve direct contact with partner countries, although this is clearly a desirable focus for future research, nor did it ask Universities in the survey to directly quantify the impact of their international partnerships. However, examples from the survey help to illuminate the outcomes of the desk research in terms of the kinds of impact that are intended and achieved.

Within the survey, the Universities were invited to comment on the challenges of operating international partnerships, including internal incentives and barriers to such partnerships and their experience of external policy constraints and enablers. This analysis was complemented by a small number of interviews with policy makers in government departments and higher education policy agencies to understand how national policies support international partnerships, whether they are potential or actual inhibitors of such activity or have a neutral impact since the main drivers come from the universities themselves.

To offer some comparative perspectives on the UK's policy environment for international institutional partnerships, a brief review was undertaken of the policy context and incentives that feature in the USA and Australia as key competitor countries for the UK. The UK can learn some useful lessons from the policy environment in these countries.

The detailed aims and research methods for the research are set out in Appendix 2.

¹ See Appendix 1 for a profile of international students at Million+ member universities.

2. Background and rationale for the research

UK universities and colleges have engaged in a range of international activities for decades including student and staff exchanges, research collaborations and more recently, a variety of forms of trans-national or cross-border education². To help focus and co-ordinate their increasingly wide portfolios and scope of international activity, many institutions now have bespoke international or internationalisation strategies led by Pro-Vice Chancellors, Deputy Principals or Directors, with accountability to the Vice Chancellor or Principal and governing body.

Until recently, most attention from government and the media has focused on recruiting international students to study in the UK, and the economic benefits that international student fees and associated expenditure bring to UK higher education institutions and the UK economy as a whole. This, for example, was the focus of the first Prime Minister's Initiative (PMI, 1999-2005) and remains the first objective of the second Prime Minister's Initiative (PMI2, 2006-2011). However, a focus only on recruiting international students ignores higher education institutions' wider internationalisation efforts, for example, to internationalise curricula and integrate an international dimension into other aspects of university activity.

As part of their internationalisation agendas, universities are developing a variety of international links and collaborative arrangements with overseas partners to expand and enhance their core businesses of teaching, research and knowledge transfer. Such links can provide financial and educational benefits to UK institutions; they also provide benefits that are sought by overseas countries (whether developed or developing) as contributions to their own economic and educational development. Universities are also seeking to internationalise their campuses 'at home' in recognition both of a need to educate 'global citizens' and because not all students are in a position to engage in international study or work experience schemes.

At institutional level, the rationale for this research arises from the changing nature of UK institutions' approaches to internationalisation in which there is often a growing focus on institutional international partnerships. These arrangements can provide students with study and volunteering opportunities, can offer staff a diverse portfolio of teaching, research and consultancy and for institutions, can offer more secure, sustainable or novel routes for the recruitment of international students and for student mobility overseas. At policy level, partnerships are also recognised as important vehicles for internationalisation as evidenced by recent initiatives to support bi-lateral teaching and research collaborations between the UK and specific partner countries such as India (through UKIERI) and Russia (through BRIDGE)³. PMI2 includes a new focus on international partnerships which bring mutual benefits. In addition, the UK Research Councils (RCUK) have opened offices in Beijing, Washington, and most recently, Delhi, to promote international collaborations in research. Finally, in the field of knowledge transfer, the new Training Gateway provides a portal through which to identify overseas training and development opportunities, many of which require, or would be enhanced, by collaborative approaches from UK universities and colleges.

3. Terminology

International links and collaborations are developed and maintained at a number of levels within UK higher education institutions, by individual academics, departments and faculties and at institutional level. The starting point for this project was a focus on formal or official partnerships at institutional level which are co-ordinated and recorded centrally. It is more difficult – as institutions are themselves aware – to identify the myriad of other international collaborations engaged in by staff and students because data on these arrangements are not usually collected systematically, or not recorded centrally, and in some cases are not made publicly available.

In an earlier study,⁴ international partnerships were defined at three levels and these descriptors were also used as a starting point for the current research:

Level One: relates to institution-wide strategic partnerships, approved by the Academic Board or Senate and the Council or Governing Body. These partnerships are expected to become 'deep and broad partnerships' and are monitored and supported senior managers in the central administrative section of the university since they are perceived to contribute to the institution's reputation

² Cross-border educational provision covers situations where either the student travels overseas to study, or an education programme is delivered overseas either face to face or at a distance (or a combination). The latter is commonly referred to as transnational education or TNE.

³ UKIERI is the UK-India Education and Research Initiative, and BRIDGE is the British Degrees in Russia Programme.

⁴ Fielden, J. (2007). *Global Horizons for UK Universities*. London: Council for Industry and Higher Education,

Level Two: involves School or Faculty partnerships with peer faculties in other parts of the world or with other kinds of partner organisations. These are often funded, sponsored, and managed by the Schools and Faculties but are typically recorded and monitored centrally where they involve collaborative arrangements and award of qualifications.

Level Three: includes partnerships that are essentially research or teaching arrangements between individuals and groups which may get little or no support. However, these sets of relationships are often the starting point for partnerships at levels two or one.

4. Universities and their international partnerships in a UK context

Two recent UK research reports commissioned by the Department for Innovation Universities and Skills (DIUS) provide a picture of overseas' teaching⁵ and research⁶ collaborations in which UK higher education institutions are engaged. Both studies received high response rates (82% in relation to teaching collaborations, 77% for research). Although these reports were not intended to provide information about the activities of individual institutions, their findings can help to situate the information of the international institutional partnerships of universities surveyed which follows within a wider UK context.

In both DIUS reports, the researchers found that the type of provision was associated with the type of institution (i.e. pre- or post-1992, which was the categorisation used in the reports). In relation to overseas collaborative provision in teaching (described as trans-national education or TNE in the research), post-1992 institutions are the largest providers of programmes. TNE programmes are those programmes which are award or credit-bearing, or involve validation and franchise arrangements - that are either delivered by UK higher education institutions in other countries or delivered by partners on their behalf. Delivery models are varied including distance learning, blended learning, validation, articulation arrangements, franchising, joint degrees and on-campus provision overseas. Post-1992 institutions provided 63% of the programmes identified by the research team and also have the highest number of students overall. Pre-1992 universities provided 31% of programmes identified, with 6% offered by specialist higher education institutions. Large institutions provide the most TNE and English institutions have the highest number of TNE programmes.

TNE provision is delivered in more than 80 countries around the world by UK institutions with their partners overseas. Most provision is in Malaysia, China, Greece, Singapore and Hong Kong. Undergraduate provision is dominant (55.2%) overall, particularly in Africa, Asia and the Middle East, and this is offered mainly by post-1992 and specialist institutions (with post-graduate provision more prevalent in pre-1992 universities). Europe is also an important location, and a more frequent export location for post-1992 institutions than for pre-1992 institutions (34% and 19.5% respectively).

Provision is concentrated in five main subjects: Business and Administrative Studies, Mathematical and Computer Sciences, Creative Art and Design, Engineering and Subjects allied to Medicine, with some regional variations. Almost half of all students are in Business and Administrative Studies (43.4%) and post-1992 institutions have the largest number of programmes in this field (44.2% with 49.6% planned for 2007-8). In this subject area, more programmes are likely to be at post-graduate level. Other strong areas amongst post-92 institutions include Mathematical and Computer Sciences, Creative Arts and Design, and Subjects Allied to Medicine.

Partners are critical to developing and sustaining TNE. The DIUS research shows some variations in the types of partners typically identified by pre- and post-1992 institutions and specialist higher education institutions. Post-1992 institutions, for example, are more likely to have private colleges as partners, while pre-1992 institutions are more likely to choose state or public universities as partners. However, overall, it is likely that the types of partner are largely determined by the regulatory environment and the shape of the local higher education system, particularly the balance between public and private provision in each country and region. Where there is limited local public higher education supply, UK institutions operate in conjunction with private colleges without degree-awarding powers to extend local provision, although, again, the picture varies by country and region, for example in China, most partnerships are with universities.

⁵ Drew, S., McCaig, C. Marsden, D., Haughton, P., McBride, J., McBride, D., Willis, B., Wolstenholme, C. (2008a). *Trans-national Education and Higher Education Institutions: Exploring Patterns of HE Institutional Activity*. London, DIUS Research Report 08 07.

⁶ McCaig, C., Drew, S., Marsden, D., Haughton, P., McBride, J., McBride, D., Willis, B., Wolstenholme, C. (2008b). *International Research Collaborations in UK Higher Education Institutions*. London, DIUS Research Report 08 08.

Turning to overseas research collaborations, the DIUS research reveals that all types of UK higher education institution engage in a wide range of international research collaborations. These include research collaborations funded by overseas bodies or by other international organisations, those funded by UK public bodies, postgraduate research where students are located overseas or where supervision is shared with supervisor(s) at overseas partner organisations, and unfunded research where academics and research groups collaborate with overseas colleagues. Almost all institutions have a research strategy and two-thirds have an internationalisation strategy which includes research, teaching and other activities, such as knowledge transfer. However, at present, the research team found that more pre-1992 than post-1992 institutions had a combined internationalisation and research strategy.

The researchers found variations across institutions in types of research collaboration. Pre-1992 universities were more likely to be in receipt of funding from overseas' public bodies (93%), other international organisations (95%) and UK public bodies (93%) than post-1992 institutions. However, post-1992 institutions also show significant success in gaining funding from these sources: 76%, 65% and 83% respectively. Post-1992 institutions report the highest proportion of post-graduate research where students are located overseas (85%) and of unfunded research where academics collaborate with overseas colleagues (91%). A similar profile is reported for large institutions.

The findings on research collaborations do not provide details of the location, subject focus or scale of collaborative research across UK institutions. However, other recent research⁷ provides an overall picture of international collaborative research output by country. This shows that the UK's main research partners are in the USA, Germany, France, Australia, Canada, Japan, China and India.

5. Structure of this report

In the following chapter (Chapter 2) we set the context for the move to internationalisation by universities and describe national objectives in this area. Chapter 3 provides a summary and analysis of the findings from our desk research, with many examples of what members are doing. In chapter 4 we consider what tangible and intangible outcomes there are from the Universities' international work; we look at the impact both on stakeholders in the UK and on overseas countries. Chapter 5 discusses the policies and roles of the key agencies in UK higher education and also summarises their perceptions of the Universities surveyed. In our final chapter 6 we present our conclusions and a few recommendations for Million+ to consider. Appendix 6 presents some details on the internationalisation policies of the UK's two biggest competitors, the US and Australia, with a note on the lessons for UK policy makers and institutions.

6. Acknowledgements

The research team would like to thank Million+ for the help and guidance that they have provided with this project, and Dr Heather Forland, Head of International Development at Kingston University, for her advice and guidance throughout the project. In addition, we are also very grateful to the universities which subscribe to Million+ for participating in the survey and supplying valuable information for this study. The team are also appreciative of the time and interest extended to the project by the policy makers who were interviewed.

⁷ Adams, J. Gurney, K. & Marshall, S. (2007). Patterns of international collaboration for the UK and leading partners. Leeds: Evidence Ltd.

Chapter 2: Internationalisation in a wider policy context

The international agendas of UK universities and colleges are influenced by several different, sometimes competing, but often interconnected factors. These include national and regional policies towards higher education, institutions' own priorities, the perception and reality of other countries' strategies, and the international activities of higher education sectors and institutions' overseas. This section includes a brief analysis of factors that appear to have had the most influence on current and future approaches to developing international partnerships, from both a policy and an institutional perspective.

A historical perspective

Sir Peter Scott⁸, taking a long-term view of the relationship between universities and internationalisation, highlights two important dynamics, first the association between contemporary universities and 'the nation state' and second, the development of 'universal science'. These two dynamics and their interconnections deserve exploration because of their continuing influence on universities' international strategies and behaviour. A historical perspective also serves as a reminder first, of the powerful relationship between national policies and universities' actions in the international arena, and second, of how deeply embedded in institutional cultures and structures some forms of international engagement now are, for better or worse.

Scott's first association draws attention to the role that UK universities have played and continue to play, internationally, in delivering national political, social and economic objectives. In the days of the British Empire, universities contributed to the achievement of these objectives through the training of administrators and the education of indigenous elites; today, higher education's international contribution includes the modern agenda of attracting and developing the skilled human resources needed to make the UK a more competitive knowledge economy and contributing to capacity-building in other countries. The legacy of colonial and trade ties remains visible in universities' international activities, both in the country and regional origins of international students coming to the UK to study and research and in the geographical spread of trans-national education partnerships. Such legacies are equally clear in the international strategies of other countries with a colonial past including Spain, France, the Netherlands and Germany. Links between trade and internationalisation continue in other forms, for example, in the expanding numbers of international students drawn from expanding economies like China (and more recently India), in the growing higher education activity in the oil-rich Gulf states and the parallel growth of trans-national and research partnerships between the UK and these countries⁹. In addition, particularly since the mid-1990s, new dimensions of trade and internationalisation have emerged through the rapid growth of 'trade in educational services'. This trade covers a wide spectrum of activity, collaborations and players, including (mainly US-owned) global for-profit education businesses such as Apollo International, Kaplan and Laureate International Universities (some of which have partnerships with UK universities) and the wide range of types of partnership between private sector organisations and traditional universities that feature in the delivery of trans-national education.

National objectives and national policies impact on institutions' international activities in other ways, the most significant impact arising from national funding policies. The UK public funding system, as Elliott¹⁰ points out, directly and indirectly conditions whether and how a university operates internationally, and this in turn means that management imperatives can shape an institution's international activities as much (and in some cases more) than educational interests, concerns and objectives. A specific example is the changes to public funding that occurred in the early 1980s. Cuts in funding to universities in 1981 and 1986 heralded a long period of financial stringency and encouragement to institutions to seek alternative sources of income to state funding. At the same time, in 1980, all direct subsidies to universities for students from outside the European Union ceased and institutions were allowed to charge 'full international fees' to cover the costs of educating these students. This led to the development of an explicit market for international students as well as wider strategies to generate income from the sale of teaching, research and consultancy services, both nationally and internationally. These funding policies have deeply influenced the structures, cultures and behaviour of UK higher education institutions, nationally and internationally. At national level, international

⁸ Scott, P. (1998). "Massification, internationalization and globalization". In Scott, P. (ed) (1998). *The Globalization of Higher Education*. pp 108-129. Buckingham, SRHE/Open University Press

⁹ Devine, A. (2008). *Opportunities and Strategies for entering the UAE market*. Presentation at the British Council UAE Country Partnership Meeting, 8th June 2008.

¹⁰ Elliott, D. (1998). "Internationalizing British Higher Education: Policy Perspectives". In Scott, P. (ed) (1998). *The Globalization of Higher Education*. pp 32-43. Buckingham, SRHE/Open University Press

student recruitment is financially significant; indeed a recent policy report¹¹ pointed to a potentially dangerous over-dependence on this income in some institutions. The income brought to the UK by international students also has significant economic value to the UK¹², so much so that recent policy initiatives (notably the first and second Prime Minister's Initiatives) have set targets for international student recruitment to the UK. Internationally, the UK's approach to internationalisation has been characterised, not always favourably, as predominantly 'economic'; at the extreme, some international recruitment activity, including trans-national delivery, is perceived as overtly financially-driven and indeed, an example of 'educational imperialism'¹³. There is a similar perception of the policy approach in Australia, but in continental Europe and in the USA institutional approaches to international higher education have been mostly driven by academic rationales that emphasise cooperation rather than competition.

In the last ten years, new codes of conduct and guidance on international collaborative activities related to teaching and the educational experience of students have been developed by quality assurance agencies in the UK and Australia and at supra-national level by international agencies such as the Council of Europe, UNESCO and OECD to protect students' educational interests as well as institutional, and indeed national, reputations. However, these codes and guides clearly do not eliminate the core financial motivation behind the activity, nor do they guarantee the quality of overseas provision.

Over the last thirty years, national economic and social goals have expanded the number of higher-education institutions and their role in meeting national needs. The 1997 Dearing Report¹⁴ captured higher education's changing roles in its four main purposes for higher education. These included developing individuals who were well-equipped for work as well as contributors to society, increasing knowledge for the benefit of the economy and society, serving the needs of an adaptable and sustainable knowledge-based economy and playing a role in shaping a democratic, civilised and inclusive society. In its opening chapter, the Dearing Report also explicitly linked the national purposes of higher education to an international context by stating that: "...the country must have higher education which, through excellence in its diverse purposes, can justifiably claim to be world class". Other international dimensions identified in the Report can be found today in the rationale and focus of institutions' international partnerships, including:

- The recognition that UK higher education institutions operate in a global market for education
- Ensuring that UK qualifications maintain their international reputation for quality
- To be at the leading edge of world practice in the development and delivery of effective learning and teaching
- To undertake internationally-recognised, high quality research
- To ensure that support for local and regional communities is at least comparable to that provided by higher education in competitor nations.

These aspirations and requirements signal that the UK's national system of higher education cannot be separated from its position and standing internationally; they also highlight the need for the core activities of UK institutions, teaching and research, knowledge transfer and exchange, to be benchmarked internationally. It is clear that both at the general level of economic and social policies and at the specific level of policies for higher education, national policies give signals as well as targets that influence and direct institutional behaviour on the international stage.

Scott's second dynamic, the spread of 'universal science,' is no less significant as a driver of internationalisation. In this case, the universal adoption of an objective scientific method has supported parallel disciplinary developments in higher education across the world and scholarly communication across national borders (facilitated by the adoption of English as a shared scientific language). Scientific research is an international activity and the drive to be part of an international scientific community is embedded both in the aspirations of individual academics and the strategic priorities of faculties and institutions. Today, major scientific programmes such as the human genome project can only be undertaken through trans-national projects and there is also recognition that major global problems such as poverty, climate change and social and health inequalities can best be tackled through international collaborative research. International league tables attest to the global dimensions of science, adding a strong competitive force at national and institutional levels. However, competition is counter-balanced by the collaborative drivers that

¹¹ Higher Education Policy Institute (2006). *How exposed are English universities to reductions in demand from international students?* London, HEPI

¹² For a recent estimate of the value of international students to the UK economy, see the reference to Lenton (2007) in chapter 4

¹³ Rhee, J.E. & Sagaría, M.A.D. (2004). "International Students: Constructions of imperialism in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*". *Review of Higher Education*. 28(1):77-96

¹⁴ Report of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education (1997). *Higher Education in the Learning Society*. Main Report, p72.

underpin 'universal science'; and a recent policy report¹⁵ demonstrates the growing number of papers jointly authored across countries and the increasing number of international research partnerships. The dynamic of 'universal science' has made knowledge creation a global undertaking and it is likely to remain a key driver for certain kinds of international institutional partnerships within institutions. At policy level, recognition of the global and trans-national dimensions of science and innovation^{16,17} is evident in national policy documents, in the opening of UK research council offices in Washington, Beijing and Delhi, and in European developments such as the European Research Area, European Framework Programmes and European Research Council (ERC) (see below).

Advances in science and technology are also, of course, tightly bound up with the development of modern societies and economies, and developments in these fields have fuelled international connections in all aspects of modern life and work, from air-travel to international banking, international media, culture, sport and telecommunications. Higher education contributes to this globalisation – the flow of ideas, people, technologies and capital across national borders – and is subject to its impacts, both positive and negative. Accelerating globalisation is cited as a policy driver by many government departments and national agencies in the UK, expressed either through explicit internationalisation strategies or exhortations for institutions to engage internationally to achieve policy goals. These policy goals are often enormously ambitious, extending from contributions to world peace, to solving global problems or enhancing a national brand and identity. They place significant expectations on institutions' internationalisation strategies, usually without any significant extra funding. In a recent analysis of the international strategies of government departments (across all UK jurisdictions) such as DfES (now DIUS), DfID, UKTI, the Scottish Executive, and national agencies such as the British Council, QAA, Universities UK and others, economic drivers were most commonly cited in policy documents (see Table 1).¹⁸ However, other national rationales for internationalisation also featured including developing global citizenship, counterbalancing the ideological tensions of globalisation, providing development aid and capacity-building, developing the skills' base, increasing mutual understanding and developing international links to increase national and regional profile. Many of these rationales and policy goals are reflected in the rationales for and focus of international partnerships among the Universities in this study (see Chapter 3).

Table 1

Drivers	Policy Responses
Increased globalisation of economies, trade, services	Opportunities for export and inward investment
Competitive global economy	Prosperity depends on harnessing the best knowledge and skills for the economy Marketing business strengths overseas
Development of a knowledge economy	Need for strong, entrepreneurial institutions Developing employability and entrepreneurial skills for students
Growing the national and regional economies	Develop and promote national and regional business internationally
Operating in a global market	Grow the market for international students Increase funding stream from international students
Rapid economic change, inequality & competition for natural resources	Use the power of economic development to change lives Harness technological and scientific ingenuity for service of the poor.
The need to build a high-level skills base for the economy and the race to attract global talent at all levels	Build employment opportunities into immigration policies Offer scholarships, fellowships and other opportunities including explicit talent-spotting

¹⁵ Adams, J. Gurney, K and Marshall, S (2007) op cit

¹⁶ Innovation Nation (March 2008), DIUS. <http://www.dius.gov.uk/docs/home/ScienceInnovation.pdf>

¹⁷ Lord Sainsbury of Turville (October 2007). The Race to the Top: A Review of Government's Science and Innovation Policies. London: HM Treasury. http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/media/5/E/sainsbury_review051007.pdf

¹⁸ Middlehurst, R. Woodfield, S (2007). Responding to the internationalisation agenda: implications for institutional strategy. York: Higher Education Academy.

UK institutions' international agendas are influenced, both directly and indirectly, by the international policies of other countries and regions and by the prevailing context for internationalisation within and across higher education sectors. The UK's geographical location in Europe and economic and political involvement in the European Union has meant that European policy has played a role in internationalisation at a number of levels in relation to research, education and knowledge transfer. In contrast, perhaps, to many other European countries, the agenda of 'Europeanisation' that has also formed a key part of European policy has not featured so strongly in the UK, although there is evidence of a growing number of UK institutions developing European strategies, either within or in addition to wider international strategies. Partnerships with a range of continental European countries feature strongly in the international institutional partnerships of the surveyed Universities.

The economic and social objectives of the European Union (EU) which are made operational through treaties, structures, funding and political processes, are now linked most closely to higher education through the Lisbon Strategy (announced in 2000), whose objective is to make the EU 'the world's most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world, capable of sustaining growth with more and better jobs and greater social cohesion'. However, for a much longer period, international mobility of students has been a core focus for internationalisation in higher education and has been actively promoted and supported at European policy level through the ERASMUS and SOCRATES programmes. From 1987, for example, the ERASMUS programme grew in less than ten years to more than 100,000 mobile students per year and came to be seen as the most successful of more than a dozen educational programmes the European Commission established in the late 1980s.¹⁹ At national level, scholarship schemes (such as the UK's Chevening fellowships) also promoted student mobility. In addition, other European education programmes have been relevant to internationalisation, promoting a variety of linkages. The COMETT programme (1986) aimed to promote co-operation between education and industry (from the mid-1990s this was subsumed within the LEONARDO programme); the 'Action Jean Monnet' allowed the establishment of European teaching-staff positions, and the TEMPUS programme aimed to support co-operation with institutions in Central and Eastern Europe. The Universities surveyed have been successful in gaining resources and support for their international activities from several of these programmes.

Another vehicle for internationalisation was initiated by the Bologna Declaration, signed by 29 European Ministers of Higher Education in June 1999. This Declaration signalled a commitment on the part of the signatory countries 'to establish the European area of higher education and to promote the European system of higher education world-wide.' The broad objectives of the Bologna Process became: to remove obstacles to student mobility across Europe; to enhance the attractiveness of European higher education worldwide; to establish a common structure of higher education systems across Europe and for this common structure to be based on two main cycles, undergraduate and graduate. The Bologna Process has expanded across countries, with 46 countries now involved, has increased in scope from the original objectives to ten action lines (which include a focus on lifelong learning and doctoral studies) and has generated considerable interest across the world, including Australia and the Asia-Pacific region, the Mediterranean and North Africa, and Latin America and the USA.

The Bologna Process and the Lisbon strategy have come into closer alignment since 2000 at a practical (though not structural level) through the common need and agendas of enhancing the quality of European higher education, improving Europe's research capacity, promoting lifelong learning and strengthening the links between higher education institutions and the business community. Various communications from the European Commission between 2003 and 2006 echo national policy statements about the economic and social role of universities in the context of European competitiveness.

Two important themes permeate European-level policies and both are visible in UK approaches to internationalisation. The first is 'mobility', focused initially (and over centuries) on the movement of individuals across national borders. For the past ten years, other forms of mobility have also been developing, as internationalisation agendas have expanded at institutional, national and regional levels. These include the mobility of projects and services, the mobility of programmes of study across borders and most recently, the mobility of providers and institutions as part of developments in trans-national education²⁰. A second theme is that of 'co-operation' which has signalled, both conceptually and practically, a

¹⁹ Teichler, U. (1998). "The role of the European Union in the Internationalization of Higher Education". pp88-99. In Scott, P. (ed) (1998). *The Globalization of Higher Education*. Buckingham, SRHE/Open University Press

²⁰ See OECD (2004). *Internationalisation and Trade in Higher Education: Opportunities and Challenges*. Paris: Centre for Research and Innovation, OECD - for a fuller discussion of Institutional and Programme Mobility in the UK and in other world regions.

commitment to work together in projects and programmes across institutions, organisations and countries. Within higher education institutions, various forms of co-operation are expressed in different types of agreement, from the less formal 'memoranda of understanding' (MoU) to the more formal 'memoranda of contract' (MoC). These expressions of co-operation are key mechanisms for internationalisation, but they also serve to symbolise (particularly through the MoU) the underlying values of academic collegiality within an international context. At a practical level, co-operation takes many forms; it is evident in curriculum development projects, discipline-based networks and associations, open and distance-learning across frontiers and in the development of institutional consortia. Co-operation is a major theme at European policy level (expressed through various programmes, as described above) and is part of 'traditional' forms of internationalisation at national levels which are concerned with developing a range of mutual benefits from trans-national communications, diplomacy, projects and initiatives.

A sharp divide and an equally sharp debate (in international circles) has developed from the 1990s onwards about a perceived shift in approaches to internationalisation in some countries, notably the UK, but also in countries such as Australia and New Zealand. In the UK, the shift was prompted by national policy developments, particularly in relation to higher education funding, as discussed earlier. It is visible in national and institutional rhetoric and in the motivations for and focus of international activities within institutions, notably those related to education. Traditionally, educational activities had been seen as a domain for co-operation and development of mutual understanding (and this remains a predominant focus in higher education institutions in many, if not most, countries and regions in the world). In the last decade or more, education has come to be seen at policy (and indeed, institutional) levels in the UK as 'an export industry' and a 'trade in services', notably in relation to the recruitment of international students and in certain forms of trans-national education. The classification of education services within the General Agreement on Trade in Services, published by the World Trade Organisation in 1994, is an important contributory factor, as is the growing competition between industrialised nations for 'market share' in international student recruitment.

The first UK Prime Minister's Initiative (launched in 1999) aimed to increase the UK's market share of international students with an explicit target of 50,000 more international students in UK higher education institutions. It is important to note that PMI2 is couched in somewhat different terms, to include core elements such as: 'creating a more enabling environment for partnerships between the UK and other countries' and 'demonstrating a shift in institutional approaches to internationalisation to indicate a move from recruitment to partnerships – and development and collaborative agendas'. The British Council played a leading part in designing the focus of PMI2 and based the revised model on surveys and feedback from other countries and from international partners about the potential or actual damage to the UK's reputation arising from the sometimes aggressively competitive behaviours and rhetoric of some individuals representing institutions in international contexts. Through developing wider and deeper international institutional partnerships, as illustrated in this study, institutions are clearly seeking to achieve a more sustainable and mutually beneficial approach to internationalisation.

However, financial return arising from international activities (particularly education services) remains a core concern for UK universities and colleges, including those Universities surveyed, since they are prohibited from using national state funding to subsidise their overseas' activities. If pushed too strongly or exclusively, financial targets can, however, create barriers for academic staff participation in international networks, or may inhibit the building of collaborative links with researchers and teachers in other countries where these are not seen by institutions as leading directly to financial benefit through research or consultancy contracts or recruitment of fee-paying international students. For all institutions, achieving an appropriate balance between economic and academic rationales is of increasing importance as internationalisation efforts spread across countries, including countries whose rationales for their international activities and their regulatory frameworks are different to the UK. If the UK aims to make international partnerships a cornerstone of future policy and strategies then national policies may need to be more attuned to the often rather different perspectives of prospective partners. It is important to note that studies of international student perceptions demonstrate that the UK currently has a strong reputation for academic quality²¹. This perception plays a crucial role in maintaining the UK's attractiveness to potential overseas students and institutional partners, and needs to be maintained especially since international competition is likely to intensify in an increasingly uncertain global economic climate.

²¹ The 2008 I-Graduate StudentPulse survey suggests that the UK and its institutions are seen as very attractive because they score well on many of the factors that international students value most – safety and personal security, reputation of qualifications, and high quality teaching and research. More details are available at: <http://www.i-graduate.org/news/StudentPulse2008pressrelease.pdf>

When comparing the UK's approach and rationale for internationalisation to that of other countries, it is important to differentiate between the economic rationale that is concerned with direct revenue generation at institutional and national levels and the wider economic rationale for internationalisation that is linked to national or regional economic competitiveness. An analysis of the international policies for higher education of a sample of other countries undertaken by the Observatory on Borderless Higher Education²², notes that economic rationales are increasingly shaping national approaches to the internationalisation of higher education, especially in the Major English Speaking Destination Countries (MESDCs) but also in other countries. However, these rationales take different forms and the study highlighted three approaches to internationalisation:

- 1 Internationalisation provides a short-term as well as long-term economic contribution to the country and the higher education sector (US and Australia are examples – see Appendix 6 for more details).
- 2 Internationalisation provides limited immediate financial contribution to the country and institutions, but a perceived long-term contribution to the society as a whole (Denmark and Germany are examples).
- 3 Internationalisation is actively encouraged as a way of enhancing or creating a knowledge-based society (Singapore, Malaysia, United Arab Emirates, South Africa, China, India and the Dominican Republic are examples), or indeed, of creating a work-force capable of operating in an international environment (Canada, UK and other European countries).

Where UK institutions are seeking longer-term, sustainable partnerships, they need to recognise the different national policy contexts in which their partner institutions operate. Typically, national policies are given effect through regulatory mechanisms associated with quality assurance, the employability of students in particular sectors, visa and immigration practices and funding rules. Over the last ten years, as transnational education has expanded to become more complex and competitive, international agencies, such as UNESCO and OECD, have also sought to provide guidance and information for countries and institutions through mechanisms such as codes of practice and registers of institutions and QA agencies. UK institutions, including those in our study, are involved in partnerships with an increasing range of countries across the world and their strategic documents indicate plans for further internationalisation. If they are to sustain and grow their international partnerships, they will need to invest in knowledge, information, data and intelligence that will enable them to keep up-to-date with a dynamic and often volatile international environment where the economic and social policies of national and regional governments are increasingly closely connected to their higher education policies and to the agendas of institutions. While there may be important financial returns to be gained from international activities, there are also increasing costs that need to be factored in to institutional and national strategies. At national level there is already recognition of the need for more targeted information and this has led to the setting up of the UK's HE International Unit to provide information to institutional leaders and to the HE policy and funding agencies.

The tenor and tone of national policies are as important in an international context as their substance. Just as UK institutions need to achieve the right balance between economic and academic rationales if they are to be able to create and sustain international partnerships, so do national policies. Short-term income-generation and longer-term economic and social advantages for the country need to be in balance, if the first agenda is not to undermine achievement of the second. Supporting strategic partnerships which deliver mutual benefits across countries and institutions may become increasingly critical for the UK.

Institutional autonomy, mission and diversity

In a study of English university responses to globalisation, internationalisation and Europeanisation²³ the authors offer four main reasons why UK universities and colleges have been particularly well-placed up till now to respond to the challenges of globalisation. These include academic independence, financial independence, financial stringency and the ability to offer programmes in the English language. Financial stringency was discussed above and we suggest that its consequences may not always be entirely positive in an international context, although it has undoubtedly been a key driver of institutional strategies and behaviour.

The dominance of the English language may also potentially be a double-edged sword. While it has provided important advantages for UK institutions for several decades, English language as a source of

²² See Middlehurst, R. & Woodfield, S. (2007). *Responding to the International Agenda: implications for institutional strategy*. Research Report 05/06 Higher Education Academy, York, HEA.

²³ Williams, G. & Evans, J. (2005). "English university responses to globalisation, internationalisation and europeanisation", in Huisman, J. & van der Wende, M. (eds.) *On Cooperation and Competition II: Institutional Responses to Internationalisation, Europeanisation and Globalisation*, pp67-94. ACA Papers on International Cooperation in Education, Bonn, Lemmens.

competitive advantage may be lessening as more and more countries offer international programmes in English²⁴, and as noted earlier, English has been the language of 'universal science' for a long time. There is also a more subtle reason why a competitive advantage linked to English (for the UK) may not continue. Increasingly, as a new report demonstrates²⁵ employers that operate internationally are seeking graduates who have lived or studied outside their home country and who have acquired more than two languages. The ability to converse in more than one language also enables graduates to understand different cultural perspectives and how these perspectives can influence decision-making in the work environment.

Although English is likely to remain the most dominant global language, other languages may become as significant in future (Spanish or Chinese for example) if they are linked both to the spread of populations speaking these languages and the growth in economic power of relevant nations and regions. The dominance of the English language over decades combined with the decline of foreign language teaching and learning in the UK, may leave UK home students and some UK staff at a disadvantage in future aspects of internationalisation unless they travel and acquire a second language. There may also be consequences for institutions (and the UK economy) if international students choose to gain their English language skills through studying - perhaps more cheaply, at a higher quality level, or with better prospects for employment - in other countries than the UK.

The other two sources of advantage, academic independence and financial independence, are closely linked to two important features of the UK higher education system, namely the autonomy and diversity of institutions. Both features are widely promoted and supported in national policies, indeed, the direction of recent policies is towards even greater mission differentiation between institutions. Autonomy has enabled individual institutions to shape their international strategies according to their own missions and aspirations. Financial and academic independence have provided incentives for the development of these strategies and have also allowed for a variety of activities, models and approaches to internationalisation to be generated and tested by institutions and this study provides an insight into some of this variety. Arguably, competition as well as collaboration, networking and benchmarking between UK institutions has also facilitated cross-sector learning and has raised the level of the UK's game in relation to internationalisation. Recent reports, and indeed, international league tables, clearly attest to the success of UK institutions internationally. These advantages are also enjoyed by the USA, whose institutions also perform strongly in all measures of success in international education competitiveness.

However, other countries are also focusing more strongly on their internationalisation strategies and at national level, are actively seeking to advance their position for strong economic, social and political reasons. International collaborations are increasingly seen as key to strengthening nations and regions. In a recent survey on internationalisation conducted by the International Association of Universities (IAU)²⁶, responses from all six regions (at government and institutional levels) – that is, from Africa, Asia and Pacific, Europe, Latin America, Middle East, and North America – agreed that of the 17 strategies listed, international institutional agreements and networks ranked first. In a separate Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) study²⁷ on internationalisation and trade in education across North America, Asia-Pacific and Europe, the authors concluded that cross-border higher education (encompassing programme and institution mobility, as well as student mobility) had grown dramatically over the past twenty years and had diversified considerably, with further projections of growth to come. The OECD report sets out a typology of national rationales for cross-border activity which again demonstrates the variation in interests across countries as they include mutual understanding, skilled migration, capacity-building and revenue generation. In several countries, there is strong national support and funding for the establishment of international collaborations of different kinds; a good example in Europe is the Norwegian Centre for International Cooperation in Higher Education (SIU) that has just awarded 1,750,000 Norwegian kroner (almost £170,000) to support 12 partnership projects with the US.

As the wider context of internationalisation changes, it is worth asking whether institutional autonomy – as a core driver of internationalisation - will remain as beneficial as in the past or whether there would be value in actively supporting a collaborative approach across UK institutions. There are several arguments in favour of such an approach. The first is that the UK higher education sector is widely recognised internationally for its level of quality – across the whole system – and its diversity in terms of focus and type of programmes and the scope and range of its research. Actively marketing this diversity in a targeted way in relation to the

²⁴ See Wächter, B. & Maiworm, F (2008), *English-Taught Programmes in European Higher Education. The Picture in 2007*. Bonn: Lemmens, 2008. This study highlights the upward trend in continental European international programmes offered in English.

²⁵ CIHE (October 2008) *Global Horizons and the Role of Employers*. CIHE: London.

²⁶ IAU (2006). *2005 IAU global survey report: Internationalization of higher education: New directions, new challenges*. See www.unesco.org/iau/internationalization/index.html.

²⁷ OECD (2004) *op cit*

specific interests and needs of other countries could be valuable.²⁸ The lack of knowledge at national level about the range and depth of institutions' international activities (and the dearth of data collected in the UK, in contrast, for example to Australia) is a barrier to such a national strategy at present (see further discussion in Chapter 5). A second argument is that where internationalisation is driven mainly by the efforts, investment and initiative of individual institutions, there is the potential both for duplication and fragmentation of effort and impact. Competition between institutions, in international student recruitment, for example, may blind institutions to the greater gains that could arise from offering joint programmes or joint research, or in marketing jointly to other countries. The same arguments apply between organisations and sectors. UK higher education could gain significant market advantage in relation to research, education or knowledge transfer if the sector's diverse strengths were marketed with business, with other public sectors or with further education. This study has sought to identify any such collaborations and the level of sector knowledge about these, for example at regional agency level, but without success. There is also, as yet, limited resource devoted to such cross-sector collaborations at national level, for example through UKTI. The Lisbon strategy and Bologna Processes of curricular reform have certainly acted as a stimulus to countries' international strategies, and their higher education systems are key players and partners in these strategies. One recent example that may illustrate the potential gains of a more collaborative approach is the establishment of 'the Training Gateway' which is a web-portal through which governments or companies can access UK expertise in the design and delivery of training and continuing professional development. International as well as national tenders from all sectors are posted through this Gateway and the associated network offers a mechanism through which institutions can identify complementary strengths and potentially build new collaborative provision.

²⁸ This approach is being adopted by the Wales International Consortium for Wales and to a lesser extent by EducationUK-Scotland for Scottish institutions.

Chapter 3: Survey of Universities' International Partnership Activities

A: Introduction and Survey Methods

Between April and August 2008 the 28 universities that subscribe to Million+ participated in our survey which focused on the nature and scope of international partnership activities linked to their core activities of teaching, research and knowledge transfer. Partnership agreements often involve other areas of activity such as curriculum development, staff development and staff exchange, but these were outside the scope of this survey.

The survey gathered information about the Universities' rationales and strategic objectives related to international partnerships and asked institutions to provide details²⁹ about their five most successful and innovative institutional-level international partnerships which they would be willing to showcase in a report targeted at Ministers and their advisers³⁰.

Participating Universities were also asked to provide a list or register of their formal international partnerships³¹ at institutional level, where available. The intention was not to quantify or audit members' activity, but simply to gain an understanding of the range and extent of different types of partnership, countries of operation, teaching delivery models in use, and the subject or disciplinary areas covered by such partnerships.

In response, the Universities provided a range of information about their international partnership activities, particularly related to overseas teaching partnerships. Some Universities reported that research and knowledge transfer partnerships were active within their institution, but that details were not held at the central level. Often the nature of the information received was influenced by the institutional respondent – in some cases this was the PVC or DVC responsible for international activity, whilst in others it was the Director of the International Office, and in some cases it was the Director of International Partnerships.

The following summary combines information collected from institutions via the survey - where they were able to provide details of their strategies and activities - with information gained from desk research³². All information, from whatever source, was verified by the institution concerned.

In the rest of this chapter we structure our findings under four main headings:

- B. A description of the international strategies of the Universities and their rationales.
- C. An analysis of the types of international activity, covering teaching partnerships, research partnerships, knowledge transfer and capacity-building activity and strategic alliances.
- D. A detailed analysis of the Universities' partnerships, by category, by country, by academic subject and by source of funding.
- E. Participating Universities views on the barriers to effective partnerships at national and institutional levels.

B International Strategies

B1. International Strategies and their rationales

The majority of Universities surveyed, like most UK universities³³, have a strategy related to their international education activities. In some cases, this strategy specifically covers international partnerships. Institutions increasingly recognise that their international activities are a crucial means for achieving wider institutional objectives and developing their reputation at home and overseas, and that a strategic approach to their international activities is essential in an increasingly competitive global context.

²⁹ Institutions received a template which they could use to provide details of their five partnerships. This covered the main aspects international partnerships including; name of partner, type of partner, country of partner, nature of partnership, year established, numbers of students involved.

³⁰ Examples of the criteria used to identify successful partnerships include the longevity of the partnership, the breadth of activities involved, and the numbers of students or staff who participate in the partnership. Innovative partnerships were defined as those which have adopted unusual partnership approach, or teaching delivery model, or which covered interesting types of activity (e.g. joint teaching, volunteering)

³¹ It is extremely difficult to investigate international links below this level (e.g. at faculty level) in a project of this scale because data is not usually collected systematically by institutions and is not (typically) publicly available.

³² For example, corporate or strategic plans, QAA Institutional (and Collaborative) Audits, and institutional web-sites.

³³ McCaig, C. et al (2008b) op cit, and Fielden, J. (2007). Global Horizons for UK Universities. CIHE. London.

Through their international strategies, UK higher education institutions demonstrate that they are aware of the changing global context and its impact on the wider economy and society. They recognise their role in preparing students for global citizenship and in addressing global problems through applied research³⁴. Institutions also highlight their role in supporting national objectives – for example, Scotland has ambitions to increase international student recruitment and to develop internationally recognised research activity – and this is reflected in institutional objectives from Scottish .

Institutional strategies can take different forms, including stand-alone strategy documents, sections in strategic or corporate planning documents, or references to international activity throughout the institutional strategy and sub-strategy documents. Most of the Universities also mention the international or global dimension of their activities in their mission or vision statements. Some of the Universities also have an explicit European strategy (e.g. Kingston and London Metropolitan Universities) or strategies that focus directly on collaborative provision overseas or international partnerships.

Example: Glasgow Caledonian University’s International Partnerships’ Strategy

The University views trans-national education as a key element of making programmes more affordable and accessible, especially at undergraduate level. The University has a target of increasing the number of students studying overseas from 1,000 to 2,500 by 2010/11. In addition, TNE programmes also provide staff with opportunities to travel, and engage with academics and researchers overseas. The University is seeking to develop advanced-entry access courses and franchise arrangements in partnership with institutions overseas, and it believes that these can provide some short-term financial gain and be appropriate in some circumstances. However, the University does not view such partnerships as the most effective long-term approach to securing an international presence. The University’s key objective is to develop four joint-venture international campuses or University Colleges by 2010/11 in key regions of demand (e.g. areas of high student demand with ability to act as regional hubs – i.e. Oman, India, China and Singapore). Based on experience gained in its international partnerships in Oman and Singapore, the University believes that these ventures will provide access to degree programmes for at least 2,500 international students, foster increased participation in associated international research and commercial partnerships and facilitate engagement in the social and economic development of the country involved.

International strategies often include an analysis of the national and international context for the institution’s international education activities. In addition, they almost always include a summary of the key international activities undertaken by the institution, an articulation of the institution’s rationale for such activities, a list of international objectives, and - in some cases - a detailed implementation plan. In most cases, the strategy will include explicit reference to international partnerships, but in some institutions the strategy focuses mainly on international student recruitment to the UK.

Some Universities surveyed have a range of strategic objectives related to their international activities, whilst others may only have one or two. Others combine their international objectives with other more wide-ranging institutional objectives (e.g. increasing postgraduate student recruitment, widening participation, or regional development together with their host city or regional development agency). Most institutions have objectives related to increasing international student numbers, some have objectives focused on developing internationally-rated research, but a smaller number have objectives that are focused on developing international partnerships. Typically these are focused on developing collaborative teaching provision overseas, but in other cases these include developing research or knowledge transfer partnerships, or broader strategic alliances that encompass a wide range of international activities.

Four possible rationales for international partnership activities

The Universities surveyed have differing rationales for their international activities and for their international partnerships; these are closely linked to their institutional mission, market positioning, culture and ethos. For some institutions, all international activities form part of a broader ‘internationalisation’ agenda, which focuses on developing and co-ordinating a range of international activities. For the others, international activities are more narrowly defined.

In its 2005 international survey³⁵, the International Association of Universities identified the following seven institutional rationales for international activity, all of which are adopted in some form by participating universities:

³⁴ Lord Sainsbury of Turville (October 2007), *op cit*.

³⁵ IAU (2005). *Internationalization of Higher Education: New Directions, New Challenges*. Paris: IAU (page 46)

1. Broaden and diversify the sources of faculty and students;
2. Create an international profile and reputation;
3. Strengthen research and knowledge capacity and production.
4. Promote curriculum development and innovation;
5. Increase student and faculty international knowledge and intercultural understanding.
6. Contribute to academic quality
7. Diversify income generation.

All of the Universities follow the second rationale listed above by seeking to use their international activities to increase their international influence, profile, status and reputation in the wider world, particularly in a context where international partners often judge potential UK partners on their performance in national (and international) league tables. We now review the 28 Universities' adoption of the other six rationales under four headings: academic rationales, knowledge-based rationales, social rationales and financial rationales.

Academic rationales

These rationales focus on the contribution of international activities to enhancing academic quality within institutions. This includes developing the curriculum and enhancing pedagogical approaches, articulating globally relevant graduate attributes and outcomes, enhancing students' academic experience, and improving the cultural sensitivity of campus services. In curriculum terms, this often means directly addressing issues of graduate employability and relevance, to ensure that graduates are able to participate effectively in the global knowledge economy. There is also often a focus on developing students' 'global citizenship' skills including soft skills such as inter-cultural awareness and understanding, and respecting and valuing diverse perspectives and outlooks.

The survey findings demonstrate that half of the institutions have embraced an 'internationalisation at home' agenda that focuses on ensuring that the academic experience (for all students) on campus is aligned with the international agenda. This includes developing an appropriate institutional ethos, policies and procedures, internationalising the curriculum and making improvements to campus services. Leeds Metropolitan University's approach to internationalisation is a prime example of this approach.

Example: Leeds Metropolitan University and Internationalisation

Leeds Metropolitan University has a strong reputation for its innovative international activity. The University has had an internationalisation strategy since 2004 which guides its international activities in six areas: internationalising learning, teaching and research; enhancing the international student experience; developing and fostering international partnerships and alliances; and recruiting international students. It is seeking to internationalise its UK campus and has a mission to develop students' international opportunities and global perspectives, and to ensure that an international, multi-cultural ethos pervades the university throughout its scholarship, curriculum, student and staff volunteering and community engagement in the UK and overseas. The University has created an International Faculty to steer and support its internationalisation strategy. The University provides opportunities for its staff and students to make a difference through engagement in capacity building, knowledge exchange projects and volunteering, or through research and development programmes. In turn, these projects and experiences enrich the intellectual and international dimensions of the university and enhance the global perspectives of its staff and students.

In addition, most institutions promote the value to staff and students of international mobility via international bi-lateral exchange partnerships, either in Europe through the Lifelong Learning Programme or with other selected partners. Institutions also often use international teaching partnerships to help develop globally relevant curricula, although there are challenges for institutions seeking to extend their 'internationalisation at home' agenda to collaborative provision overseas.

Knowledge-based rationales

International partnerships are often seen as an important means of developing the necessary capacity or critical mass to enable institutions to participate in important basic and applied research projects and to develop research cultures within institutions. In addition, for some of the Universities, international research partnerships can support an objective of helping to investigate and solve some key global issues and concerns (e.g. climate change, global health issue). The applied focus of much of the research in these institutions also lends itself to international enterprise and knowledge transfer activity, and this can include exploitation of knowledge and expertise for both commercial and developmental purposes.

Social rationales

The Universities that took part in the research have a particular social mission, evidenced by their engagement with the widening participation (WP) agenda in the UK, and some seek to apply this to their international activities. For example, some members view international collaborative provision (delivered overseas or at a distance) as a means of expanding access to students who would not otherwise be able to access their programmes either for reasons of cost or a need for flexible delivery modes (as outlined in the example from UCLan below). In addition, some institutions view their international partnerships as mutually beneficial, not only in economic terms, but in terms of developing educational management, and research and capacity in partner institutions and through sharing areas of specialist expertise via development-focused projects.

Example: University of Central Lancashire's extension of its WP agenda to overseas students

UCLan's International Strategy has a basic tenet of seeking to extend study opportunities to a broader student population. Thus, and together with local partner institutions, UCLan works with students who are academically qualified, but who, for various reasons, are unable to pursue a University education within their home country. Key to the success of each partnership is the high level of support that UCLan provides in-country, including the secondment of UCLan academic staff and the provision of English language training. Many students studying via these partnerships do come and study at UCLan's main campus during their final year, and recent external examiners reports have highlighted the particular success of these students.

Financial (or economic) rationales

The most prevalent rationale for international activity within the Universities is a financial (and in some cases economic) rationale which contains three main elements – generating additional income, ensuring academic sustainability and maintaining institutional competitiveness. The Universities surveyed are not alone in emphasising the underlying financial rationale for their international activities, since all universities must ensure that their international activities are not a financial burden on their core UK academic business.

Generating additional income

The survey findings demonstrate that all of the Universities view international activity as a means of generating additional income for the institution (sometimes described as 'the business'). Overseas income is primarily generated from student fees, but also from research grant or contract income, and from consultancy. Therefore these institutions have a strategic interest in growing, maintaining and securing the flow of international students to teaching programmes in the UK, at their overseas campuses or abroad in partnership with overseas institutions. Some institutions (UCLan, Derby, UEL, Middlesex, and Staffordshire) have significantly more international students studying overseas than international students at their campus in the UK.

Most Universities surveyed aim for international teaching partnerships to be self-financing (after an initial set-up period), sustainable for at least the medium-term, and in addition, may see them as a means of generating a financial surplus to be re-invested in other activities (usually overseas). It is noticeable that strategies for international teaching partnerships appear to be becoming more cautious, with evidence of a focus on partnerships needing to be low-risk and financially viable (following due diligence), as well as well-planned and managed, and with a robust business model. In some cases institutions expect a significant return on their investment, and plan to exploit economies of scale to use similar models or approaches in other countries. International teaching partnerships frequently require mutual financial benefit for both partners, not least because overseas partners are often private institutions who also seek to make a surplus (even if they are nominally non-profit organisations).

Sustainability

International student recruitment is vitally important to many of these institutions, both for income reasons, and to secure breadth in their academic programme portfolio. The academic sustainability of many postgraduate programmes in professional disciplines such as Business and Management and ICT, but also in Science, Engineering, Technology and Mathematics (STEM subjects) is often heavily dependent on recruiting international students. Most of the Universities are seeking to diversify their international student markets to avoid dependence on too many students from key markets (e.g. China and Malaysia), and seek to use international partnerships in new or emerging markets to help develop a country presence that can help to secure regular flows of students from these countries (and their immediate regions) either to the UK campus or to in-country provision.

Engaging in international research partnerships also helps institutions to achieve research sustainability. Projects which involve a partnership with an overseas institution - or a consortium of overseas partners - enable institutions to engage in research projects that they would not have the capacity to undertake alone.

Such projects also generate income which pays staff and equipment costs and can enable research groups to remain viable and recruit extra staff, thus building critical mass to develop institutional capacity for further research activity.

Economic competitiveness

Some of the Universities surveyed are also aware of the importance of international partnerships in supporting economic competitiveness, either for the institution itself, or at local, regional or national level. This requires recruiting high-quality students, researchers and teachers and engaging in internationally-rated research projects with international partners. Some institutions (e.g. Wolverhampton below) also point to the importance of leveraging international links and partnerships to help facilitate links between local (UK-based) businesses and organisations and their international counterparts, thus contributing to economic development both in the UK and overseas.

Example: The University of Wolverhampton's India Project

In 2007 the University launched the Wolverhampton India Project that is focused on the Punjab and seeks to foster collaboration in trade, education and sport between the university and local organisations, and Punjab counterparts. In June 2008, the University signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with the Punjab Government which aims to increase educational opportunities and training, particularly in regard to English-language skills for teachers in the region. The University has also signed an MoU with Donba College and the Lovely Professional University in Punjab to provide opportunities for student and staff exchanges, progression and recruitment.

B2. Implementing strategies for international partnerships

The survey findings provide evidence that the Universities are beginning to develop specific tactical approaches, policies and procedures to help implement and further develop their international partnership strategies.

All of the Universities are seeking to increase the number of their strategic international partnerships and use three main tactical approaches, which are not mutually exclusive and can be used simultaneously. Most approaches appear to be fairly 'low risk', although those that involve the development of a physical presence overseas are more ambitious.

Rationalisation or consolidation of existing partnerships

Many of the Universities have undertaken reviews of their existing international partnerships with the intention of rationalising or consolidating their partnership activity. In some cases, rationalisation involves a phased withdrawal from certain partnerships, based on a desire to maintain quality or to ensure financial viability. This may take place following a large-scale strategic review, a QAA collaborative audit, or can be a response to policy or regulatory shifts in partner countries, or when an overseas partner changes its status (e.g. Derby's changing relationship with Inter College in Israel or Glasgow Caledonian's redefined relationship with its partner organisation in Oman). Some Universities surveyed expressed a desire to withdraw from teaching partnerships in countries where regulation is less-well developed and to develop partnerships in countries with more comprehensive regulatory systems. This approach is designed to protect the institution's reputation for quality and to ensure that graduates are able to find employment in their own countries.

Example: Coventry University

After a period of significant growth in both the range and number of its overseas partnerships, the University has now entered into a period of consolidation and review of existing and new arrangements. Its priority is to further develop existing relationships into "multi-touch" relationships which incorporate its key strategic priorities of applied research, industrial and professional linkages, and staff and student exchange. Key criteria for each overseas partnership are academic quality, student experience, return on investment, regional clustering, fit with the University's marketing strategy and complementarity with the home campus activity.

Managed development of new partnerships

Another common approach focuses on developing managed partnerships with particular institutions in targeted countries or regions. This often occurs after a period of rationalisation, but the approach is also used when an institution is seeking to expand or develop its partnership activity from a low base. Such partnerships are often described as 'high-value' or 'high-quality' and are typically carefully planned, but are usually relatively few in number. Some participating Universities seek to replicate successful existing models in new countries to maximise economies of scale, and in selected cases are seeking to develop joint-venture 'campus' models that can act as regional hubs from which to co-ordinate their international activities in a

particular country or region. Greenwich is planning to create 'Overseas Partner Colleges' to fulfil this role, whilst Glasgow Caledonian, as we have seen, is seeking to use its experience in establishing its Caledonian College of Engineering in Oman to develop other regional bases in China, India and Singapore.

Strengthening and deepening existing partnerships

Sometimes when these institutions have long-standing partnerships with trusted overseas partner institutions, their approach focuses on strengthening these partnerships, through either increasing the depth or breadth of the partnership. Deepening the partnership could include including offering more programmes or involving more faculties in a collaborative teaching agreement; broadening the link could involve expanding a partnership that was initially based on student exchange or a progression arrangement to include other activities such as curriculum development, staff exchange, or joint research projects. In some cases institutional partnerships evolve into international consortia and strategic alliances in which a small group of carefully selected institutions collaborate in a range of different international activities (e.g. teaching, staff and student mobility and research projects).

Example: The University of Bedfordshire and the China Agricultural University (CAU) (International College Beijing)

Bedfordshire has had a 2+1 articulation agreement with the China Agricultural University (CAU) (International College Beijing) since 1998, which provides around 300 CAU students each year with advanced entry into year 3 of a Bedfordshire degree. Initially, the partnership had the following main aims: to offer overseas students the opportunity to participate in two higher education systems, broadening their educational experience and enhancing their career prospects; to generate additional income for both institutions; and reciprocally to transfer knowledge of contemporary developments in higher education back to the emerging economy of China. By 2006/7 the partnership had provided opportunities for some 1100 Chinese students to graduate in the UK in five BA programmes that included business administration, advertising and marketing, human resource management, computer science and media production. It had also generated significant income for both partner institutions and was short-listed for the Queens Anniversary Prize in March 2006. The partnership has also fostered productive academic and cultural links between students and staff in both institutions and has allowed them to work together on curriculum development (e.g. the University's Centre for Excellence in Teaching and Learning has begun funding a series of research investigations into how the concept of personal development planning translates for Chinese students), to consider cross cultural diversity and to gain insights into different cultural values, the global economy, environmental issues and the structures of societies. The success of the programme has helped facilitate further links between the two institutions, such as the development of a bespoke MA in Media Management designed specifically to train 150 media specialists from the Municipal Government of Beijing to cover the Beijing 2008 Olympic Games, joint research programmes (e.g. EU funded research) and social, political and diplomatic connections.

Increased institutional-level coordination of international partnership activity

The QAA code of practice and other guidance on the management and governance of overseas collaborative activity (e.g. from the Council of Validating Universities (CVU) or the British Council) has assisted institutions to develop institutional criteria for the selection of partners. Increased interest in overseas teaching partnerships has encouraged some members to develop management structures that aim to ensure that institutional-level partnership activity is well-managed and aligned with broader institutional mission and goals. This helps to safeguard and enhance the university's reputation. Our survey and reveals that the Universities surveyed generally report the use of five broad criteria when developing international partnerships:

- Practising careful partner selection and due diligence - e.g. only partnering with accredited and experienced partners of similar status, with similar cultures and values, and appropriate institutional profiles.
- Developing effective quality assurance procedures for teaching collaborations – e.g. related to curricula, staffing, pedagogy, student admissions, and assessment and awards.
- Ensuring opportunities for mutual academic benefit – e.g. student and staff mobility, joint research projects, collaborative curriculum development and other academic links.
- Ensuring financial sustainability – e.g. partnerships should be self-financing (or profit-generating), have at least medium-term longevity, and should be cost-efficient.
- Providing socio-economic benefits to partner countries – e.g. widening access at affordable cost to overseas students, educational capacity building, and development assistance.

A number of institutions have created policies, processes and structures to develop, monitor and evaluate their partnership activity at the central level (e.g. Abertay, BCU, Bedfordshire, and Teesside). Many

institutions now have committees that oversee collaborative provision, registers of collaborative provision, named staff that monitor strategic partnerships (typically in the quality office) and staff in the international office or division that are responsible for developing international partnerships and for managing associated relationships. Good examples include the work of the Dean of the International College at Napier University³⁶ and the School of Flexible and Partnership Learning at the University of Derby (see below). The University of Bedfordshire has also adopted a centralised approach and has appointed a Director of Transnational Education with responsibility for relationship management in its partnerships.

Some of the Universities have highly-developed quality assurance systems and are able to exploit their expertise commercially, or in terms of capacity-building, to other institutions in the UK and overseas.

Example: The University of Derby

The University has established a strong infrastructure to support its collaborative provision overseas (and also in the UK). The School of Flexible and Partnership Learning (FPL) which exists outside the faculty structure - combines academic and administrative functions and handles all initial enquiries related to collaborative provision. It takes a key role (with faculties) in sourcing and developing partnerships. The FPL is expected to work with the PVC (Academic Development) to lead collaborative developments in consultation with the Faculties. The University has also developed clear criteria for the selection and on-going management of collaborative partners for the delivery of University programmes based on strategic fit, academic quality, and financial sustainability. All collaborative partnerships are examined using rigorous cost-benefit analysis to ensure that they are viable and remain profitable.

C. Types of International Activity

C.1 International Teaching Partnerships

The survey collected information from the Universities on their teaching-related partnerships that involved a formal agreement - either related to teaching delivery in partnership with overseas institutions (offshore or transnational education) or which guarantee recruitment of students to members' higher education programmes. This type of provision is described as 'collaborative provision' by the QAA, and is generally covered by the Universities' quality assurance procedures³⁷. Many participating Universities also provided information on bi-lateral partnerships with overseas universities related to student mobility. This usually takes place within a course or programme of study, so these have been included as examples of teaching partnerships.

a) Collaborative Provision

Collaborative provision covers both arrangements that involve the delivery of a UK programme overseas and where students complete a programme at an overseas partner institution which guarantees entry into a UK programme delivered either in the UK or overseas³⁸. In collaborative provision, students are either registered as a student of the UK University at the outset or as soon as they enter a UK programme, having achieved a particular qualification at a specified level after studying at the overseas partner institution³⁹. An indication of the scale of collaborative provision undertaken by these Universities – in terms of non-UK student enrolments overseas (at higher education level) - is provided in Table 2 below. Based on survey responses from the institutions we estimate that over 50,000 non-UK students are studying on HE-level award programmes outside the UK.

³⁶ See case study D in "The Practice of Internationalisation: Managing International Activities in UK Universities". Research Series 1. UK HE International Unit. 2008

³⁷ This term is used to describe arrangements that are covered by the QAA Code of Practice Section 2: Collaborative provision and flexible and distributed learning (including e-learning) - September 2004. These activities are the subject of QAA audit (Institutional Audit, Collaborative Provision Audit and Overseas Audit).

³⁸ UK universities also have many recruitment-focused partnerships with overseas higher education institutions or other organisations that are outside the scope of this survey since they do not represent a significant institutional commitment. The two main types of partnership are those with recruitment agents in overseas countries who seek to recruit students to member institutions' programmes either in the UK or overseas, and progression agreements which are intended to assist overseas students to apply for UK-based programmes.

³⁹ Some arrangements include both elements – e.g. some twinning arrangements where a UK institution validates a partner programme which then allows students to enrol on another UK programme (either at the beginning or at an agreed point).

Table 2: Categorisation of the Institutions by Number of Non-UK Students Studying Overseas

Type	Criteria	Institutions
Large-scale	Over 3,000 students studying outside the UK	Bedfordshire, Coventry, UCLan, Derby, UEL, Greenwich, Middlesex, Staffordshire, Sunderland
Medium-scale	500-2,000 students studying outside the UK	Abertay, Anglia Ruskin, Bolton, Glasgow Caledonian, Kingston, Leeds Met, London Met, LSBU, Napier, TVU, Teesside
Small-scale	Less than 500 students studying outside the UK	Bath Spa, BCU, Bucks New, Northampton, Roehampton, Southampton Solent, West of Scotland, Wolverhampton

Source: Estimates based on survey responses

Collaborative Provision involving Programme Delivery Overseas

There are three main types of overseas delivery, which differ according to the degree of involvement of the partner institutions in the curriculum development and delivery of the programme.

- Where the partner is not involved in delivery or curriculum development.
- Where the partner is involved in the delivery.
- Where the partner is involved in both activities.

In practice, these types tend to blend into one another. The numbers of students enrolled on such programmes varies widely. For example at the top end of the scale, Middlesex University has over 7,500 students studying for a Middlesex degree overseas, whilst other Universities only have a few hundred students enrolled overseas.

i. No partner involvement in delivery or curriculum development

Where the Universities seek to retain control over the content and delivery of their programme overseas, the involvement of international partners is limited to providing the teaching infrastructure⁴⁰ and some administrative and tutorial support. In such cases the UK partner provides all the teaching and learning materials, either in paper or on-line form, and teaching takes place via supported distance learning or e-learning, or through outreach teaching – the ‘flying-faculty’ approach - where UK staff travel to the partner institution to offer face-to-face short periods of intensive teaching (e.g. Bolton, Glasgow Caledonian, Leeds Met, Staffordshire and Wolverhampton). The flying-faculty approach is used extensively by the University of Bolton, whose staff fly to teach in eight overseas partner institutions in addition to the University’s new campus in Ras al Khaimah (see example on page 33). There are no examples of wholly on-line or distance-based provision related to these universities’ awards, and all e-learning or distance-learning programmes involve some type of partnership with overseas institutions, even if this covers only basic administrative support.

Some of the Universities have substantial expertise and experience (in some cases over a decade or more) in providing distance-based provision overseas, most frequently in Business and Management. The University of Bedfordshire has a successful MBA in distance-learning which combines on-line materials with local tutorial support at centres in India, Poland, Oman, Germany, Switzerland, South Africa and Russia. Other institutions with distance learning expertise include Derby, London Met, London South Bank, Northampton, Staffordshire, UEL, Wolverhampton and Sunderland. Sunderland provides distance-based provision overseas through two options: independent supported distance-learning (but without the direct support of a local centre) via the Internet, CD-ROMs or printed materials, or what it describes as ‘centre-based courses’ which are offered in conjunction with a partner. The latter requires students to attend a local centre for tuition in the evenings and weekends. These programmes, designed for working adults, were offered in 36 different countries.

In addition, the Commonwealth Scholarships Commission funds these institutions to provide distance learning overseas, and Leeds Met, LSBU, Bolton, Staffordshire and Sunderland received awards in 2006 and 2007. Universities surveyed received 40% of all distance learning scholarships awarded in 2007.

Example: London South Bank’s distance learning programmes in Africa

In 2007 LSBU received a scholarship award from the UK Commonwealth Scholarship Commission (CSC) in order to promote distance learning programmes in Africa. The award supports students on LSBU’s Education for Sustainability distance learning Masters programme which was set up in 1994 through a

⁴⁰ (For example, rooms, and audiovisual and library facilities)

unique partnership between LSBU and a group of environmental and development NGOs. Many graduates from the course have gone on to leading positions of influence in their own countries. One group of participants, for example, has been sponsored by Oxfam UK to develop groundbreaking education programmes. The Commission agreed to fund 22 scholars, who were selected from over 800 applicants. The students will complete the programme over three years by distance learning. They will also receive a one-week face-to-face workshop at the start of their first and second years. The first workshop was held in October 2007 in South Africa and was made possible by the partnership between LSBU and the North-West University (NWU) in South Africa.

ii. Partner involvement in programme delivery only

The most common overseas delivery model used by the Universities is where an overseas partner institution is authorised to deliver either all or part of a UK partner's programme outside the UK. Where the overseas partner delivers a programme that is also provided in the UK this is called a franchise arrangement and where the programme is only offered at the overseas partner institution this is called a validation agreement. In both cases the UK university uses its quality assurance procedures to ensure that the overseas partner institution has the capability to deliver the award (in some cases this involves institutional accreditation). In the case of validation agreements, the partner's course is assessed to ensure that it merits an award of the University as being equivalent in quality and standards to a course of the University at the same level.

Staffordshire University is involved in large-scale franchising activity in Asia, and has 5,000 students studying for its awards overseas, whilst the University of Central Lancashire also has large numbers of students studying overseas on large-scale collaborative franchise programmes. Universities such as Coventry, Middlesex and Bedfordshire have large-scale validation agreements with international partners, particularly in the Gulf States.

Example: The University of Bedfordshire and Majan University College, Oman

Bedfordshire has had a validation agreement with Majan University College since 1996. Currently there are 1100 students registered on Bedfordshire programmes in the areas of business, languages and computing which are delivered by Majan under a licence agreement. The eight programmes offered in Oman include 2 HNDs, 5 BA/BSc degrees and an MBA. Over the course of the partnership Majan has become the first private institution to become a University College in Oman (2005) and it has since become a centre of excellence in English language provision and graduates have gone on to pursue postgraduate studies in the UK and elsewhere. The partnership involves regular staff development and exchange and other scholarly activities across both institutions; it has helped to develop cross-cultural understanding, and provided students with opportunities for exposure to other higher education systems. It has also helped Majan University College to develop comprehensive QA policies and regulation and Bedfordshire to develop its own QA processes and protocols related to provision solely delivered overseas that are transferable to other types of partnership activity. In addition, the partnership has provided a basis for further strategic initiatives at postgraduate level e.g. the MBA by supported distance learning in 2006 (now on its 5th Cohort), and the forthcoming MSc in Computing by supported distance learning (Feb 2009).

In some validated or franchise agreements only part of a programme (e.g. some levels or years) is franchised to the overseas partner (part-franchise) with the expectation that students will complete their studies through direct delivery with the UK partner, either in their home country (e.g. via a flying faculty approach) or in the UK. This is common with some 'twinning' or 2+1/ 2+2 arrangements where students are registered for a UK award at the beginning of their studies, but the programme is jointly delivered by both the UK and the partner institution. In these cases, students do not generally receive a qualification for completing the portion of the course at the partner institution, and are thus 'tied-in' to completing their course in the UK. The level of involvement and control of the UK partner in such arrangements varies depending on the status and experience of the overseas partner, although in all cases the learning outcomes are expected to be identical.

The development of the QAA code (on collaborative delivery) has led most institutions to seek to ensure the quality of franchised or validated courses, and to ensure that sub-franchising does not take place – i.e. when an overseas partner franchises the delivery of a programme to another organisation. Generally all such partnerships are controlled and managed by the UK University and in some cases the UK partner takes greater control over teaching, learning materials and assessment procedures and may train local staff to teach ('fly-to-train') or provide other levels of support to the partner, thus building capacity in the partner institution. Such arrangements are sometimes called 'autonomous franchises' or 'enhanced franchises' and can help partner institutions meet regulatory requirements related to collaborative provision. Coventry, for example, has such autonomous franchises in Hong Kong and Malaysia.

iii. Partner involvement in both curriculum development and programme delivery

A growing number of the Universities are involved in overseas delivery partnerships in which international partners collaborate in both programme or curriculum development and the delivery of a particular programme of study. This is usually called 'joint provision' and leads to either a joint award from both institutions involved or awards from both institutions ('dual awards')⁴¹. In such cases there is expected to be significant teaching input and curriculum development from both partners.

Joint delivery arrangements are generally supported and funded as part of a multi-dimensional strategic partnership or alliance between the partner institutions or through UK government or EU supported schemes such as the EC Asia-Link scheme, Erasmus Mundus, the BRIDGE programme in Russia, PMI2 Connect and UKIERI. Schemes such as this have provided important financial support in the form of pump-priming or start-up funding for the development of collaborative programmes and these funds have benefited a number of these universities.

Example: Roehampton University - Erasmus Mundus

Roehampton is one of only 6 UK co-coordinating universities in the EC-funded Erasmus Mundus Programme which enables students and researchers to study in more than one country for joint, dual or MA degrees developed by a partnership of international higher education institutions, supported via development and scholarship funding provided by the EU for 5 years. The University has two Erasmus Mundus partnerships:

1. MA/Mgr in Special Education Needs (SEN) with Fontys University (Tilburg, the Netherlands) and Charles University (Prague, Czech Republic) since 2005. This joint one-year Masters programme is delivered in three countries and looks at the definition of special educational needs, legislation and provision within a European and international context with regard to inclusive education.
2. MA Human Rights Practice with Göteborgs Universitet (Göteborg, Sweden) and Universitetet i Tromsø (Norway). This two-year multiple-degree programme prepares students to work on the protection, promotion and implementation of human rights.

Many of these Universities' dual award programmes are with European partners. For example Anglia Ruskin University has dual award partnerships in business programmes with partners in Germany, France and the Netherlands. Other Universities with particular expertise in joint awards, in Europe and elsewhere include Kingston, Napier and Staffordshire.

Overseas recruitment arrangements

The Universities surveyed view international partnerships as a key method of helping to secure the flow of international students (and associated fee income) to the institution. As well as facilitating the delivery of UK programmes overseas, international partnerships also help with the recruitment of international students by providing pathways for overseas students to enter a UK university programme either at the beginning or at a specified later point - e.g. year 2, year 3 (typically called 'advanced standing'). The UK programme can be delivered either in the UK or in the partner country. Such arrangements are called articulation⁴² or credit recognition arrangements. Under such arrangements, students are not registered as students of the UK University until they achieve the necessary entry requirements, whereupon they are automatically admitted to the relevant programme⁴³. Articulation arrangements require the UK University to utilise its quality assurance (QA) procedures to validate the quality of the award of the partner institution as preparation for a university programme. It is thus a formal arrangement, and comes under the remit of a QAA collaborative audit and associated code of practice. Such agreements provide the university with a measure of control over the quality of the student intake, but at the cost of significant QA requirements and a high-level of institutional commitment.

Almost all of the Universities have, or are developing, some kind of articulation arrangement with overseas partner institutions and they are particularly prevalent in partnerships with both public and private sector institutions in Malaysia and China⁴⁴. In some cases, an institution may have a number of different articulation agreements with the same partner in the same country. Articulation arrangements are called twinning or 2+1 or 2+2 partnerships, when students are expected to enter a UK partner's programme at a later point (advanced standing) after achieving a qualification from the overseas partner.

⁴¹ In some cases (e.g. Erasmus Mundus degrees) more than two institutions are involved in developing and delivering the programme.

⁴² Articulation agreements and progression agreements are quite distinct, although in many institutions the terms are used interchangeably, which can lead to some confusion. Technically, articulation agreements commit overseas partners to accepting students to their programmes (if they achieve the required standard), whilst progression agreements do not.

⁴³ Foundation Degree 'top-up' arrangements are typically articulation arrangements since all Foundation Degrees are required to have in-built progression routes.

⁴⁴ Mainly due to in-country regulations limiting in-country programme delivery by overseas providers.

Example: The University of Bedfordshire and Lim Kok Wing University, Malaysia and London

The University of Bedfordshire has an innovative 'double degree' credit transfer partnership with Lim Kok Wing University that began recruiting students in September 2008. The partnership allows media studies students to study in three locations: two of LKW's worldwide network of campuses in Kuala Lumpur and London, and the University of Bedfordshire. The partnership aims to provide students with a 'global student experience' by combining the academic expertise of Bedfordshire with LKW's innovative learning process that focuses on creativity, innovation and globalisation. LKW final-year students transfer credit from two years in KL to study for a year in the UK, one semester in LKW London and the second semester at Bedfordshire. Students will receive one of four BA (Hons) degrees from Bedfordshire in Broadcasting Journalism, Digital Film and Television, Professional Communications, and Sports Journalism. They also receive a LKW degree. There are plans to support the mobility of Bedfordshire students to spend time at LKW's KL campus.

b) Student Mobility

All of the Universities – and indeed all UK universities – have a significant number of bi-lateral partnerships with overseas partner universities relating to student (and sometimes staff) mobility. These include exchange agreements where undergraduate (and occasionally postgraduate) students from both partner institutions travel to the overseas partner to study for part of a degree programme in selected subjects (e.g. for a semester or academic year) and study abroad agreements which do not require an exchange of students and may be for a shorter period (e.g. a few weeks). Some institutions, such as Anglia Ruskin University and Staffordshire University, have modular degree programmes which are designed to allow students to take selected modules at overseas partner institutions.

It is difficult to gauge the number of students that participate in mobility schemes or how active each partnership is, since data is not usually systematically collected at institutional level. Indeed, in some cases individual faculties or schools develop exchange agreements that are not recorded at central level. However, our survey shows that the Universities engage in four main types of bi-lateral exchange and study abroad partnerships:

1. Partnerships with institutions in the EU as part of the EU's Lifelong Learning Programme (formerly Erasmus and SOCRATES).
2. Partnerships with institutions in other European countries (which in some cases teach in English).
3. Partnerships with institutions in English-speaking countries.
4. Partnerships with institutions in some non-English speaking countries where the institution chooses to teach in English.

Where student mobility is built into a degree programme delivered jointly with overseas partners, this is called joint delivery and has been discussed above.

Typically, Universities have a significant number of bi-lateral partnerships in the first category (up to 100), although the number of UK students travelling overseas is quite small for a number of reasons⁴⁵. This often limits the number of overseas students able to study in the UK because there are usually institutional policies in place that attempt to ensure a reasonable balance of incoming and outgoing students. Some of the 28 Universities have partnerships with European universities outside the Lifelong Learning programme which do not require student exchange (e.g. at the University of Abertay, Dundee and Anglia Ruskin University) and where tuition may be provided in English (see example from Abertay below).

Example: University of Abertay – EU Articulation Scheme

As part of the University's policy to increase its links with networks of European universities, it has developed an EU Articulation Scheme that provides opportunities for EU citizens who are students of EU universities (EU Erasmus Charter institutions) to spend one academic year at Abertay and the study period is recognised via European Credit Transfer Scheme (ECTS) credits. This Scheme differs from Erasmus in that it does not require an exchange of students between institutions. Depending on their previous studies, EU students can choose to join either the second year (Semester 3 and 4), or third year (Semester 5 and 6), or the fourth year (Semester 7 and 8) of one of Abertay's undergraduate degree programmes. There are also a very limited number of places available on certain Masters degrees. EU students can gain a double qualification by

⁴⁵ Fielden J., Middlehurst R., and Woodfield S. (2007). *Global Horizons for UK Students*, London: CIHE.

graduating with both a diploma or degree from the University of Abertay Dundee and a degree from their 'home' university.

In addition, many universities have a significant number of partnerships with institutions in English-speaking countries. Typically these partnerships are part of an institution's own exchange scheme with institutions in the USA, Australia, Canada and New Zealand. The partnerships with US institutions tend to focus more on study abroad than exchange, since US students prefer a shorter period of study away from their home country (e.g. a semester). The EU-US Atlantis scheme also supports partnerships between European and US institutions related to student mobility and curriculum development, and Sunderland University is currently participating in one recently-funded project (see example below).

Example: Sunderland's participation in a project funded by the EU-US Atlantis Scheme

In 2007 the University of Sunderland was one of four UK universities participating in one of 14 projects in the 2007 round of the EU-US cooperation programme for higher education – Atlantis. Sunderland is leading a project called ICACE - International Cooperation in Ambient Computing Education which it is undertaking in partnership with Troy University in the USA. The other partners are FernUniversität in Hagen (Germany), the University of Algarve (Portugal) and San Diego State University and University of Arkansas at Little in the USA. This mobility project is focusing on building multidisciplinary skills into the computing curriculum, fostering understanding of other cultures through exchanges, and directly influencing curriculum development in the partner institutions via workshops.

The Universities also have significant numbers of bi-lateral partnerships for student exchange and study abroad in other parts of the world such as China, Singapore, Hong Kong, etc. These are often linked to institutional or faculty level partnership agreements (e.g. MoUs, MoAs) that focus on collaborative teaching programmes or research projects, and which also involve other types of academic and cultural links such as joint conferences or scholarships. In some cases, student mobility may be one activity involved in an institutional network or consortium (e.g. UWS or Kingston).

In addition, UK government-funded schemes have also supported UK institutions in facilitating student mobility to overseas partner institutions both in India (UKIERI) and worldwide (PMI2 Connect). This type of funding has been used to build in elements of short-term student mobility to an existing teaching partnership, often to help students experience another culture (e.g. partnerships between Bath Spa and Dongguk University in Korea, and Leeds Met's partnership with a number of institutions in India), or to gather information for student research projects (e.g. Staffordshire and the University of Madras).

Another type of student mobility that involves partner institutions is volunteering. This usually takes place in the vacation period and thus does not interfere with students' study programmes. Leeds Metropolitan University, as part of its internationalisation strategy, has been particularly active in supporting international volunteering through its international partnerships (see example below)

Example: Leeds Metropolitan University - Centenary International Volunteers

In 2007, the centenary year of its Headingley Campus, Leeds Met embarked on an ambitious drive to develop the global perspectives of students and staff through community and conservation projects across six continents. Leeds Met paid 50% of the costs for 148 volunteers to take part in fifteen projects in ten countries, with the rest of the funding generated through fundraising. The projects chosen were developed with partners around the world, such as universities or foundations that Leeds Met was already working to support through fundraising. Projects included building sustainable tourism trails in Indonesia, providing education, training and support for former leprosy sufferers in India, working with Roma children in Transylvania, supporting a community centre in New York State, helping to develop tourism in South Africa in advance of the 2010 World Cup, supporting conservation projects in Australia and raising aspirations of Brazilian children from the 'favelas' through sport. Most of the volunteering projects were of only two or three weeks' duration, but were able to produce an intense, life-changing impact on students and staff. The University intends to build on this, offering additional opportunities in new countries in 2008, but continuing its commitment to those projects which worked well last year and building sustainable relationships in communities where it can make a difference and on projects which have so enhanced the global perspectives of participants. This can now be seen as a real alternative to one semester or one year academic exchange programmes or work placements for students who cannot take such a long time out of their studies or away from the UK.

C2 International Research Partnerships

The Universities that took part in this research are involved to differing extents in a range of international research partnerships. Usually these partnerships relate either to specific funded projects, or are part of

broader institutional partnerships that involve other international activities. Through partnering with international higher education institutions, research institutes and private sector companies, these institutions are able to create the critical mass to engage in significant research projects which can help to develop their research reputation and capacity, and the skills and expertise of their staff. Some of the Universities (e.g. Bedfordshire, Coventry, Teesside and Greenwich) received significant amounts of research grants and contracts income from outside the UK. Appendix 3 provides details of these Universities' overseas research grants and contracts income for 2006-7.

The survey provided only a limited insight into the international research partnerships of the Universities since many respondents reported that information on such partnerships is not held centrally within their institution, and that many research projects were developed and co-ordinated at faculty level. In addition, such projects do not always require institutional level sign-off or co-ordination and are very difficult to track and investigate.

Nevertheless, the survey findings demonstrate that these institutions are engaged in both multi-national, multi-partner EU Framework Programme funded projects and other international partnerships in niche areas of research. Many of the research partnerships involving these Universities are in fields that are of strategic importance to the UK. In addition, although beyond the scope of this survey, the research team discovered that the Universities also undertake internationally recognised contract research for a range of funders (including some from overseas) in their fields of specialist knowledge and expertise. For example, the University of Abertay participates in an international soil research centre and PhD Programme (STAR - Soil Technology, Architecture, and Research) which involves 5 other international institutions: University of Aarhus and Aalborg University (Denmark), University of Delaware, USA, Saitama University, Japan, and University of California at Davis, USA. The STAR research centre and PhD school includes mutual access to soil sites and data, and short- and long-term visits and exchange of researchers, PhD students, and measuring equipment. The Centre has funding from the Danish government for collaborative research (Soil-it-is) on climate change and soil processes.

The main type of international research activity involving these institutions is the EU's Framework Programme. Some institutions reported involvement in a number of different Framework VI projects with international partners and have submitted bids for round VII. These projects often involve partners from several different countries, including universities, research institutes and private companies. They also involve elements of knowledge transfer and are discussed in more detail in the following section.

Example: London South Bank University's involvement in the European Union Framework 6 Programme

The University has 12 contracts funded by the European Union Framework 6 Programme for Research, with a value to LSBU of £1.9 million, including:

- A £52,000 two-year project on education called Form-it "Take Part in Research" involving 11 European partners including LSBU
- A £1.6m three-year project on robotics/non-destructive testing called Climbing robot cell for fast and flexible manufacture of large scale structures (CROCELLS) involving 6 European partners including LSBU
- A four-year £53,000 project on Energy efficient Community Stimulation by use and Intergration of Local Energy Resources (ECOSTILER) involving 12 European partners including LSBU
- A three-year £160,000 project on Low energy hotels in Southern Europe (LowEHotels) involving 7 European partners including LSBU
- A three-year £211,587 project in the field of surface engineering called Flexible automated processes for PVD coatings in new applications (Flexicoat) involving 10 European partners including LSBU
- A £141,000 two-year project on materials engineering called CONCEPT, focused on the development of a high energy nanofocus computed tomography system for glass reinforced plastic wind turbine blades
- A £67,000 three year project in the field of non-destructive testing called 'Development of Ultrasonic Guided Wave Inspection Technology for the Condition Monitoring of Offshore Structures' involving 7 institutions (including LSBU)

Other international research partnership projects involving the Universities are funded by the research councils in the UK and overseas, and the business sector, as well as by UK funding schemes such as UKIERI, the England-Africa Programme and PMI2 Connect. Many of these projects have an applied focus and involve capacity-building activities that are particularly relevant to the mission of surveyed institutions. The Napier University Business School hosts the EU-China Development and Research Centre which was launched in Beijing in October 2003. Since then, the Centre has built up a network of research associates in

universities and organisations across China to provide research and consultancy services via an academic network. The University of Northampton Business School hosts a China Centre which encourages collaborative research activity and scholarly exchanges between Britain and China, including consultancy services to local firms (e.g. translation and interpretation services) and capacity building in China (policing). Also in China UCLan has recently opened a joint research facility with a Chinese partner (see example below).

Example: University of Central Lancashire joint research facility in China

UCLan opened a joint research facility in September 2008 at the Shenzhen Virtual University Park (SZVUP) near Hong Kong, which will run in partnership with the City University of Hong Kong and will focus on joint projects in applied sciences including Digital Sciences, Modern Manufacturing, Biomedical Sciences and Environmental Technology. It will support 50 researchers and will provide graduate training, knowledge and skills transfer in these fields, with all results from the research projects being published jointly by the two universities.

C3. Enterprise, Knowledge Transfer and Capacity Building Partnerships

The Universities are also engaged in partnership projects with higher education institutions and other organisations overseas to apply their knowledge and expertise. This type of activity is called by a number of different names, such as enterprise, knowledge transfer, consultancy, third-leg and capacity- building. In some cases, such activity is referred to directly in an international strategy; typically, however, the strategic focus of these activities is articulated in an institution's enterprise strategy.

Depending on the nature of the partnership, particularly in terms of funding and the status of the partner institution, the focus of such partnerships can be income generation for the University or, as in most examples uncovered in our survey, capacity-building in the partner institution or country. Universities are understandably reluctant to exploit their expertise for financial gain in developing countries.

The survey findings indicate that the Universities are involved in the following types of enterprise, knowledge transfer and capacity-building partnership activity:

- Co-development of Continuing Professional Development (CPD) training programmes – e.g. curriculum development – typically in subjects such as healthcare, ICT and education.
- Delivery of Continuing Professional Development (CPD) training programmes – e.g. training the trainers – typically in fields such as HR, education, or leadership and management.
- Providing expert consultancy services to overseas partner institutions – e.g. quality assurance and accreditation and English-language testing (for example at Roehampton University).

At the national level, the Training Gateway has been established as a register of opportunities for UK universities to promote their CPD training skills in the UK and internationally. Recently Glasgow Caledonian University and Bucks New University have engaged in overseas consultancy or CPD after responding to this network. A classic example of a CPD project gained through competitive tender is shown below.

Example: University of Wolverhampton and the Romanian Border Police

The University of Wolverhampton is providing human resource training to members of the Romanian Border Police after securing a prestigious EU project. The 'Training in Curriculum Design and Development' programme will be delivered by four lecturers from the Human Resources department of the School. They will provide information about modern teaching techniques and interactive classroom methods to the professors and teachers of the Romanian Border Police (RBP), who will adopt the new techniques when training their staff. The training will be delivered to 150 people over a two-month period during 2008.

In many cases, there is a great deal of overlap between enterprise activity and teaching and research, especially when these are combined with capacity-building or knowledge transfer. Indeed, many funding bodies (e.g. the EU) require knowledge transfer to be embedded into research projects⁴⁶.

⁴⁶ CPD in particular operates in a grey area since it can cover teaching, research and knowledge transfer activities – for example when a partnership project is funded to research and develop a CPD programme which is then delivered overseas in an attempt to build capacity in the partner institution.

Example: The Natural Resources Institute at the University of Greenwich

The University's Natural Resources Institute (NRI) plays a role in continuing professional development in developing countries, both in the public and private sector in partnership with organisations such as the Association of Commonwealth Universities. The University's corporate plan suggests that the NRI will develop further international partnerships through consultancy and delivery of postgraduate programmes. The NRI has also received funding from the England-Africa Partnership scheme in 2006 for an agriculture-based project with Makerere University in Uganda focused on enhancing the capacity of the Department of Agricultural Extension/Education (DAEE) at Makerere University, to offer modular degree programs for private agricultural advisory service providers. In addition, the NRI has also received funding from round 2 of the DELPHE programme in 2007 for a capacity-building project with the University of Zimbabwe focused on research into the effective and sustainable utilisation of traditional wild plant-based foods.

It is very difficult to collect information on third-leg activity from universities, except where the institution has an enterprise or knowledge transfer office. Even then, the data management systems do not necessarily identify whether a project involves international partnership activity – except in the case of EU funded projects which require a significant level of institutional-level administration. Thus, the main source of information about such activity comes from a range of funding programmes which support these activities (see Appendix 4 for further details about these Universities' involvement in these schemes):

- EU project funding – e.g. Framework VI/VII and TEMPUS
- EC funding schemes – e.g. the EC-Asia Link Programme
- UK and overseas Government funded schemes – e.g. DfID DELPHE programme, England Africa Programme, UKIERI, PMI2Connect, and BRIDGE⁴⁷
- Commonwealth Scholarships Commission – which manages funding of around £12m each year of DfID awards and fellowships in developing countries

A number of the Universities have significant involvement in the EU Framework Programme. For example, the University of Bedfordshire is leading a range of multi-partner projects in fields such as computing and ICT, business and management, and the social sciences. London South Bank University is active in the EU Framework Programme and other European-funded projects in the fields of education, health care, engineering, and technology. Kingston University is involved in EU Framework programmes focused on engineering, technology and the social sciences, including 'Mobilising SSH', a two-year global collaborative research project with a consortium of 13 partners on mobilising future research collaborations in the social sciences and humanities in the EU, the Newly Independent States (NIS) and China.

The EU projects usually involve consortia of a number of European institutions and organisations, sometimes including institutions from outside Europe (e.g. Asia). The other funding schemes generally involve one or more UK institutions in partnership with one or more overseas institutions in target countries in Eastern Europe, Asia (especially India and China) or Africa.

Outside the major funding schemes, some of the institutions have established partnerships to deliver consultancy, CPD or other kinds of capacity building which are either project-based (with selected partners) or are integrated into, or are an extension of, a multi-level strategic alliance that involves other activities such as teaching, research and student mobility. For example, The University of Wolverhampton has a Centre for International Development and Training (CIDT) which, for the past 35 years has supported people-centred sustainable development by working in partnership to develop the skills of individuals and institutions through education and training, research, consultancy and programme management. It has worked in close partnership with national governments, donors, agencies, NGOs, institutions and consulting companies in Asia, Africa, Latin America, Europe and the South Pacific.

In addition, some of the Universities are also involved in capacity building activities supported by overseas Governments and other organisations, related to education (e.g. Northampton in the UAE (see example below), and West of Scotland in Estonia and Southampton Solent in the Philippines (see example below) and other areas such as policing (e.g. Teesside in Rwanda, Wolverhampton in Romania). The University of the West of Scotland has also undertaken a €1.5m European Commission funded project by the Business School's Centre for International Corporate Governance and Accounting (CICGA) to implement International Financial Reporting Standards to entrepreneurial businesses in Azerbaijan.

⁴⁷ Many of these are managed and co-ordinated by the British Council, although the funding comes from the UK government.

Example: Northampton CPD in the UAE

A partnership between Northampton Business School and the Institute for International Research (IIR Dubai) offers an MA in International Human Resources Management using blended learning strategies including face-to-face workshops in Dubai, interactive CDs and VLE materials by University of Northampton academics. The programme is promoted as a stand-alone executive development module and a Master of Arts from Northampton which has an 18-month study period. The University has no ongoing physical presence in the country. Northampton, along with a small number of UK and international universities is providing masters' level learning and teaching in the Arabian Gulf through the Centre for Leadership Excellence and Applied Research (CLEAR). Demand for training in HRM has been fuelled by a ruling from the Emirates Government that from 2008 all HRM personnel in the Emirates must be UAE nationals. The University has also been asked by the UAE to further review training, development and learning opportunities for other important business disciplines in the region, including leadership and management.

Example: Southampton Solent in the Philippines

The University's Warsash Maritime Academy (WMA) provides education, training, research and consultancy to the international shipping and off-shore oil industries. Since 2007 it has had an arrangement with the International Maritime Employers' Committee (IMEC) – an international employer's organisation - to deliver the Postgraduate Certificate in Maritime Education & Training (PGCertMET) in the Philippines which enrolls around 15 students a year. The course is designed for maritime college lecturers who are engaged in delivering professional education and training to cadets and officers for the world's merchant shipping fleets. Students are sponsored by the International Maritime Training Trust (IMTT). The course is delivered solely by WMA staff and involves WMA staff travelling to Manila for face to face interactive sessions and students travelling to the UK to use specialist equipment. Learning is supported by e-mail tutorial support and on-line discussion groups via Southampton Solent's VLE.

C4. Strategic Partnerships, Alliances and Consortia

Our survey findings demonstrate that over half of all of the Universities either currently have some kind of strategic, institutional- level international alliance, or outline an aim to develop such an alliance in their strategic or corporate plan. In most cases this means developing 'broad and deep' partnerships with a small number of selected institutional partners of similar standing and expertise for mutual benefit, or creating an overseas campus (in partnership with a local organisation) to offer a wide range of collaborative programmes.

For some institutions this can mean developing larger consortia or networks - involving more than two institutions - which cover focused activities such as collaborative provision, research and staff and student mobility. Interesting examples are provided by UWS and Coventry in the boxes below.

Example: University of the West of Scotland – consortia related to both teaching and research

The Experimental Nuclear Physics Research Group at UWS participates in an ongoing research network which involves nuclear physics laboratories in partner institutions in Italy, Finland, Germany, France, and the USA.

In addition, UWS is also one of eight English and Scottish universities that have partnered in the Centre for Russian, Central and Eastern European Studies which is supported by £4.7 million in funding over five years from the Economic and Social Research Council, the Arts and Humanities Research Council, the Scottish Funding Council and the Higher Education Funding Council for England to develop postgraduate training in policy-making and advice, business and the non-governmental sector. Over the 5 years, the centre plans to award 40 taught and research masters degrees and 20 PhD scholarships. It is also funding a one-year postdoctoral fellowship in each institution, with fellows able to spend time in more than one university. The centre has six international partners: Charles University in Prague, Czech Republic; Tartu University in Tartu, Estonia; the Institute of Political Science, Corvinus University, Budapest; Jagiellonian University in Krakow, Poland; and the Region Research Centre, Ul'yanovsk State University in the Russian Federation.

Example: Coventry University

Coventry University participates in the UN Global Compact network of organisations committed to ten universal principles in areas of corporate social responsibility (CSR) and which emphasises the important role academic institutions can play through research and knowledge dissemination to increase understanding of corporate citizenship and the CSR concept.

Many strategic alliances or partnerships grow out of existing collaborative provision, which can extend to include additional teaching programmes, joint research, capacity building and staff and student mobility (e.g. Bedfordshire in China and Oman, Greenwich in Egypt, Napier in China, and West of Scotland in Malawi). Other international partnerships are created as broad and deep alliances from the outset. For example, in 2007, Kingston University established a strategic network with six partner universities in France, Germany, Lithuania, Spain and Turkey. The network seeks to facilitate opportunities for collaboration in education, culture, research and enterprise.

D. Detailed Analysis of the Universities' Partnerships

D1. Types of partner institution

The institutions surveyed currently partner with different types of organisations depending on the nature of the partnership and the location of the partner. Partner organisations can include prestigious public and private universities, private colleges and educational foundations, professional bodies, research institutes, government departments, and private sector companies.

The Universities' international teaching partnerships involve public universities (especially in China, Japan Hong Kong and Russia), private colleges, and organisations which own a number of colleges in a country or region and that offer UK programmes in different locations. Examples of the latter include Kaplan with Bedfordshire in Singapore and Hong Kong, and Staffordshire with the Asia Pacific Institute of Information Technology (APIIT) in Malaysia, Pakistan, Sri Lanka and India, with INTI College in Malaysia and Hong Kong, and with the Systematic Education Group International (SEGi) in Malaysia and India.⁴⁸

Partner types depend on the regulatory context in specific countries - particularly restrictions on degree awarding powers, and the nature of in-country overseas delivery— and the availability of, and demand for, overseas provision. In Hong Kong and India, public sector universities often establish separate educational entities which engage in collaborative provision, usually for-profit. An example of the latter is the School of Continuing and Professional Education (SCOPE) at City University in Hong Kong, which hosts collaborative provision with several of these Universities (e.g. Coventry, Wolverhampton and Napier). In addition, the University of Bedfordshire works with the British Council in India to deliver its MBA by Distance Learning, and Staffordshire collaborates with the British Council (also in India) to deliver its MA in Sustainable Development by distance-learning.

Example: The University of Bedfordshire and Kaplan, Asia Pacific Management Institute - Singapore and Hong Kong

The University of Bedfordshire has a partnership with Kaplan's Asia Pacific Management Institute in Singapore and in Hong Kong which allows Kaplan to deliver two BA (Hons) programmes in Business Management and Accounting in Singapore. The BA Accounting will also be offered in Hong Kong in the future. Programmes began in Summer 2008, and are taught by senior academic staff from various institutions (e.g. the Singapore Polytechnic or the National University of Singapore) and are guided by a Bedfordshire-appointed Director of Studies. An innovative feature of the programmes will be the promotion of the concepts of 'graduateness' and skills in a different cultural setting, and it is hoped that the use of the University's personal strategic portfolio (at level 2) will provide a unique opportunity for Singaporean students to gain a fully-rounded undergraduate experience. The programmes will provide high-quality academic support (via Kaplan).

Some overseas partners do not have degree-awarding powers and thus seek to offer overseas degrees, whilst others are able to offer their own undergraduate degrees and seek to partner with a UK institution at postgraduate level (e.g. for Masters courses). Private sector institutions can be both for-profit and not-for-profit, depending on the particular regulations and market in each country. In all cases, the collaborative partnership is designed to be self-financing, and in some cases it is expected to generate a significant profit (for both partners). The UK partners often use their share of the income to reinvest in the partnership activity or to cross-subsidise other international partnership activity.

The nature of the relationship between the UK and overseas partners can change over time, and a development trajectory can be identified where particularly strategic and mature partnerships can broaden or deepen. For example, in many cases progression arrangements can develop into articulation arrangements, and these can then be upgraded to joint delivery partnerships. Ultimately, these partnerships may develop

⁴⁸ SEGi is a major private institution in Malaysia which has recently been granted university college status. The institution is a multi-site institution with a number of campuses both in and around Kuala Lumpur and further afield within Malaysia. Each college operates as its own entity within a wider educational group.

into a strategic alliance covering undergraduate and postgraduate teaching, joint research and other cultural and academic links.

In some cases, UK institutions enter into joint ventures with overseas partners to develop overseas campuses or colleges overseas that can offer a range of different programmes from the UK university, and can be designated as accredited providers of the UK university's programmes for students in a particular country – or a region - when a university or an overseas government is pursuing a strategy of developing regional 'hubs' to attract international students (e.g. London Met in Central and Eastern Europe).

In 2005, Middlesex University opened a 'branch campus' in the Dubai Knowledge Village, which it views as an integral part of the University, and subject to the same Quality Assurance procedures – e.g. the same validation and monitoring system, and the same examinations and awards. Students are also able to transfer between campuses. The Dubai campus offers students a range of Bachelor's degrees in IT, Hospitality and Tourism, Psychology, Media, and Bachelors and Masters in Business and Management.

Participating institutions have capacity building partnerships in Africa and Asia (see Appendix 4). These usually involve public sector universities in these regions, but can also involve governmental organisations and NGOs.

D2. Location of international partners

Universities surveyed are involved in collaborative teaching partnerships across the globe, many of which are in the priority countries for the UK⁴⁹. Focus countries and regions depend on institutional strategies and changing regulatory contexts. The Universities are heavily involved in countries such as China, Malaysia, Hong Kong, Oman and Dubai that are seeking to develop their skills base to equip graduates to participate in the global knowledge economy. There view is that international partnerships can help to achieve national economic development goals. Some of the Universities also have significant partnerships in Africa and Russia, and others have a range of links with European institutions, although there is some evidence from the survey that many of these European teaching partnerships are being phased out.

Over half of the Universities have some kind of link with Chinese institutions and most relate to articulation arrangements and twinning, although there are some examples of flying faculty, franchising and joint provision models. Some institutions have a number of articulation links (e.g. Bedfordshire, Birmingham City University, Glasgow Caledonian, LSBU, UCLan, UWS and Middlesex) in China, whilst others have a small number of selected partners. Some of these partnerships are long-standing and also facilitate international student recruitment to the UK, and provide opportunities for staff and student exchange. Some interesting examples of links between Chinese institutions and the Universities surveyed are provided in the boxes below.

Example: University of the West of Scotland and Northeast Normal University

This partnership is based on a twinning arrangement between UWS and NNU – a public university in China – to offer 3+1 and 4+1 models of articulation in Physics, Media and Business leading to BA or MSc awards. The partnership has been in place since 2002. As well as its benefit for generating fee income, the partnership is also being used to help student recruitment and to provide opportunities for staff exchange – and was originally developed from an existing student exchange partnership. Students spend either 3 or 4 years in China before completing their studies in the UK.

Example: The University of Wolverhampton and Shenzhen Polytechnic in China

The University has had a university-wide relationship with Shenzhen Polytechnic in China since 1995. The relationship has focused on student progression and staff exchange. Since 1996 the University of Wolverhampton has welcomed visiting scholars from Shenzhen and almost 600 students have travelled to the UK to study a top-up undergraduate degree or a postgraduate degree. In addition, the two institutions have worked together in other areas such as bespoke training courses, co-sponsorship of exhibitions,

⁴⁹ The Prime Minister's Initiative 2 has following 24 target countries: Australia , Bangladesh , Brazil , Canada , China , Ghana , The Gulf (including Saudi Arabia and UAE) , Hong Kong , India , Indonesia , Japan , Korea , Malaysia , Mexico , Nigeria , Pakistan , Russia , Singapore , Sri Lanka , Taiwan , Thailand , Turkey , USA , Vietnam. However, particular funding schemes also list other target countries (e.g. The International Strategic Partnerships in Research and Education (INSPIRE) schemes targets the following countries in Central South Asia: Pakistan, Bangladesh, Iran, Kazakhstan and Afghanistan.

curriculum development and joint research. For example, in September 2007, 16 Wolverhampton students went to China on a study trip to Shenzhen to learn about Chinese language and culture.

Recently there has been an interesting trend for collaboration between the London-based Universities in this study and partners in China (and in Cuba) related to collaborative provision, two-way capacity-building and student and staff mobility in the field of Chinese Medicine (see examples below).

Example: Chinese Traditional Medicine – London Metropolitan University, London South Bank University and the University of East London

London Metropolitan University has a dual award validation arrangement with Shanghai University of Traditional Chinese Medicine (SUTCM) which allows a small number of SUTCM students to study the basis, according to western scientific traditions, of Chinese traditional medicine and, following completion of their course, to proceed to postgraduate study in London. Students successfully completing the programme emerge with dual awards, the Shanghai award in traditional Chinese medicine and the London Metropolitan BSc in Chinese Herbal Medicinal Science. London Metropolitan staff work alongside Chinese colleagues at the partner institution in delivering 8 modules in China to provide the students with those elements in the London award not covered by the Shanghai syllabus. The collaboration involves staff development, with Chinese staff from SUTCM spending extended periods at London Metropolitan in order to improve their knowledge of the London curriculum and their academic English and with London staff making intensive teaching and staff development inputs on visits to Shanghai. The collaboration envisages Chinese staff from the partner institution increasingly taking over delivery of the additional London Metropolitan curriculum in Shanghai. In future it is hoped that some Chinese students will take up the validated opportunity to undertake the final year in London. There are also research projects and agreements between the two institutions. This partnership has allowed London Metropolitan University to develop a new area of research and courses in complementary therapy.

In 2007 LSBU and Hanban, the office of the Chinese Language Council International in China, signed an agreement to establish the Confucius Institute for Traditional Chinese Medicine at LSBU. The institute is the first of its kind in the world to provide tuition in Chinese medicine, culture and language, and opened in September 2008. The initiative is based on a partnership between the Heilongjiang University of Chinese Medicine (HUCM) and Harbin Normal University. The Centre will allow the Faculty of Health and Social Care to provide a range of educational programmes to help healthcare practitioners in London to gain the competence and capacity they need to deliver alternative therapeutic services to the local population.

In 2008 the UEL School of Health and Bioscience announced a new exchange partnership with Matanzas Faculty of Traditional Chinese Medicine in Cuba which will allow students studying for a BSc (Hons) degree in Acupuncture the opportunity to spend time in Cuba observing how acupuncture is practised within the Cuban national health system. Final year students on the BSc also have the opportunity to receive clinical training in Nanjing, China.

In addition, over half of the Universities have long-standing collaborative partnerships with institutions in Hong Kong, mainly using the franchise model, although there are some examples of articulation, flying faculty and joint provision. For example, Staffordshire has had a franchised agreement with City University since 1989.

India is another important location for overseas collaborative provision. Fifteen of the Universities are involved in partnerships of various types, including articulation arrangements, franchising, validation, and joint provision. The Indian government is keen for overseas partnerships to be genuinely mutually beneficial, and many partnership agreements also contain commitments for cooperation in the areas of joint research, faculty exchanges and curriculum development (such as the Agreement between Bedfordshire and the Nitte Education Trust in Bangalore). UKIERI funding has been particularly important in helping to establish joint delivery and joint provision (e.g. at Greenwich, UCLan, Roehampton and Teesside).

Sixteen of the institutions surveyed described partnerships in Malaysia, mainly involving the franchise and articulation models, although Napier is involved in a PMI2 Connect project which is supporting the development of a joint programme with a Malaysian partner. A significant partner for these Universities in Malaysia is SEGi which delivers franchised courses for Abertay, Greenwich, Sunderland and Bolton. ARU, Coventry, UEL and Staffordshire also have many links with Malaysian institutions.

Eleven institutions reported collaborative provision in Singapore, mostly using the franchising or validation models (e.g. Glasgow Caledonian), with some examples of articulation arrangements (e.g. Abertay, Coventry, and Middlesex).

The Middle East is the location for a growing amount of collaborative provision involving these Universities, particularly in Oman, though also in other Gulf States (e.g. Abu Dhabi, Dubai and Ras al-Khaimah). Seven institutions are operating in Oman, three in Dubai (including Middlesex's branch campus), two in Abu Dhabi and one (Bolton) has recently established a branch campus in Ras al-Khaimah (see the box below). The majority of provision is either franchised or validated courses, but there are examples of flying faculty and supported distance learning. Other Middle Eastern locations include Bahrain, Jordan, Syria, and Qatar. Derby has had significant distance-based provision with Inter College in Israel, although this partnership is now closing. Many of the partnerships in the Middle East recruit significant numbers of students. An interesting example of collaborative provision in the Middle East is Kingston's partnership with two institutions in Iran.

Example: Kingston University and Iranian partners

In 2007 the University signed a partnership agreement with Azad University in Iran to support research links (PhD studentships) and teaching at pre-degree and Bachelors level. Kingston validates the Azad International Foundation Certificate (with pathways in Engineering, Computing, Science and Art and Design on completion). It also franchises the 1st year of a BSc (Hons) in Computer Science to Azad. All franchised/validated programmes are delivered at Azad's Oxford base in the UK. Azad students on the franchised BSc programme are expected to study for a further two years at Kingston to complete their degree. The first of these students will progress to Kingston in 2008/9. The partnership has also helped recruit two PhD students to Kingston. The University also has an articulation agreement with KN Toosi (in place since 2005) for a MSc in Automotive engineering. The programme recruits between 5 and 15 students each year.

Example: Bolton branch campus in Ras al Khaimah, UAE

The University of Bolton has established a branch campus in Ras al Khaimah (RAK) Free Trade Zone in the United Arab Emirates (UAE). In September 2008 the campus began to enrol students on 14 undergraduate (BA, MSc) and postgraduate (MSc, MBA) programmes in Built Environment, Engineering, Business, Computing/Information Technology and Art and Design. Each programme will recruit a minimum of 10 students. The new institution is a joint venture between the University and Western International College (financed by the Kartha Education Society – a group of educational institutions operating in the Middle East and South Asia). The campus will use a 'flying faculty' model – whereby Bolton staff rotate between the UK and two or three-month stints in the UAE - and is described as an 'enhanced franchise' model in which the overseas partner receives enhanced training and support from Bolton. Bolton has academic control and programmes will be directly equivalent to those in the UK and will share the same examination boards, quality monitoring process and external verification. All degrees and transcripts will be the same as those provided in the UK, and there are plans for the campus to facilitate student and staff exchanges. The campus infrastructure has been created by an academic infrastructure provider (IFP) with Bolton investing no more than £1.5m. The new campus will charge annual fees of around £4,000 a year. The new initiative is part of plans to develop higher-level skills in the UAE to meet demand for skilled graduates to boost economic development. Plans for a similar branch campus model in Singapore are expected to be announced in 2008.

The Universities are involved in international partnerships in thirteen different African countries, most notably Malawi, but also in Botswana, Nigeria, Zambia and Tanzania and to a lesser extent in Uganda, Gambia, Swaziland, Ghana, South Africa, Libya, Ethiopia and Kenya. Collaborative teaching provision is mostly franchise in nature and sometimes includes elements of flying faculty (e.g. Bolton and Derby). Many of these are funded by UK government schemes such as the England Africa Partnerships Schemes or the DfID DelPHE programme (see Appendix 4 for more details about these schemes).

Example: Leeds Met Africa

During the last 20 years the University has established a network of partnerships with communities, governments and institutions in Africa, in particular in Zambia, Malawi and Tanzania. In 2006, the umbrella organisation Leeds Met Africa was launched to co-ordinate these activities to provide a vehicle for the university's continued commitment to seeking sustainable and effective responses to African development priorities. The initiative sought to use the University's African experience to identify common themes that could benefit similar activities in developing countries, generate additional income, engage staff in the ethical context for the wider internationalisation agenda and enhance the curriculum for all Leeds Met students. The University's involvement in Africa has encompassed a wide variety of projects and has sought to be consistent with Millennium Development Goals, many of which have been funded by the DelPHE, and England Africa Partnerships Scheme. Many of these projects have focused on the role of education in the

alleviation of poverty, on achieving equal opportunities through gender balance and on enabling students from disadvantaged backgrounds to access study programmes.

Example: University of Greenwich and Middlesex University and the University of Modern Sciences and Arts in Cairo

The University of Greenwich has been in partnership with MSA since summer 2003 and MSA also partners with the University of Middlesex. The Greenwich partnership spans a number of curriculum areas including engineering, architecture, biotechnology and pharmaceutical sciences and is the University's biggest overseas partnership, operating through a model of external validation, whereby students gain both a degree from the partner and a University of Greenwich degree. The Middlesex partnership focuses on undergraduate degree programmes in business, computing, and media. The MSA partnership is one of only a few in which British universities are working together with private institutions in Egypt to help support the expansion of private higher education and increasing participation. In the Greenwich partnerships there are now developments taking place in research both through student exchange, working on key areas and through the proposed registration of teaching assistants for PhD programmes. Research symposia are also being planned in the area of pharmaceutical science.

In recent years eight institutions have developed collaborative provision in Russia, most notably related to the joint development of postgraduate programmes and six of the institutions surveyed have been supported by the BRIDGE programme to develop mainly business based courses with public sector Russian universities.

The survey also identified partnerships of various types in 27 European countries. The most popular countries for collaborative provision are Greece (13 institutions) and Cyprus (5 institutions) predominantly for franchising and articulation, whilst there are significant numbers of partnerships in Germany (12), France (9), Ireland (5), the Netherlands (7) and Spain (5) covering franchising, articulation and joint provision.

Example: London Met and Zuyd University, Maastricht

London Metropolitan University has a number of European collaborations including an MA in Comparative European Social Studies (MACCESS) jointly developed with Zuyd University in Maastricht, validated by London Metropolitan University and delivered in Holland. The programme is financed by and operates under the auspices of the Council of Europe. It is supported by a wider network of some thirty other European higher education institutions, which in part provide both candidates for the programme and specialist teaching inputs. Development of the programme is also supported and sustained by a research centre with the same subject focus which operates in parallel to the programme delivery. This programme was first validated in 1994.

Universities surveyed reported involvement in collaborative partnerships in 18 other countries, and partnerships in further countries are under development. Key PMI2 target countries include Pakistan (4 institutions), Sri Lanka (5), and Thailand (4). There are a few examples of collaborative partnerships in English-speaking countries (e.g. Australia, Canada and the USA). Three of the Universities have links in the USA, and London Met is seeking to develop research and teaching collaboration there, following its award of accreditation from the Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE).

Anglia Ruskin, Greenwich and Middlesex have partnerships in Trinidad and Tobago. Anglia Ruskin University offers franchised undergraduate and postgraduate programmes in partnership with the School of Accounting & Management, whilst Middlesex has articulation based partnerships. Greenwich has worked with SBCS in Trinidad for a number of years in the areas of architecture and construction, occupational health and safety, and in computing and there are also plans to expand this partnership to cover the humanities. Delivery takes place through supported open learning materials, distance-learning materials, as well as face-to-face delivery by SBCS staff.

D3. Subjects and Fields covered by international partnerships

The institutions that took part in this research are involved in collaborative higher education teaching partnerships at foundation, undergraduate and postgraduate level.

The bulk of the collaborative teaching partnerships involving these institutions focuses on professional disciplines such as business and computing, and to a lesser extent engineering (UWS, BCU, Bolton, UCLan, Coventry, Glasgow Caledonian, Greenwich, and Kingston). Many of the overseas teaching partnerships in the Middle East focus on Engineering, whilst Business, Management and ICT are most popular in Hong Kong, China, Malaysia and Singapore.

Example: University of Abertay – Computer Games Technology

The University of Abertay has articulation agreements with partner institutions in Turkey, China and India related to its postgraduate programmes in Computer Games Technology. It has an articulation arrangement related to a two-year master degree at Izmir University of Economics with Abertay's MSc in Computer Games Technology. This articulation with advanced standing link enables around 40 Turkish students each year to spend their first semester at Izmir, and then travel to Abertay for two semesters to articulate from PGCert to PGDip Level. Students then return to Turkey to complete the final year of their Izmir Masters. Abertay also has similar agreements with Nanchang University and SouthWest University of Technology in China, and Amity University in India under which Chinese and Indian students spend time in Abertay as part of their MSc in Computer Games Technology. The programme allows students to articulate to PG Certificate Level whilst at Abertay, after completing English language modules and relevant preparatory modules in their home country. The Nanchang agreement supports 30 such students each year, whilst the SouthWest and Amity agreement allows 10 students in each institution to follow this route.

There are examples of successful or planned teaching partnerships in other niche fields such as Art and Design (e.g. ARU, Bolton, Northampton, Middlesex, BCU, Derby, Kingston, and UCLan), Health and Social Care (Greenwich, Kingston, Middlesex, TVU, Coventry, and Teesside), Media Studies (Bedfordshire, Bolton, UCLan, Wolverhampton, UWS, and Kingston), education (ARU, Derby, Kingston, Teesside and Roehampton), Science and Technology (UCLan, Napier, UWS, Greenwich, London Met, and LSBU), Tourism and Hospitality (Derby, Staffordshire, Sunderland, London Met, TVU, and Napier) and the Social Sciences (Teesside, LSBU, London Met, Roehampton and Kingston). Kingston, for example, offers a joint MSc degree in Human Rights and Genocide Studies. The MSc is offered in partnership with Università degli Studi di Siena (Italy), Collegium Civitas (Poland) and Europa-Universität Viadrina Frankfurt (Oder) (Germany).

Research partnerships tend to focus on particular areas of expertise, often in highly applied fields such as Computing Technology, Human Resource Management, Conservation, and Environmental Science. These subjects are also the focus of many enterprise and knowledge transfer partnerships where the institutions' expertise is used to assist in projects with overseas partners. The England Africa Partnerships Scheme and the DelPHE Programme cover themes such as health (e.g. UCLan in Tanzania, Malawi and Swaziland), climate change and agriculture (e.g. Coventry in Nigeria), as well other areas such as policing (e.g. Teesside in Rwanda, Northampton in China) and education (e.g. Leeds Met in Malawi and Tanzania). Other topics covered by knowledge transfer partnerships involving these institutions include, Health Sector Management, Professional Development and English language testing (Roehampton)

When Universities develop broader institutional alliances, the intention is to include many different disciplines within the partnership, usually to include as many faculties as possible and incorporating, teaching and capacity-building activities in which different parts of the university may have different areas of expertise.

D4. Funding for International Partnerships

International partnerships involving these Universities are funded from a variety of sources including the institutions themselves, partner organisations, overseas Governments, NGOs, companies, and national competitive funding schemes such as PMI2 Connect, UKIERI or the England Africa Partnership scheme⁵⁰. Universities surveyed have had significant success in these UK and EU funded schemes which support international partnership activity, particularly involving collaborative delivery, student mobility and capacity building. Examples of the Universities' involvement in development focused projects in Africa and Asia have been discussed in the preceding sections.

PMI2 Connect and UKIERI funding is focused on supporting international partnerships that encourage joint research, collaborative programme delivery and student mobility. Kingston, Middlesex, Roehampton, Greenwich and Teesside are currently involved in PMI2 Connect-funded research partnerships in Japan in

⁵⁰ Since this project was completed the England Africa Partnerships Scheme has been re-created as the Education Partnerships in Africa (EPA) scheme (2008-11). In addition, the PMI2 Connect programme has recently expanded to include a new International Strategic Partnerships in Research and Education (INSPIRE) scheme focused on academic and research partnerships between the UK and a selection of countries in Central South Asia, and funding for research cooperation between UK HEIs and partner organisations in selected Gulf states - Saudi Arabia, Qatar, United Arab Emirates, Oman, Kuwait and Bahrain

various subject areas, whilst five of these institutions have received PMI2 Connect funding for collaborative programme delivery projects with partners in Pakistan, Malaysia and Vietnam. UCLan, Coventry, Roehampton, Southampton Solent, Greenwich and Teesside universities have received UKIERI funding to support collaborative delivery programmes with Indian partner institutions in areas such as business, CPD, education, and the social sciences.

The EC-Asia Link Programme supports regional and multinational networking between HEIs in Europe and developing countries in Asia. Greenwich, Wolverhampton, Bedfordshire, Birmingham City University, and Abertay received funding from this scheme from 2002 to 2005 (see Appendix 4 for more details).

The majority of teaching partnerships are designed to be ultimately self-financing (usually from student fees), but may require start-up funding from the UK institution, or from international partners or overseas Governments (e.g. Bolton has collaborative provision in Africa supported by the Malawian and Zambian Governments). In some cases new partnerships are cross-subsidised from other successful partnerships (e.g. Bedfordshire has used funds generated from its partnership in Oman to support new partnerships).

Example: Glasgow Caledonian University – Engineering-focused partnership in Oman

In 1996 Glasgow Caledonian University was involved in the establishment of the Caledonian College of Engineering in Oman (CCEO). CCEO is a private college that has University College Status in Oman. GCU has an affiliation agreement with CCEO at undergraduate level and a contractual agreement for MSc delivery, but it has no shareholder interest in the institution. CCEO currently has around 1,550 students studying Glasgow Caledonian franchised degrees in engineering, built environment and business & management at MSc (2 years part-time) and BSc (Hons) (4 years) level. UG programmes are delivered face-to-face by local academic tutors and MSc programmes involve intensive delivery by GCU staff, supported thereafter by local academic tutors. Fees are set by the overseas partner. GCU is currently the only overseas provider operating in Oman. The partnership with CCEO has been successful, but CCEO is currently being considered for merger to form Muscat University, and thus the relationship with GCU is likely to change and the relationship with GCU may be based on postgraduate franchise activity.

Research partnerships that involve project work generally require funding to support staff and infrastructure costs, data collection and travel and subsistence, which means that they generally receive grant funding of some kind – from governmental bodies, charities and research councils (UK-based or international). Some of the Universities (e.g. Greenwich, Teesside, Bedfordshire and UWS) receive over 40% of their research grants and contract income from overseas sources, and much of this comes from EU governmental funds (see Appendix 3 for more details)

Knowledge transfer and enterprise partnership do not always require funding, but may receive some support from UK institutions, international partners or funding schemes, or may form part of a broader strategic partnership where mutual capacity-building runs alongside other international activities.

Example: the University of the West of Scotland in Malawi

UWS has a long-standing link with the University of Malawi (since 2000) which includes collaborative teaching provision, curriculum development, and a joint project involving the School of Health, Nursing and Midwifery focused on the introduction of a healthcare facility in the remote rural village of Kaponda. It has also participated in a pilot project on Child Health in Malawi funded by the UK government's Joint Environment and Human Health Programme, partnering researchers from three UWS Schools with statisticians from the University of Strathclyde and soil scientists from University of Duisburg-Essen, Germany.

E. Barriers to effective partnerships at national and institutional levels

The survey asked institutions for their opinions on the barriers related to successful international partnership activities at both the institutional and national levels. Since the majority of respondents were primarily responsible for institutional-level teaching partnerships, most of the responses related to these types of partnerships rather than research partnerships, knowledge transfer partnerships, student exchange partnerships or broader institutional agreements.

Although each type of partnership will face different barriers, some key issues are outlined below.

E1: National policy issues

UK Government and policy agencies are characterised as both barriers and enablers to international partnership activities. The increased policy commitment and financial support for international education demonstrated by the most recent Prime Minister's Initiative has been welcomed by institutions, many of whom have benefited from pump-priming funding for teaching and research partnerships and student mobility from sources such as UKIERI, PMI2 Connect, BRIDGE, and the England-Africa Partnerships (EAP) Scheme. However, the Universities surveyed expressed concern that such funding is relatively small scale, the competitive bidding process is time-intensive, and that many of the schemes appear tailored towards research-focused institutions (especially research opportunities).

Advice and guidance from the British Council and UKTI on the market conditions and regulatory context for partnership activity in key countries is appreciated by institutions, as is their ability to gain access to overseas Governments to lobby on behalf of UK HE plc. However, given the complex, ambiguous and rapidly changing regulatory context in countries such as China and India, some Universities surveyed expressed a desire for more, relevant, targeted and up-to-date guidance and more effective influence from UK policy agencies to help safeguard the Universities' overseas interests.

In addition, some Universities expressed a frustration that policy agencies tended to liaise more regularly with research-led institutions that may not be as knowledgeable about issues in certain markets as some of the Universities that took part in this study. This is likely to affect the ability of these agencies to promote members' interests and to articulate what these institutions are able to offer countries overseas. A key example is the overseas impact of newspaper league tables in key 'rankings-sensitive' markets in Asia, which can create difficulties for these Universities when identifying partners. The Universities surveyed expressed a desire for government agencies to communicate to overseas partner countries that such league tables are unofficial and are not an effective guide to institutional quality. There was a clear feeling that UK institutions have benefited from UK's reputation for quality in higher education in recent years, but that this may be undermined by inappropriate use of league table information in key markets.

The Universities were also concerned about the recent changes to the UK visa regulations, which are likely to affect on-campus recruitment to the UK and significantly increase institutional compliance costs; they may also affect recruitment to international teaching partnerships (especially twinning or articulation agreements). Some members thought that Home Office policy was not sufficiently 'joined up' with the objectives of the PMI and that visa regulations could potentially undermine its objectives.

Other comments related to particular areas of policy activity. Some institutions expressed a desire for more guidance from the QAA on developing and quality assuring international partnerships, particularly related to the contractual elements of joint and dual degrees, and others criticised the restrictive practices of some UK professional bodies in relation to international collaboration. Perhaps surprisingly, there was very little comment on the UK's policy related to the European Higher Education Area (e.g. its engagement with the Bologna Process) as a barrier or enabler to international partnerships and student mobility.

E2: Institutional issues

At the institutional level, institutions approach their international partnerships in different ways depending on their missions and cultures. A key trend that has emerged from the survey is that, although most partnerships are initiated and managed at faculty level, institution-level co-ordination and support is becoming increasingly important. A perception also emerged that UK HEIs are becoming somewhat more risk averse in terms of international partnership activity. This is at least partly related to regulatory requirements such as the QAA Code of Practice on Collaborative Provision and the greater awareness of risk management within institutions.

The following institutional issues related to international partnership activity emerged from the survey responses:

- The need for international partnership activities to fit with the institutional mission and the wider institutional strategy related to international education. This mainly relates to partner selection and due diligence where it is important that potential partners have a similar status or reputation related to their teaching and research profile, share the same values and, and are financially secure.
- The importance of effective leadership and co-ordination of international activities at both institutional and faculty level. Institutional and faculty champions can help to drive forward the international agenda,

help to ensure connectivity and consistency of approach across institutions and ensure that new overseas partnerships can benefit from institutional knowledge gained from previous experience.

- The necessity of effective financial modelling and business planning that is potentially transferable to other partnerships. This should take into account the true costs of engaging in each partnership, and build-in the resource implications of project management, start-up funding, realistic levels of fee income, travel and staff time.
- The importance of ongoing relationship management for each partnership. This should focus on closely clarifying the relevant terminology, articulating and sharing mutual goals and responsibilities, monitoring the relationship, and regular engagement on the partnership's future development and sustainability.
- The need to develop flexible quality assurance procedures that have the capability to adapt quickly to different market contexts, modes of operation and delivery mechanisms. There was a perception that private providers are often able to be more flexible and responsive to market demand, particularly in in-demand subjects such as computing and business.
- The need to adequately resource quality assurance departments to enable them to comprehensively monitor the quality of overseas teaching provision – particularly related to consistency and standards in marketing, admissions, integrating student-centred learning, student support and assessment
- The importance of faculty engagement in international partnerships. Faculty are vitally important in initiating partnerships and ensuring the success of overseas partnership activity, particularly related to recruitment, course development, teaching and assessment.

The Universities also pointed out the importance of other global issues that impact upon international activities and overseas partnership activity. These include the supply and demand for higher education in different countries, and economic trends such as the global 'credit crunch' and currency fluctuations which affect the ability of international students to bear the costs of studying at an overseas institution.

Chapter 4: Contributions, Outcomes and Benefits

A: Evidence on economic and educational benefits to the UK

This chapter focuses on the economic and educational benefits of overseas partnership activities -starting with their impact in the UK:

- On the region or city in which the University is located.
- On the academic staff
- On the curriculum
- And finally, on the university overall.

For each of these we look at the economic, academic and commercial implications, where applicable. However, it should be noted that our research uncovered little direct or quantifiable evidence, apart from the obvious issue of the impact of international students in the UK.

1. Impact on the city or region:

A substantial proportion of the Universities overseas partnerships involve teaching collaborations of one kind or another and the majority of these lead to the arrival in the UK of international students. In terms of economic impact, the most up to date figures (2003-04) for the value to the UK of incoming international students show that tuition fee income is £2.1 billion and that the associated expenditure of overseas students in the UK is estimated at £2.6bn.⁵¹ This latter figure makes no allowance for expenditure by any of their families coming to the UK.

The significance of these estimates of income earned from international students is that all of it trickles through into expenditure in the city or region where the university is based. The international students' expenditure of £2.6bn goes directly to businesses or landlords, while the £2.1bn received by the university eventually trickles into the local economy through salaries and the purchase of utilities or consumables. Many universities have undertaken studies of their economic impact on the community and these all show that a sum at least equivalent to the total university budget is put into the local economy.⁵²

On the basis of Lenton's figures, and assuming that students studying at the Universities surveyed generate the same average income as all the others, we can say that the international (non EU) student activities in these 28 Universities contribute about £660m in total to their cities or regions.⁵³

There are other impacts on the city or region in the UK that should be noted:

- Universities' overseas partnerships are being used as the basis for building collaborative networks with businesses in the partner city and the Regional Development Agency is often involved in working with the University.⁵⁴
- The University's experience and contacts overseas can help local small businesses enter local markets. Coventry, Wolverhampton and Staffordshire Universities and the UKTI are working to set up a network of "Soft Landing Zones" (see box below for more details). Under this scheme in various countries facilities such as desk space, meeting rooms, internet access and translation are located next to universities' science parks and the British High Commission in each country offers support.
- Inward investment in the region is facilitated by the universities working with the RDAs to offer skills training so as to guarantee foreign companies a supply of suitably qualified labour. According to discussions with the UKTI fears about the quality of the UK workforce are common among inward investors. We did not discover details about universities surveyed playing this role, but the opportunity exists.

⁵¹ Lenton, P. (2007) Global Value. The value of UK education and training exports; an update. September 2007. British Council.

⁵² See the ESRC and the Funding Councils project run from Strathclyde that is co-ordinating a number of economic impact studies of universities on their regions at : <http://ewds.strath.ac.uk/Default.aspx?alias=ewds.strath.ac.uk/impact>

⁵³ This calculation simply takes Lenton's estimate for 2003-04 that 215,650 international students contributed £2.7bn to their local economies and pro rates it for the 70,000 international students at Million+ universities.

⁵⁴ An example of this is the collaboration between the University of Northampton and the Northampton Borough Council and the Northamptonshire Police in China.

- Universities and city councils are sharing the cost of outward missions in order to tempt in foreign investors. In almost all such cases the university is the lead player because of its knowledge of the country and the markets concerned.
- Where the multi-cultural and international nature of the student population is in some cases different from the ethnic mix of the host city, the university sometimes acts to encourage local people to join in the multi-cultural activities on campus.⁵⁵

Example: Coventry University, Staffordshire University, and the University of Wolverhampton – Soft Landing Zones (SLZ)

Coventry University Enterprises Ltd (CUE) in partnership with UK Trade and Investment (UKTI) has launched the 'Soft Landing Zones' (SLZ) programme which provides in-country support for UK organisations setting up operations overseas (e.g. starting a second office abroad, establishing international joint ventures or partnerships, research and development opportunities and outsourcing agreements with companies). The aim is to establish a wide network of Soft Landing Zone offices, based in or located adjacent to universities' science parks, and build direct links to key university personnel. Facilities such as desk space, meeting rooms, internet access, language translation, access to university research facilities and legal and accountancy support are available to SLZ members and SLZ offices are closely tied to the British High Commission and British Embassy in each country. The University of Wolverhampton and Staffordshire University are both working with SLZ to market their science parks overseas and key offices have been established in university science parks across 14 countries, including China, India, Malaysia, Brazil, Poland, Sweden and Mexico. Additional offices are currently being developed in Turkey, South Africa and Australia.

As regards international students taught in their home countries, Lenton quotes a British Council estimate of 208,000 foreign students studying on some form of transnational education (TNE) programme offered by a British institution overseas; this leads her to estimate that the UK benefited to the extent of £196m from this activity. Lenton's figures are based on a small survey of HEIs which produced estimates for the respective sums earned by various forms of TNE; these were that "the income returned to the UK from twinning arrangements/joint programmes/franchises in 2003-04 was in the region of £500 per student, the income from programmes on overseas campuses in the region of £2,706 per student and the income from distance learning in the region of £2,040 per student". The estimate of 50,000 TNE students enrolled at these institutions reported in Chapter 3 suggests that these enrolments should be worth in excess of £47m to participating Universities (at 2003-4 rates), assuming a proportionate spread of programme types.

In addition, Lenton estimates that the value to the UK of all international research grants and contracts and other earned income was £542m in 2003-04, although the majority of this income is likely to have flowed to research-intensive and research-led institutions rather than Universities that took part in this research.

2. Impact on academic staff

A university's international partnership activity can only operate effectively if it has the backing of relevant academic staff. Academic staff engagement in international partnerships can bring them academic, economic and commercial benefits. The academic aspects are closely tied to the university's strategy for internationalisation. If, as Chapter 3 demonstrates, this is now increasingly common, the university has the creation of international strategic partnerships at the heart of its international strategy, the rationale will usually be that such institutional partnerships will deepen over time and develop into comprehensive relationships covering teaching and research and joint projects in the country concerned.

The potential benefits of international partnership activities for staff are:

- The understanding of other cultures and other ways of learning and teaching that come from working alongside colleagues in partner institutions and overseas.
- The growing international research opportunities presented to staff with the chance to build on their research strengths with appropriate international partners. Partnerships tend to develop from ones based on undergraduate teaching and scholarship in the first instance to ones with post graduate programmes, PhD exchanges and ultimately collaborative research.
- The consequential ability to improve interactions with international students at home and provide them with a learning experience that starts with a better understanding of their home environment.

⁵⁵ Fielden, J (2007). Global Horizons for UK Universities. CIHE.

- The opportunities to meet international academic staff and forge research or consultancy collaborations in the country concerned.
- The potential in many institutions to earn a salary supplement or accumulate savings, if resident overseas.

Where the overseas activity has a developmental focus, the academics concerned may be driven by altruistic as well as academic motives. Leeds Metropolitan University has focused on this and reported the “transformational effect” that a short period of international volunteering has on most students who take part. This is certainly true also of some of the more significant projects that the Universities surveyed are involved with in Africa under the English Africa Programme or with the Commonwealth Scholarships Commission. Thus, international development work and volunteering benefits both parties – the outgoing academic or student and the recipients.

3. Impact on the curriculum

The internationalisation of the curriculum is a key element in most internationalisation strategies and it is directly assisted by a university’s international partnership activities. These equip academic staff with an understanding of other cultures and learning styles; the process of reviewing the transfer of a UK syllabus into partner institutions quickly illustrates the differences in learning and student expectations. This feeds back into the task of reviewing the UK curriculum so that it is sensitive to foreign students’ perceptions as well as illustrative of more than purely European perspectives.

Another benefit to the curriculum is that overseas partnerships can allow the introduction into the UK of totally new programmes that have been developed jointly with an overseas partner. Both London Met and London South Bank Universities (LSBU) have found this with their Chinese partnerships as a result of which they are now offering within the UK programmes in Chinese Medicine. In LSBU’s case this is within the umbrella of a Confucius Institute for Traditional Chinese Medicine, Culture and Language. The local Chinese population can benefit directly from the university’s transnational education activity. The resulting course is the first of its kind outside China.

One other potential curricular benefit is the opportunity for overseas placements arising from close links with partners. Arrangements of this kind are still in their infancy, but involve home students visiting the subsidiaries of UK-based companies on university business or science parks, with which an overseas partner institution has good links. We are aware of some UK universities developing such industrial placement programmes, but have not been told of any examples in surveyed institutions.

4. Impact on home students

The principal impact of international partnerships on home students is the effect of working in a multicultural campus and of having the opportunity to socialise and get to know students from other environments. This is frequently stated as one of the core objectives of universities’ internationalisation strategies and most of the Universities surveyed have what is termed a “student-centred internationalisation strategy” rather than a university-centred one, in which the main objective is to ensure that students receive an education that equips them for an internationalised world. Coventry, for example, has set itself the following aims in this area: “internationalisation of the university should enrich the educational and professional experience of students and staff by introducing them to the languages, cultures and intellectual traditions of other nations”.⁵⁶

One key academic objective which, sadly, is more aspirational than it should be is the opportunity offered by international partnerships for domestic students to study abroad in one form or another. The benefits of this can be considerable and there is evidence that it has some impact on students’ employability⁵⁷. When selecting new staff, many employers said that they valued a period of study abroad and also the ability to speak a foreign language. Yet the numbers of UK home students taking up the opportunity are extremely low, as are those joining Erasmus schemes in the rest of Europe.⁵⁸ Several of the Universities provide

⁵⁶ Quoted in Fielden J (2007) op cit. p. 18.

⁵⁷ The findings of an i-graduate survey of employers published by CIHE in September 2008 in *Global Horizons and the roles of employers*.

⁵⁸ See Fielden, J, Middlehurst R and Woodfield, S (2007) *Global Horizons for UK Students*, CIHE for DIUS. This reported on the problems and barriers hindering UK students from travelling overseas.

financial assistance to students wishing to study overseas, particularly in China; however, many of the barriers are not financial, but are related to the age and personal circumstances of students.

5. Impact on the university overall

Universities as a whole derive significant benefits from their international activities. Until recently this statement would have been interpreted principally in financial terms, but it now has a much wider meaning, since the academic and cultural benefits from genuine partnership activities are fully recognised. In addition it is acknowledged that the UK was becoming unpopular overseas because of its emphasis on financial returns from the international student recruitment (see the discussion in Chapter 2). Thus, while there are still obvious financial advantages, most Vice-Chancellors tend not to emphasise these (except to Council members, possibly), but will argue that the university fares better by taking a long term partnership approach when working with overseas institutions.

However, in many institutions the focus of the senior management team is still on the bottom line and income from overseas activities such as direct recruitment and the faculty and key staff within the international office are the real advocates for capacity building and development activity. They often contribute a great deal in terms of time and expertise in many cases for little reward. This needs to change if the wider benefits of partnership activity are to be realised within the university. One University described this “as giving something back” and has provided one of its overseas regional offices with significant sums of money to be spent on local developmental or knowledge transfer activities. The rhetoric of the PMI2 initiative supports this change of emphasis towards collaboration and partnership and argues that the UK’s prime objective is to be the preferred partner country of choice for overseas institutions.

One long term benefit from the flows of international students to the UK that is often cited but never quantified is the cultural and economic goodwill towards the UK engendered in the students participating in overseas study. The recent Million+ report on the creative industries summarised it as follows: “mutually beneficial relationships are developed between students, institutions, business and governments in these students’ countries of origin resulting in long term influence and continuing benefit to the UK economy in terms of employment of personnel and purchase of technologies.”⁵⁹ There could also be direct financial benefits to universities, as alumni offices now increasingly recognise the importance of their overseas alumni as long term future donors to their institution.

The development of overseas teaching partnerships is seen by some as an alternative marketing strategy. No longer does the university have to participate in recruitment fairs and exhibitions in a country, if it already has several productive teaching partnerships that bring regular flows of students to its campus. Some might even argue that teaching partnerships are a cheaper and more reliable form of recruitment in the medium to long-term.

As was mentioned in Chapter 3, the development of a small number of strategic international partnerships is the key component of most internationalisation strategies, including of the Universities surveyed. These can have a significant impact within an institution. At Leeds Met for example, the grouping of all the university’s partnership activities in Africa under a “Leeds Met Africa” banner, described in Chapter 3, sent positive signals to donors and governments about the university’s commitment and interest in helping Africa’s development.⁶⁰

Donor funding for a university’s development projects overseas brings positive recognition to what might have remained internal research interests. Thus, the tabeisa partnership project in Ghana and South Africa, which is run by the Universities of Greenwich and Coventry, has achieved a high profile position through the success of its programmes for training small entrepreneurs in both countries.⁶¹

Example: Coventry University and the University of Greenwich – Tabeisa partnership

Coventry and the University of Greenwich are involved in the tabeisa partnership (<http://www.tabeisa.ac.uk>) with four universities in South African and one Ghanaian university: Cape Peninsula University of Technology; Walter Sisulu University for Science and Technology; Durban University of Technology; Tshwane University of Technology, South Africa; and the University of Education, Winneba, Ghana. The partnership received funding via Round 1 of the England Africa Programme (EAP) in 2006 for the project

⁵⁹ Million+ (2008). *Creative Futures. Building the creative economy through universities.*

⁶⁰ See <http://www.lmu.ac.uk/internat/region/africa/leedsmetafrica.htm>

⁶¹ See www.tabeisa.ac.uk

'Design4Life Africa' which sought to assist institutions in Ghana and South Africa to help reduce poverty by creating partnerships between designers and producers to support ethical fashion and textile design and production. The project is based on a successful model in Ghana in which designers in Ghana and the UK produced traditional Ghanaian textile and dress designs to create a fashion range to be made by Ghanaian fair trade groups. Tabeisa expects to have created over 12,000 jobs in Africa by 2009.

B: Educational benefits to other countries and regions.

The overseas impact of UK universities' activities has not been widely studied or reported on and we have been unable to find any relevant impact studies. The only (as yet unpublished) evaluations relate to the impact of the activities of the Commonwealth Scholarships Commission (CSC) on their recipient countries. As we have seen in Chapter 3, institutions surveyed contribute significantly to these. The Association of Commonwealth Universities is in the middle of an impact study reviewing the effectiveness of the CSC's awards in contributing to the Millennium Development Goals of recipient countries. Interim findings from this that were made available to a recent independent evaluation of the CSC's programmes were positive and showed that the DfID funding of scholarships was having a very beneficial impact in the countries concerned.⁶²

In the absence of any formal studies we can only suggest the likely benefits of these Universities' overseas partnership activities in the countries where members operate. There are six specific points to consider:

- *Contribution to national higher education policy goals.* Many countries aspire to increasing their age participation ratio in tertiary education but simply cannot afford to do so from State funds. A reliance on providers from the domestic private sector and international universities is becoming an accepted way of meeting the gap between massive demand and a limited supply (especially in Asia and the Middle East). Thus, these institutions are helping countries to achieve their goals for an educated population able to contribute to the development of a knowledge economy. Completion of a UK course provides students with a very marketable qualification which adds to their employability and salary potential.⁶³ The drawback is that degrees offered by overseas universities are expensive and do not contribute to any national goals for increasing equitable access to higher education. Only the rich middle classes can afford to pay UK international student fees.
- *Delivery of UK programmes at less cost than in the UK.* Where programmes are delivered entirely off shore, or are on a 3+0 partnership basis, UK institutions are less open to charges of profiteering through high tuition fees or encouraging the brain drain. This allows the parents and students to obtain a UK award at far less cost than by studying in the UK. Even though this is usually more costly for them than studying with a wholly domestic provider, a larger number of students will have obtained a quality-assured education leading to an internationally-recognised qualification.
- *Provision of staff development and resources in partner institutions.* When the Universities surveyed enter into partnerships with developing country institutions they are usually involved in extensive staff development activities that strengthen the capacity of the partners' staff to deliver the UK programme. In most cases this leaves the partner with the capability to use the UK materials in other courses or programmes. UCLan, for example, is particularly focused on mutually beneficial partnership activity, and other institutions such as Coventry and Bedfordshire are keen to increase partner institutions' capacity to deliver their programmes 'autonomously'. In the CSC's Distance Learning Scholarship scheme, for example, there is an explicit requirement that the UK institution will hand over its own distance learning materials to the local partner and train staff in using them. These materials can be used locally for other university programmes.
- *Capacity building and contribution to the achievement of MDGs.* Most of the development projects have goals related to the MDGs and, as we have seen from the CSC's experience, are likely to strengthen the national capacity to tackle the problems of poverty. In some projects the achievements are immediately quantifiable. The Tabeisa programme, for example, claims that it will have created over 12,000 jobs in Africa by 2009. In Africa, Universities surveyed have apparently been slow starters, since a sector survey of partnerships by the ACU for the Africa Commission reported that only 27% of respondents came from the post 1992 sector.⁶⁴ However the evidence in Chapter 3 shows a substantial increase in collaborative activity with African institutions.

⁶² DfID (2007). *Review of the DFID-funded Commonwealth Scholarship Schemes*. Unpublished.

⁶³ Recent research by i-graduate to be published in September 2008 reports that "international alumni who have studied in the UK and returned home are substantially more likely to indicate that their salary is "well above average" or "above average".

⁶⁴ Kubler, J (2005). *African and UK University Partnerships*. Association of Commonwealth Universities.

- *Mutually beneficial research collaboration.* One consequence of close collaboration with overseas institutions is that UK academic staff come to understand the research interests and challenges of their partners and colleagues. Our survey has shown how frequently this develops into collaborative research activity, sometimes involving UK industry or public sector bodies. In the first instance there is a capacity-building element as the UK partner helps its partner to acquire research skills, but this soon grows into longer term collaboration (usually small scale and frequently funded from within departmental or faculty budgets). An example of this is the partnership between Bedfordshire and the China Agricultural University described in Chapter 3.
- *Direct contributions to the profitability or effectiveness of foreign corporations or public services.* The survey of overseas activity in Chapter 3 has shown many instances where the Universities provide Continuing Professional Development to public and private organisations overseas. Although the connection between CPD and financial outcomes is never clear, the need for continual upgrading of people skills is universally accepted as a fundamental part of most economic strategies. The Universities that took part in this research are meeting this need as well as creating professional networks that might have other more tangible benefits in the longer term.

Example: University of the West of Scotland and Sub-One Technology Inc.

An example of an overseas commercial contract is the £6m research contract between The Thin Film Centre (TFC) at UWS and California based Sub-One Technology Inc. focused on investigating the performance and application of an ultra-smooth, hard, diamond-like carbon film that can be applied to the internal surfaces of a range of components in many industries, including oil and gas.

There are also two key potential negative impacts of international teaching partnership activity:

- That international education encourages the brain drain since a substantial number of students do not return to their home country (even in transnational programmes). Indeed, the USA and Canada see the retention of international students as an explicit way of strengthening their own talent pool and there is currently an international race to relax visa regulations allowing graduates to stay longer after their study, as they bring economic benefit to their new host country⁶⁵.
- That the cost of UK university validation procedures and staff development drives up the local tuition fees that partner institutions have to charge their domestic students. In Sri Lanka this is becoming a political issue and it is estimated that the UK charges and procedures have the effect of doubling the tuition fee that the local partner has to charge its domestic students.

However, on balance the net impact of UK institutions' activity on their overseas host countries is generally positive, although there is no quantifiable evidence to prove this point.

⁶⁵ This benefit has been calculated by the Higher Education Policy Institute as approximately £1bn. HEPI Report no 32. July 2007. *The economic costs and benefits of international students.*

Chapter 5: National agencies' policies on international partnerships

In order to understand the context in which these Universities carry out their international activity we interviewed some of the relevant higher education policy makers and senior agency staff. A full list of those consulted either in person or by telephone is provided in Appendix 5.

The interviews focused on four key topics:

- Awareness of Million+ and perceptions of it as an organisation
- Agencies' policy as regards international activity.
- Policy barriers that are hindering international work
- Possible future policy initiatives or enablers.

This chapter provides a brief summary of the role of each agency as regards international partnerships in order to set the context for respondents' views. The focus is principally on policy as regards learning and teaching partnerships, as that is where surveyed institutions are strong (and where policy agencies are aware of the actual or potential international contributions of these universities). However, we also briefly cover policy issues on international research collaboration. After this we summarise the findings from our interviewees on the four topics discussed.

1. Perspective of each agency and its role

A report in 2006 for the Higher Education Academy gave a useful summary of the international strategies of the key government bodies and agencies in higher education.⁶⁶ We do not repeat that here since our focus is on only one aspect of agency policies - that concerning international partnerships of all kinds. In addition, in the intervening two years there have been no significant changes in overall government policies on internationalisation; although DIUS, a key player, is shortly to reveal its new strategy in this area.

The **British Council** plays many roles as regards international partnerships:

- Manager of specific country partnership programmes such as UKIERI in India, the China Framework Agreement and BRIDGE in Russia.
- Co-ordinator of high level UK country initiatives such as the UK-India Education Forum and the US Education Forum
- Manager for government of the PMI2 programme and the PMI2 Connect funding schemes.
- Adviser/consultant and intelligence provider to universities that subscribe to its EducationUK services.
- International recruiting agent for specific universities and organiser of some international recruiting fairs.
- Promoter of Scottish HE overseas through EducationUK Scotland for all Scottish HEIs.
- Researcher/publisher of generic studies on international education and organiser of the bi-ennial 'Going Global' conference.
- Provider of education and training consultancy services to overseas government and donor agencies.
- A public service role as information source and contact point for all UK visitors to countries.
- First contact point in the UK for the UK High Commissions and Embassies wishing to have information about particular universities or HE services in general.

This means that, collectively, the Council has a vast amount of information on international higher education. However, in common with all large distributed organisations it has difficulty pulling all this together so that all of their staff are fully informed. It also has difficulty knowing what is going on in the sector (as do many policy makers) and, since it gets to know only some institutions well, is open to potential criticism of always talking to a few select universities or inviting a chosen few to events or missions (as mentioned by university representatives in Chapter 3). This places an onus on organisations such as Million+ to take the initiative in keeping key senior staff in the Council up to date with information about its members' activities.

The Council has several roles that present it with a risk of conflict of interest or conflicting priorities. When providing consultancy support or advice to overseas governments, for example, it may be in competition with

⁶⁶ Middlehurst, RM and Woodfield, S (2006).). Research report 05/06. Responding to the internationalisation agenda: implications for institutional strategy. Higher Education Academy.

UK HEIs who may turn to it for advice on related tenders. It has a public service duty to help anyone with advice and yet it charges subscription fees for specific types of advice and service.

The **UK HE International Unit (IU)** is a new arrival on the HE scene and is still to make its mark fully. It was established to be a central point of generic information on international markets for UK institutions and to enable government agencies to have one informed point of entry to UK HEIs. The Unit has rapidly established itself as an excellent source of market intelligence and is beginning to acquire specialist expertise and political understanding of countries such as India. Like the British Council it cannot recommend one institution to an enquirer and has to limit its research activity to generic studies or data collection. However, it does need to know what is happening inside institutions in order to remain informed and alert to current information needs. It has no formal methods of collecting market intelligence, but has to rely on the media and PR briefings. Yet again, therefore, there is a role for Million+ in keeping the IU informed about its members' work internationally.

The IU sees one of its roles being to commission research on international higher education and its first two research studies have been published in 2008.

The **Department for Innovation, Universities and Skills (DIUS)** is the prime policy making body for England as regards international partnerships. It has its own international section within the HE Directorate and also shares a Joint International Unit with the Department of Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) and the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP). DIUS is working on reviewing and updating its 2004 international strategy which will be followed by a series of country strategies. It has funded several studies of international partnerships and HEI activity, the two most recent of which are referred to in Chapter 1 above.

DIUS also contains a Science and Innovation Team that works closely with Research Councils UK on science policy. Because of the nature of their work, this team tends to think mainly of Russell Group institutions in relation to international research partnerships and has few connections with the Universities which subscribe to Million+.

UK Trade and Industry has a small education team that is responsible for supporting the export efforts of the education sector including schools, equipment manufacturers, Further Education Colleges (FECs) and HEIs. This has a limited budget which is mainly devoted to support for overseas trade missions. Inevitably, some of the more tangible education exports – hardware, equipment and books – attract the attention of officials and ministers more than educational services. UKTI's role is also to help inward investors wishing to invest in the UK; in this function the team works sometimes with regional consortia containing RDAs, companies and universities. Although the UKTI budget for educational promotion is small, it is enough to finance some HE participation in outward missions and high level ministerial visits to target countries. One of the major concerns of the UKTI staff consulted was their difficulty in getting to know about HEIs' activities internationally and in knowing whom to approach in HEIs in view of their very divergent organisation structures and allocation of responsibilities. They contrasted this situation with the position in FE that has been transformed by the recent creation of TVET-UK, an umbrella organisation that is willing to act internationally for all FE Colleges.

UKTI's principal value is as a gateway to the Trade Advisers and specialists in the UK's embassies and high commissions and to Regional Development Agencies in this country. Its networking role with them enables it to call them and their support staff in aid of HEIs more readily than the British Council. One example of the UKTI's practical role is its support for the Soft Landing Zones Programme (described in Chapter 3 above) which it is sponsoring in overseas countries in collaboration with the Universities of Coventry, Wolverhampton and Staffordshire.

The Higher Education Funding Council for England has shrunk its international capacity since the formation of the IU and its remaining staff with international responsibilities view HEFCE's senior management as the prime audience for their policy papers and country research. HEFCE therefore has limited policy significance for institutions with respect to their international partnerships, and in any event its strategic objectives are much more restricted in the international arena than they once were.

The Department for International Development (DfID) has increased its funding for the UK's Commonwealth Scholarships Commission (in contrast to the Foreign and Commonwealth Office's recent decision to cut their support for scholarships to developed countries). The Department's goals remain centred on a poverty reduction agenda with the aim of ensuring that its funds contribute to the achievement of countries' MDGs. However, the Department still remains much more interested in basic education than in

the tertiary sector, to which it currently gives very few funds. However, there are two signs that this policy is changing:

- A new policy paper stresses an approach to helping countries achieve economic growth through skills and proposes to help countries carry out “growth diagnostic studies” in order to analyse the growth potential, identify the barriers to achieving it and then develop solutions.⁶⁷ The implementation of this policy in countries must involve a greater role for the countries’ tertiary education sector.
- DfID’s research funding will double to £220m pa by 2010 and will be focussing on capacity development in areas such as food, health, economic growth etc. M+ institutions should look out for this, but it will be necessary for them to find good international partners to help build local capacity.⁶⁸ In view of the very large number of overseas partners described in Chapter 3 this should present few problems.

This gradual change in policy to one that creates demands for tertiary education has implications for institutions surveyed, whose programmes may well be suited to developing the skills that growth diagnostic studies suggest are required. However, DfID’s interests still remain centred on the poorest countries – Nigeria, India, Bangladesh and Pakistan – and funding will be principally in these areas.

Research Councils UK is increasingly concerned with UK global competitiveness and with the position of UK science in the world. This inevitably means that it has an interest in helping the more research intensive institutions and in working with organisations such as the Russell and 1994 Groups or international research consortia such as the World University Network. The policy context is that the UK’s collaborations with countries such as China and India are growing, but not as fast as those countries’ links with Germany and the USA.⁶⁹ In the science disciplines where the UK hopes to excel, global collaboration with the USA, Germany, China and India is essential. Thus, each of the Research Councils is concerned to encourage collaborative projects, either through R&D Framework Programmes such as the EU’s or through government to government collaboration (such as the UK-India Science and Innovation Council, the UK-China Partners in Innovation and the UK-Brazil Partners in Science initiatives). This explains the RCUK’s decision to open offices in the USA, Beijing and New Delhi.

The recent publication *Innovation Nation* stated that the government’s aim was “to make the UK one of the most attractive places in the world for mobile R&D intensive businesses to invest”.⁷⁰ The combination of a research base that promotes international collaboration and an open economy will encourage DIUS to develop an international strategy that positions the UK to benefit from global innovation. UKTI, DIUS and the RCUK will be key players in a newly formed Global Science and Innovation Forum, which will co-ordinate and prioritise the work of government agencies in this area overseas.

An interview with the secretariat of the **Commonwealth Scholarships Commission (CSC)** focussed on the changing nature of the awards that it distributes (and from which many Million+ members benefit). The UK Commission is funded by DfID and follows their poverty reduction strategy; this means that overseas award holders must be in occupations that contribute to the achievement of their national MDGs. The other new policy features, which are reflected in the changed mix of the CSC’s award portfolio, are the emphasis on distance learning programmes run overseas (which are shown to be more cost-effective than importing scholars to the UK) and the switch to shared scholarships and awards with institutions in developing countries. In both these areas the Universities surveyed have substantial experience; it was no surprise to find that they delivered over 40% of the distance learning scholarships awarded in 2007.

A meeting with **the Quality Assurance Agency** identified many of the QA issues that the agency had found in HEIs’ international partnerships such as the reluctance of enough academic staff to work for long periods overseas, the difficulties of managing overseas academic provision and ensuring that quality is maintained, and the growing issues of fraud or corruption, which initial due diligence processes often failed to identify. In general, the perception was that the Universities who took part in this research were more willing to take risks in engaging in trans-national education than pre-1992 institutions, since they had a greater need for the funds and more personal incentives. However, our survey reveals that they are also becoming increasingly aware of the risks and are seeking to manage them in a variety of ways.

Discussion with a representative of **Universities UK** revealed significant concerns about the potential impact of the new visa system on universities and colleges, including the Universities in this study. Concerns were

⁶⁷ See <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/pubs/files/growth-policy-paper.pdf>

⁶⁸ See the new research Strategy at <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/pubs/files/Research-Strategy-08.pdf>

⁶⁹ Adams, J, Gurney, K. and Marshall, S. (2007). Patterns of international collaboration for the UK and leading partners. Evidence

⁷⁰ Innovation Nation (March 2008). DIUS. See <http://www.dius.gov.uk/docs/home/ScienceInnovation.pdf>

expressed about the impact on institutions including registration requirements, data collection and monitoring requirements, impact on recruitment practices and the extra resources involved. Concerns were also expressed about the extra pressures on students, including the time pressures to decide on their place of study, the narrowing of their 'choice horizons' combined with the already acknowledged high cost of study in the UK; would these issues damage international recruitment? On the other hand, the new arrangements would encourage retention efforts, including a renewed emphasis on the quality of students' study experiences in the UK. There would also be some benefits for improved data collection on international students studying in the UK on various kinds of arrangements.

2. Findings from interviews

Awareness of Million+

Almost without exception the interviewees knew very little about Million+. Some knew of the predecessor body, the Coalition of Modern Universities, but had not made the connection with the new name. The significance of the new name was also not understood and needed explanation.

Once interviewees were made aware of the identity and role of Million+, they were all positive in wanting to know more about the achievements of subscribing Universities internationally and their plans. Many had an understanding that these institutions had been the pioneers in trans-national education and the establishment of international teaching partnerships. This experience and obvious success in making such partnerships work could be the organisation's Unique Selling Point (USP) with policy makers. Million+ could establish itself as the network that understands how to develop successful teaching partnerships; this image could be built both in the minds of UK policy makers and, as important, with potential overseas partner institutions. In doing this there is of course a risk that Million+ might come to be regarded as a group of "teaching-only institutions"; thus, any marketing of Million+ expertise in teaching partnerships should also emphasise the specific research expertise that is clearly present in member institutions. We return to this suggestion in our recommendations in Chapter 6.

UK policies as regards international partnerships

The agencies we spoke to have differing positions on international partnerships. While all accept them as valuable mechanisms for promoting UK HE overseas, they differ on the extent to which they believe that such partnerships require any form of continuing financial support or policy endorsement. The current set of country-specific programmes for India, China and the US are seen by some in DIUS as short term pump-priming exercises requiring only modest inputs of funds. The UKTI on the other hand is keen to promote income-generating activities in places such as the Gulf, although it has little funding to disperse and only influence to offer in support. The other clear policy divide is between DIUS which welcomes the success of the UK's international student recruitment and the Home Office which has other strategic priorities over security and visa regulation which run counter to an open-door welcome for international students.

The policy questions that arose concerning international teaching and research partnerships are as follows:

- Is it a proper concern of government what autonomous HEIs do overseas? With the exception of the reputational risk, which the QAA should take care of, is there any reason why the State should get involved?
- Even if there was a policy reason for intervention, surely universities are wealthy enough to undertake their own export activities? Why should government fund activities which should generate income?
- If funding was accepted as necessary, where should it best be directed? To the removal of generic barriers, to help less successful or "starter" institutions, to build partnerships in strategic countries (as now) or to promote generic good practice studies?
- Is there some way that the present plethora of schemes and programmes could be rationalised? Do RCUK and the Research Councils, for example, acknowledge the research funding going through UKIERI, the England Africa Programme or PMI2 Connect?
- How much is it necessary to encourage or sponsor global research partnerships? Can one not rely on academic researchers to search out their best partners in the world and make collaborative arrangements with them? Or is there always a case for intervention where Big Science is concerned and national strategic interests could be involved?

Since our discussions included those responsible for research and science policy, we heard views that were biased to the interests of Russell Group institutions or at least to research teams with an international 5*

ranking. It will therefore be important that Million+ and subscribing Universities build on their success in the December 2008 RAE announcements. An area where surveyed Universities have already been successful is in gaining EU research funding. Again, this fact is not well known and the success of institutions such as Sunderland and London South Bank Universities in this area should be more widely disseminated.

Policy barriers to international partnerships at the national level

We asked our interviewees and the Universities surveyed whether there are any barriers at the national level to institutional partnerships overseas. Our conclusion is that there are no substantial policy barriers within the UK to institutions creating partnerships with universities overseas. All arms of government want these partnerships to happen and to flourish. However, there are practical problems at both ends of the arrangement. In the UK the growing complexity of visa applications under the new points-based system presents difficulties for both the applying students and the administering institution. The only consolation is that other countries are developing equally rigorous systems which may also act as barriers to entry (as the US system has proved for the last three years).

Overseas the barriers relate principally to regulatory regimes which in some countries continue to create difficulties for market entrants from other countries. The core problem is that in most countries a UK university wishing to develop a partnership with a state-funded institution is treated as a private sector entrepreneur. This is not always a popular label and in countries such as Bangladesh, Sri Lanka and to some extent, India, the political climate towards the private sector is uncertain at best and hostile in some cases. This causes the country either to leave its policy on international providers unclear (as in India and Bangladesh) or to develop a regulatory regime that is slowly and cautiously implemented.⁷¹ In response to this the International Finance Corporation is seeking to encourage governments to clarify their policies on the private sector and to adopt good practice guidelines in their regulatory regimes.⁷² Quality assurance agencies are also gradually being created in most of the countries where the UK wishes to develop its partnerships. The status of these agencies is often unclear; for example, the services of the National Assessment and Accreditation Council in India are voluntary and in Sri Lanka the work of the Quality Assurance and Accreditation Committee is not formally adopted by the University Grants Commission. Increasingly, these quality assurance regimes are driven by nationalistic motives and are less willing than hitherto to rely on quality assessments by organisations from the provider's countries such as the QAA or the AUQA. The experience of UK institutions after South Africa's Higher Education Quality Council removed accreditation from the MBAs of some UK providers in 2004 was a warning that quality assurance agencies in partner countries can have teeth. It also showed that the criteria adopted for approval by country quality assurance agencies will be based on the national strategic goals for higher education, not on the criteria used in the UK or Australia.

Within the UK the main barrier that we have identified is in policy makers' awareness and understanding of what universities are doing internationally. This lack of information is due to the autonomy and diversity of the sector and the reluctance of many institutions to share their experiences of international partnerships with other potential competitors. Because policy makers do not know enough about UK institutions' activities they can develop negative perceptions such as – “we are not keeping up with competitors”, or “we are amateurish in our overseas affairs and do not operate in a business-like way”. Both these statements were made during our interviews.

Perhaps because of a lack of knowledge about the institutions that took part in this study and their international activities, policy agencies appear to 'lump these institutions together' with other post-92 institutions in terms of their international partnership activities. Despite the lack of comprehensive information, these Universities are perceived as more 'commercially-orientated' in their teaching partnerships and 'entrepreneurial' in terms of enterprise links. They are also perceived to be more willing to take financial and reputational risks in international partnerships. This is viewed positively by some agencies and in less positive terms by others that fear the possible exposure of UK institutions to financial or quality problems and the knock-on consequences for the UK's reputation for quality higher education delivered overseas.

Government and policy agencies have access to differing levels of information about international education in UK HEIs, and none hold comprehensive information about international partnership activity. Information is

⁷¹ As an example of the delays the British Council reported that in 2005 43 UK institutions were waiting for Chinese Ministry of Education approval for 115 degree programmes.

⁷² See the paper *The evolving regulatory context for private education in emerging economies* by John Fielden and Norman Larocque at a recent IFC/World Bank symposium in Washington at http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EDUCATION/Resources/278200-1099079877269/547664-1099079934475/547667-1135281523948/EWPS14_Private_Education.pdf

collected on an ad hoc basis (e.g. for Ministerial visits), from accessible and well-known contacts rather than via systematic methods of data collection. However, the institutions themselves could reply that providing such information (as in Australia - see below) is resource-intensive – and unfunded - and any information or feedback that they receive in return may not justify the work involved. The inevitable consequence, however, of an absence of sound information and robust data is that anecdotal evidence and innate prejudices fill the gap. This provides a partial, skewed and impoverished view of the UK higher education sector and its varied strengths and contributions.

We should ask whether there is a solution to this issue or whether it is endemic to the way that the UK HE sector is structured. Could we emulate Australia where information on formal international agreements is openly published? Why is UniversitiesUK reluctant to follow suit? We are aware that some years ago the idea of developing a database similar to that in Australia was rejected by UUK members, but now that greater institutional collaboration and concepts of shared services are becoming more accepted in the UK, it is timely to re-introduce the idea as a way of saving needless exploratory missions with overseas partners or enabling institutions to collaborate in partnership approaches.

Australian Universities' Formal International Agreements

Universities Australia publishes details of all formal agreements between Australian Universities and foreign institutions at intervals. The latest survey of the position at November 2007 revealed that there were over 5,100 agreements and the leading countries with which Australian institutions partnered were the US, China, Japan, Germany and the UK. Links with Europe had been growing faster than anywhere else and there were now over 1,500 of them; however, there are more institutional links with German HEIs than with those in the UK. Collaborative agreements were analysed by category and it was found that in November 2007 67% involved student exchange and 66% academic/research collaboration.

See:

http://www.universitiesaustralia.edu.au/documents/policies_programs/international/activities/InternationalLinksData-2008.xls

The Global Value report in 2007 from the British Council recommended the collection of information in another area – the fees earned from trans-national education. If a national system is ever established for recording the details of overseas partnerships, the financial income from them should be included in the data requested.

Our current research for Million+ will go some way to informing policy makers about the activities of a key group of universities in the sector, but it should be remembered that our evidence is limited as we only asked for information on a small selection of members' partnerships. In discussions with policy makers we noted that the examples of innovative overseas activity they cited were always from a few institutions (usually close to London and not any of the Universities that took part in this survey). It is to be hoped that the case studies in this report will correct this.

One earlier barrier to overseas collaboration was the difficulty institutions had in obtaining reliable information on countries and their policies regarding international providers. This is gradually improving due to the efforts of the UK HE International Unit with its valuable web site. The Unit also reports in its Newsletter on universities' overseas activities, but their information source is from public relations offices rather than formal surveys or other more objective data sources. However, the staffing capacity of the Unit is very limited and this will constrain efforts to meet all the expectations for detailed and broad market information on all countries for all types of institutions. In addition, the subscription service provided by the Observatory on Borderless Higher Education, provides more in-depth and broad-ranging strategic information about global developments in education, regulation and quality assurance.

Policies to enable or promote international partnerships

If there is a conclusion from our discussions on government policy towards international institutional partnerships (particularly for teaching) it is that, while they are welcomed, there is no firm or continuing commitment to supporting partnerships per se. Nor does government see it as a high priority for funding, since they regard them as self financing (or ideally profitable) enterprises. Thus policy objectives are based on removing barriers, helping to secure entry to target countries (such as India or China) or promoting good practice.

A range of different agencies and units in the UK provide funding programmes that support international partnerships, although there was concern among the Universities that the amounts of money involved are often small, and thus their impact may be limited compared with the amounts of funding available in other countries (e.g. DAAD support for the German-Jordanian University). Some suggested that there is unlikely to be a sufficient return on investment to justify high levels of government funding for international partnership activity. However, a lack of funding for collaborative activity could encourage overt commercial behaviour and foster an unwillingness to share information and expertise.

Another clear message that emerges is that there is little co-ordinated policy level activity related to international education in the UK. A range of agencies are involved to different degrees in key activities such as market intelligence, funding, regulation, information provision, overseas promotion, and developing government to government and intra-regional relationships. This lack of co-ordination acts as a barrier since, unlike in other countries (e.g. in Germany, France, Sweden, and Australia) there is no single source of assistance and intelligence about international activities for UK institutions or their potential partners overseas. It also prevents the UK HE sector from co-ordinating an effective response to key issues such as the impact of the changing visa regulations for international students on international recruitment and the implications of new student and researcher mobility schemes being introduced in Europe.

As regards research partnerships, there is a strategic thrust in some key discipline areas to develop the UK's capacity in line with the ambitious growth targets of the Science and Innovation Investment Framework, 2004-2014.⁷³ This inevitably leads RCUK to explore international research partnerships with other leading research countries and to encourage DIUS to establish bilateral partnerships with them, as has happened with the USA, China and India. Participating Universities should seek to benefit from the DIUS/RCUK research focus in respect of their world class specialisms. The secretariat will need to keep closely in touch with any initiatives emerging from the work of the Global Science and Innovation Forum that might benefit its members.

In other policy areas unrelated to partnerships, such as promoting outward student mobility, encouraging foreign language study abroad or enticing global talent through targeted scholarships and awards, we believe that there is still scope for further new development. These three areas are ones where there is considerable international competition in announcing policy initiatives – Australia, Canada and the US regularly declare improvements in scholarship funding or visa reform and we suspect that UK responses in this competitive arena will continue for some time. A recent UK example was the decision by DIUS in 2007 to support a programme of scholarships to support some student visits to China. This met the policy objectives of encouraging overseas mobility and strengthening our understanding of China.

Policy agencies seem to focus on the Russell Group institutions when thinking about overseas partnerships, especially related to research partnerships and researcher mobility, because of a perception that overseas governments are most interested in developing partnerships with 'elite' institutions. This lack of awareness of the range of international activity in UK HEIs and limited policy engagement at institutional level is likely to hinder effective support for the development of international partnership activities overseas for the Universities in this study.

⁷³ This called for an expansion in the UK's science expenditure from 1.86% of GDP to 2.5% by 2014.

Chapter 6 - Conclusions and Recommendations

1. Introduction

This chapter sets out our main conclusions and policy recommendations, based on the findings from our survey, policy-level interviews, review of the literature and desk research. It is also informed by our wider research and consultancy work on internationalisation and higher education.

In this study, our focus has been on gathering evidence about these Universities' international institutional partnerships. However, these partnerships take place in relation to a broader context of international trends and issues that affect other universities and colleges in the UK. We have therefore sought to separate those conclusions and recommendations that specifically relate to the Universities involved in this report and those that are of wider import for the UK higher education sector and the UK itself.

2. International institutional partnerships developed by the Universities

Our survey (in chapter 3) has shown that the 28 Universities surveyed are very active in a range of different international partnership activities that have economic and educational benefits for both UK higher education and overseas countries. These Universities:

- Participate in inter- and multi-national research projects with highly-regarded education and business-sector organisations. Projects are often in highly-applied fields that directly address global issues and problems.
- Have significant numbers of well-established and mutually beneficial teaching partnerships involving both professional and technical disciplines (including STEM subjects) and which enrol large (and growing) numbers of students – sometimes in multiple locations in one country. From the survey, we estimate that there are over 50,000 students studying for qualifications at HE level outside the UK with surveyed Universities.
- Engage in entrepreneurial and knowledge transfer activities in areas such as CPD, support for business and the development of science parks overseas.
- Partner with institutions in developing countries based on research capacity-building, CPD and development assistance.
- Have developed worldwide partnerships that facilitate student and faculty mobility and exchange, and which enable UK students to gain vital overseas experience.

Due to lack of a comprehensive and systematic data collection process, both within universities and at sector level, much of the international partnership activity undertaken by participating Universities goes unnoticed and unsung at sector and policy level. This represents a serious missed opportunity for institutions themselves, their representative bodies and UK Plc, particularly when compared with the systematic national level data collection that is undertaken in Australia on international teaching partnerships.

The Universities have international partnerships for teaching, research and knowledge transfer across the globe, in developing and developed countries. Many of the countries involved are defined as priority countries for the UK in terms of trade, foreign policy, economic development in the UK or overseas' development agendas. There are also a number of examples of these institutions using their regional offices to build a regional hub for further expansion in China, India, the Middle East and Central and Eastern Europe.

These Universities have engaged with a range of different partner organisations in their international partnerships – from highly-regarded research universities to small private colleges. These partnerships provide them with a wide range of experience and expertise in how to develop and manage successful partnerships with all types of partner. It also highlights the fact that these Universities are the UK institutional partners of choice, where they have visible and accessible expertise and reputations to match.

Teaching partnerships

The creation of international teaching partnerships is a growing feature of these Universities' internationalisation strategies – representing a development from an original focus on the recruitment of individual international students. Such partnerships are likely to become an increasingly important mechanism to ensure the continued flow of international students to UK institutions, particularly at

postgraduate level. This is important because, as in Australia, international student income is crucial to institutional financial viability.

The Universities that took part in this study have substantial experience in international teaching partnerships; in many cases, this experience has been built over more than a decade. In the late 1980s and 1990s, some overseas' teaching activities were labelled as 'risky' and there are documented examples of when such a label was appropriate. Since then, institutions, assisted by the work of the QAA, have learnt from their experiences and there is clear evidence from our survey that many institutions have reviewed their international strategies and partnerships and have actively sought to put in place strengthened management structures and quality assurance procedures, aligned with their wider institutional strategy and mission. This is likely to be beneficial for the partnerships, but will also enhance the reputation of these Universities in the international arena. Innovative and successful partnerships should be widely celebrated within and outside the UK, and the lessons from success more widely shared and promulgated. It is important to find the right balance between guidance and regulation that helps to manage risk and protect institutions' and the UK's reputation, and over-zealous regulation that prevents enterprise and innovation in international partnerships. In this area, the UK would do well to monitor developments in Australia, where the HE sector is seeking to address very similar concerns.

The kinds of successful and sustainable international partnership models that the Universities have developed that could be regarded as examples of good practice in teaching partnerships include distance learning, supported franchises, and twinning arrangements. It is worth noting that these Universities received 40% of all the distance-learning scholarships awarded in 2007 by the Commonwealth Scholarships Commission.

Research partnerships

The Universities that took part in this study are currently successful in generating multi-partner research funding from the EU, overseas government agencies and organisations, notably in niche areas of research expertise. Indeed, five of the Universities received up to 40% of their research grant and contract income from overseas' sources, with significant sums coming from the EU. It will be important for these Universities to benefit from the increased UK Government funding for research to support both the necessary research infrastructure to enable them to continue to engage in these research partnerships and to sustain the level of quality required.

We make the observation that the combined effect of successful teaching and research partnerships overseas is likely not only to raise the profile of these Universities overseas, but also to assist in maintaining international student recruitment to the UK. These partnerships also contribute to the visibility and reputation of the UK sector as a whole.

Although Government funding schemes which support international partnerships related to teaching, research and capacity-building are welcomed by the Universities surveyed, the amount of funding is often small, the competitive bidding process is time-intensive, and most partnerships are only viable if they are self-financing. Not all partnership activities make a surplus from the start as in some cases it can take time for partnerships to become sustainable. In addition, many of the funding schemes appear tailored towards research-focused institutions (especially research opportunities).

Our survey revealed that many of the international partnerships have a clear developmental trajectory, building over time (when successful) from initial teaching links involving the delivery of programmes to broader partnerships that facilitate student and faculty exchange and joint research activity. Such partnerships bring mutual benefits to the partners. In addition, broad and deep partnerships based on student, faculty and programme mobility, and joint curriculum development are likely to become crucial for maintaining and enhancing research capability and staff development, in both directions.

A key challenge is to identify when one person's 'level 3' partnership or link becomes of wider interest to the faculty or the institution as a whole. This requires effective communication systems and information sharing across the institution. Opening up a link to involve more institutional stakeholders also requires expertise, capacity and resources at faculty or institutional level to further develop and manage the partnership.

Despite the widespread rhetoric about competition between UK institutions, these Universities are also in some cases, collaborating in international partnerships and sharing expertise. Collaboration can, of course, enable institutions to participate in projects that they would not otherwise have the capacity to undertake.

There is significant evidence of the positive benefits that international students bring to the region and community in which universities are situated, to the academic staff involved, to the curriculum which all students benefit from and to the university itself. Because of their close links with their communities, Universities surveyed are particularly well placed to develop collaborative partnerships overseas that can bring commercial as well as academic benefits. Our findings have shown that some cities, regions and local companies are being helped by these Universities to do business overseas. Our calculations have also shown that the inflow of international students to these institutions is bringing at least £0.6bn to their local communities.

3. Barriers and enablers for successful international partnerships: institutional perspectives on national policies

The actions and output from UK government and policy agencies can act both as barriers and as enablers for international partnership activity at institutional level.

The 'enablers' that have been welcomed by institutions include:

- Policy commitment and financial support for international education in the Prime Ministers' Initiatives, including pump-priming funding from schemes such as UKIERI, PMI2Connect, BRIDGE and the England-Africa Partnerships Scheme (EAP).
- Advice and guidance on the market conditions and regulatory context for partnership activity in key countries (but there is a recognition that more relevant, targeted and up-to-date guidance is needed given the volatility of the international environment).
- Lobbying on behalf of UK higher education and its institutions to overseas' governments and provision of access routes to these governments and overseas' agencies (although there was also an expressed need for more effective and informed influencing strategies to safeguard these Universities' interests overseas).
- The UK's reputation for quality and the work at policy level to sustain this. However, concerns were also voiced about the influence and potential impact of league tables and the need for policy agencies to counter often misleading or partial knowledge of UK universities' (and in this case, participating Universities) quality, expertise and international contributions.

Universities, in some cases, also expressed a desire for more guidance on developing and quality assuring international partnerships, particularly related to the contractual arrangements for joint and dual degrees.

Institutions would welcome more resources for developing and sustaining international partnerships, recognising both the increasing costs involved (particularly those imposed by UK policies such as new visa regulations) and the strategic importance of these international partnerships for the recruitment of students and the wider benefits they bring. These include maintaining a pipeline of talent and skills into the UK and ensuring UK staff and students continue to develop their international skills, inter-cultural awareness and understanding.

The enablers (and barriers) to building and sustaining international partnerships that exist at institutional level are reported in Chapter 3 and include:

- Policy agencies appeared to liaise far more often and more closely with 'research-intensive' universities. These universities may not necessarily be as well-informed about particular international market issues as many of the Universities surveyed.
- In addition, lack of contact and engagement between policy makers and the Universities surveyed and knowledge about their international partnerships meant that policy-level international lobbying was likely to be ineffective and inadequate as far as they were concerned.
- Grave concerns were expressed about recent changes to UK visa regulations and their likely impact on on-campus recruitment of students to the UK and recruitment to international teaching partnerships (especially twinning or articulation agreements). Extra compliance costs could also damage opportunities for revenue generation which is needed to sustain international partnerships. These kinds of consequences would also, of course, have wider consequences for the UK.

4. Insights gained and conclusions drawn from interviews at policy level concerning the Universities' international institutional partnerships

All our interviews highlighted the fact that knowledge about the international partnerships of the Universities that took part in the research project is limited at policy agency and governmental levels. Only one Government agency interviewed (UKTI) appeared to know about the international partnerships of some of the participating Universities, and these were institutions that were both prominent in their international activities and drew on the support available at national level from UKTI.

Million + may wish to consider how it can assist subscribing Universities to become more visible and how its own profile could be clearer. The information and lobbying role of Million+ is important, as one interviewee commented, Million + should be "telling the world" about the strengths and international potential of these Universities. There is clearly a priority for Million+ is to make these international partnership activities better known. It should now establish regular information exchange meetings with the various key policy agencies and thereafter ensure that these bodies continue to be fully informed of the international work of subscribing Universities. The achievements of the Universities surveyed deserve to be better known and the experiences and lessons that they have learned should be fed back into national policy where relevant. It would be worth Million+ investing in the production of brochures outlining a selection of international achievements and giving these a worldwide circulation.

More seriously, Government Departments in particular, but even some higher education policy agencies, appear to have a 'skewed' or partial image of the UK HE sector. In having incomplete, inaccurate or insufficient knowledge, they are unlikely to be in a position either to promote or inform overseas partners about what the UK can offer. Our interviews with policy makers validated these concerns expressed by institutions. Wider publicity is particularly needed concerning teaching partnerships which the 28 Universities have pioneered on behalf of the sector and where we believe that they may have the most experience. The secretariat could focus its data collection in this area in future and also identify academic, political or regulatory barriers that were preventing international teaching partnerships from being as strong as possible. On the positive side, they could also alert policy makers to market opportunities where some policy or financial support would enable the sector to respond effectively. These themes are expanded further in the following chapter.

Universities reported concerns about the impact and credibility given to league tables by overseas' countries (see above) and saw little evidence of policy-level efforts to balance or mitigate the impact of these tables in other countries. We cannot verify whether such efforts are indeed made in interactions overseas by UK policy agencies, but if not, this may be linked to policy-makers' pre-conceptions about UK universities and their lack of detailed and up-to-date knowledge about the experience of some parts of the sector.

Given this lack of knowledge about the international partnerships (and international activities more broadly) of Universities participating in this research, there is a missed opportunity at national level (particularly evident in England) to promote the diverse strengths of different UK universities and colleges to international 'markets', countries and regions. The Russell Group has far higher visibility at policy level inside and outside the UK than do Universities surveyed (with a small number of exceptions).

Policy agencies reported that international consortia of institutions (such as WUN) aided visibility of UK universities in international arenas, and offered more visible access routes to individual universities' international (and national) activities. The Universities could also develop (or promote existing) consortia in which they are engaged such as GUNI, the Compostela Group and others.

There appears to be no consistent or coherent agenda for internationalisation between Government Departments and individual institutions, the sector as a whole and sector groups. This prevents a clear and well-informed message being given to overseas' interests about the diversity of the sector (despite the rhetoric about the UK sector's diversity). There is also evidence of some potential conflicts between individual institutional goals and those of different government departments. However, there appears to be more coherence in Scotland than England. This contrasts with the co-ordinated approach to international education that is in place in Australia, where a single agency (Australia Education International) acts as the co-ordinating body for all international education activity. Although Australia has a much smaller HE sector, there are many lessons that can be learned from its approach, and these are discussed in Appendix 6.

There are substantial opportunities for collaborative work and services at system level internationally (for example, re-building tertiary systems in fragile states, developing QA systems, building new universities) and opportunities with businesses (such as in-country work-force training). The 28 Universities already have

expertise in some of these areas and could be well-placed to respond, but they would also need to collaborate with a range of partners, including relevant policy agencies. However, the mechanisms to deliver these projects require increased levels of co-ordination beyond individual Universities, and this would require resources, for the pump-priming stages at least.

Other countries' perceptions of the quality of UK universities in their international partnership activities are critical to the internationalisation strategies of all HEIs. Several of the Universities have a strong and growing international profile; they have the potential to add-value to the UK's reputation. It is of course also important to note that any lack of attention to quality by individual institutions in their overseas' work can create reputational damage for all UK institutions.

Both institutions and policy agencies recognise that the current amounts of funding available to support the development and sustainability of international partnerships is small. Our policy interviews, as well as the institutional survey, suggest that the knowledge and information requirements for engaging internationally and developing and sustaining international partnerships are increasing; this suggests that more resource is likely to be required at all levels. However, there is a difference of view between government departments and institutions as to the value, need and level of funding support that may be required to support international partnership activity. A key question asked at government department level was "what would the return on investment to the UK tax-payer be?"

In relation to international research, there was reported interest in the as-yet early evidence that group collaborations internationally are more productive than collaborations at the individual level. This could suggest a need to support international partnerships more actively (although not necessarily at institutional level).

Some interviewees from government departments clearly favour differentiation of the sector; it was also suggested that this would make the sector easier to understand in an international context, and enable others to access specific services through sector groups or other intermediary bodies.

There appears to be broad consensus among most of the higher education policy agencies interviewed and at institutional level (but not in all relevant government departments) on the importance of scholarships for study abroad (for UK and overseas' students). It was suggested that UK students in the Universities surveyed might be particularly deserving of such assistance and were likely to have the most difficulties in undertaking overseas' placements for study or work.

It was suggested that the Universities that took part in this study could offer particular skills and specialisms in the international market, such as distance learning, where their strengths are known and respected. They could also work together proactively to develop bids for multi-institutional projects, to share information about institutional expertise or to promote themselves a group outside the UK.

Some policy makers believed that these institutions may take more risks and be more entrepreneurial internationally, but also may be more 'at risk' in relation to financial downturns and international market volatility.

5. Policy issues that affect all UK higher education institutions

A major finding from our survey and our interviews relates to the absence of regular information on international partnerships. The UK (and both UUK itself and the International Unit) need systematic and up-to-date information about universities' international partnerships (and indeed, wider internationalisation activities) if they are to provide appropriate support to promote universities' own international efforts and those that are of particular benefit to UK Plc. UUK and the British Council also need such information in order to respond to requests for information, contacts or services arising from Ministers in the UK or from governments, agencies or other sources overseas.

The absence of readily available information about the sector means that access routes to people and expertise in UK universities (for international clients) are reportedly slow, diverse and not transparent, even when the university sector and its structures and the International Offices and Officers are well known to key policy agencies. Information about teaching, knowledge transfer and research partnerships is not held in one place and overview knowledge is not accessible at either national or institutional levels.

Furthermore, not all policy agencies and departments share key information that is collected from institutions and this does not assist the sector in achieving as much international visibility and cohesion – with diversity – as would be feasible if such data and information was shared. A clear example is the British Council's

annual survey of all International Officers that collects information about international partnerships and activities – cross-referenced to information collected from in-country and regional offices. This is collected for the Council's benefit, but is not shared; this information would be invaluable to support the UK's international agenda and profile if made available more widely.

It was reported that there is a lack of understanding in overseas' Embassies and some overseas' offices (among agencies whose job it is to promote universities and their international potential) about what universities can offer. Again, this could be remedied by better information.

In order to identify reputable and reliable partners, UK universities need to gain wide and deep knowledge of their potential partners' activities within the UK and across other countries. The UK part of this information gap can be solved, but there is a need to track partners' links and relationships beyond the UK.

The UK may either need a single information portal or point of access that is useful for national and external audiences, (whether governments, businesses, students or other potential partners and clients for UK HEIs) or clearer access routes to information held by sector group agencies that serve as entry routes to members and their particular specialisms. We accept that at institutional level, there are also anxieties about sharing what is often seen as competitive information and this fear has prevented such an initiative in the past. In addition the creation of a national data base of this kind would have immediate costs. However we think the need and justification are sufficiently great to justify expenditure on a feasibility study, which **we recommend**.

The new visa system and the new formal relationships with Immigration could fundamentally change the UK market for overseas' undergraduate and post-graduate students, and this may have a wider impact on international partnerships. It will, however, facilitate the collection of data and information on incoming students. There are also uncertainties about implications arising from this system for the recruitment of international staff and for mobile researchers. If this were to happen, there would not only be a cost to institutions but also to the UK.

There appears to be a lack of coherence between government departments and their policies with regard to the international agenda, whether seen from an institutional perspective or a UK Plc perspective (although this is less so in Scotland). This is despite the rhetoric on the importance of international partnerships and international markets to the UK, and the existence of internationalisation strategies at policy level. There is also direct conflict between the policies of one Whitehall department and another at international level (e.g. DIUS, DfID, Home Office) and this has a consequence for institution's own international strategies. Universities have to relate to more than one government department (or part of a department in the case of DIUS) in relation to different parts of their international strategies and international partnerships (i.e. for teaching, research, and enterprise or KT). In addition some responsibilities are split in relation to students: DIUS (JfU) has interests in recruiting international students, while UKTI has an interest in these students as potential graduate recruits for businesses. The British Council's role and international agendas are also not always transparent or well-aligned with other key government departments. Furthermore, the Council often appears to be in competition with institutions in the delivery of a range of educational services (however, we also collected evidence of university- British Council collaboration in the delivery of such services). Other countries such as Australia and Germany manage to present a more co-ordinated and strategic approach to their international policies.

UK policy agencies, particularly those with an overseas' presence, gather information about overseas' perceptions of UK universities, their international activities and the actions and behaviours of their representatives. As mentioned in earlier chapters, the setting of financial targets for international student recruitment can act as drivers of behaviour that have a potentially detrimental and longer term effect on the UK's reputation and ultimately, the sustainability of its international partnerships. Perceptions from other countries were reported as being (in some cases) far from positive in relation to some international student recruitment practices. Beyond the QAA, it is not entirely clear how such messages are channelled so that institutions, the sector and its agencies are made aware of these perceptions on a regular basis so that action can be taken to address them. It is also important to recognise that current policy signals and rhetoric about the financial benefits to UK institutions, the sector and economy from international students also have the potential to fuel negative overseas' perceptions of the UK if not balanced by information and publicity about the range of other contributions made by institutions' international partnerships. Such promotional activities should form a clear part of the marketing strategy of the UK within PMI2.

A related observation was also reported, namely, that internationalisation approaches both at HEI and national level often appear to be insensitive to, or unaware of, the policy priorities of other countries. This reveals a possible tension that is also reported in the wider literature⁷⁴ between the divergent interests of nations, students and institutions in their goals for international activities. Students' goals in seeking professional and vocational qualifications to increase their international marketability may be more closely aligned with the strategies of universities that offer international programmes which are closely attuned to market-demand (and employability). However, these goals may not always fit with the capacity-building, nation-building and human resource development aims of overseas' countries. UK universities need to be sensitive to these tensions, and policies at national level should also be crafted in ways that balance the goals of competitiveness and economic return to the UK with wider social and political goals that bring mutual benefits to partner countries. If such balances are not achieved, the longer-term sustainability of a number of international activities in HEIs, including international partnerships, may be undermined. The Universities' international strategies and international partnership activities offer many examples of how mutual benefits can be achieved and sustained over time; such collaborations appear to be building a sound platform for longer-term competitive advantage.

6. Comparisons with the USA and Australia

Higher education institutions in the USA and Australia, like those in the UK, are heavily engaged in international student recruitment activities and partnerships with overseas institutions. They are major competitors to the UK both in terms of inward international student recruitment and recruitment to programmes delivered overseas – although each of the three countries has strengths in particular overseas markets and in particular overseas partnership approaches. The analysis in Appendix 6 provides evidence that Australia and the USA pursue very different approaches to international education at both federal and institutional levels. It also demonstrates that the UK HE sector should monitor developments related to international partnership activity in these countries with interest, particularly in Australia which is leading the way in research and information provision in this area.

Australia has a federal-level international strategy, and has adopted a highly co-ordinated approach to international education. This is largely driven by the heavy reliance of Australian HEIs on the income generated from international students, and the need to maintain a highly-skilled workforce. One government agency (Australia Education International) has responsibility for the regulation, promotion and data collection related to international higher education. The Australian government is keen to protect the Australian higher education 'brand' and its reputation in the international higher education market, particularly related to its international teaching partnerships 'offshore' which are extensive and long-standing. The Australian HE sector has agreed a Transnational Quality Strategy which focuses on providing information to stakeholders and protecting and promoting the quality of Australian higher education overseas. There is systematic data collection at federal-level related to overseas teaching provision and all institutional-level audits cover overseas programmes. The Australian government also promotes (and financially supports) other types of academic partnerships, related to student mobility and curriculum development and joint research – for example the OS-HELP income-contingent loan scheme for Australian students wishing to study abroad and the Science Linkages programme which funds international collaborations in scientific subjects. Australian HEIs themselves also take international education very seriously, and most have clearly designated leadership responsibility for international development (e.g. a PVC or DVC responsible for international affairs).

In contrast, there is no federal level international education strategy in the USA, and international education activities are largely driven by institutions. Federal involvement in international education is limited to support for relatively small-scale scholarship schemes (e.g. the new Paul Simon Study Abroad Foundation), capacity building projects in developing countries, selected research linkages (via the National Science Foundation) and some funding for overseas partnerships that are focused on student and faculty mobility, and collaborative delivery in selected countries (Russia, the EU and Brazil). These initiatives are motivated by foreign policy goals (e.g. developing mutual understanding, changing perceptions of the US) and the drive to promote social cohesion between the USA's many different cultural communities through expanding overseas experience. Despite the USA's role as a significant recruiter of overseas students, there is limited evidence of an economic motivation for international activities either at federal level or at institutional level. International student income is not as crucial in the US as it is in either the UK or Australia, and the main reasons for maintaining overseas student numbers are academic, particularly the need to maintain numbers of research students in key subjects (e.g. Science and Engineering). Historically most overseas partnerships

⁷⁴ Mcburnie, G & Zигuras, C (2007). *Transnational Education: Issues and trends in offshore education*. London, Routledge.

have been driven by institutions' academic priorities (research and student and faculty mobility), although the numbers of pure teaching partnerships and US branch campuses appear to be increasing as some institutions seek to develop alternative income streams in new markets.

As in the UK, there is evidence that higher education institutions in Australia and the USA are increasing their overseas teaching collaboration activities. Australia has a small HE sector compared to the UK and the USA, but it recruits significant numbers of students both on and off-shore. Since it lacks the historical reputation for educational quality enjoyed by the UK and the USA, it has developed its own reputation for innovation in international education at both the policy and the institutional levels - in terms of marketing and branding, regulation, quality assurance and information provision - which has helped it to maintain its position as a major international recruiter, particularly in East Asia. Therefore, UK institutions should monitor developments in Australia with interest, particularly the examples of good practice in overseas teaching provision provided by the Australian Universities Quality Agency (AUQA). The USA still appears to be a 'sleeping giant' both in terms of international student recruitment and the extent of programmes delivered overseas, but despite the limited support at federal or state level, there are some signs that more US institutions are beginning to take overseas teaching provision more seriously, particularly in China, India and the Middle East. The American Council on Education (ACE) and NAFSA (The Association for International Education) have begun to publish reports on international partnerships which will be of interest to UK institutions.

7. Recommendations

We list our recommendations in terms of the two main audiences for this report: government departments and policy agencies, and UK higher education institutions:

For government and policy agencies, we recommend that:

- Million+ is added to the list of key agencies that are consulted and considered in relation to the international dimensions of universities' core activities: teaching, research and knowledge transfer.
- Those Government Departments that are responsible for funding or channelling funds to the British Council to promote UK higher education's international partnerships should ensure that the full strength and diversity of the UK system is adequately and appropriately represented in policy arenas.
- Information collected at national and international level relating to international partnerships by policy agencies such as the British Council should be shared for the wider benefit of institutions and the higher education sector.
- Relevant departments consider funding a feasibility study (that could be undertaken by UUK or the HE International Unit) to create a database to profile the UK's international partnership activities, similar to the information collected by Universities Australia in regular surveys, and in the AusLIST on-line database.
- Government Departments consider treating international partnerships as a special policy area where co-ordination between agencies would be valuable.

For UK higher education institutions, we recommend that they:

- Make positive attempts to meet with and engage with policy makers to highlight the achievements and contributions arising from successful international partnerships.
- Bring to the attention of the Science policy makers in particular, the specific strengths and research achievements UK HEIs, including the research income, outputs and varieties of impact arising from international partnership activities.
- Help relevant members of staff to network with colleagues in other HE institutions as a means of developing international collaborations and consortia.
- Share country specific information with each other since there is more to be gained than lost in competitive advantage from doing so.
- Work together – either in mission groups, or across the UK HE sector - to identify exchange and publicise the lessons learned and good practice arising from successful and sustainable international partnerships.
- Provide regularly updated information and data on international partnership activities to relevant sector agencies
- Seek to involve the civic and business community in international links and international partnership activities.

- Continue to strengthen the integrated management structures that are being developed to support the implementation of internationalisation strategies of which international partnerships are a key part.
- Ensure that institutional representatives regularly engage with and inform international representatives of policy agencies (e.g. British Council offices, overseas Embassies and UKTI representatives) about the particular capabilities and strengths of the institution in international partnership activities.

Appendix 1: International Students at Institutions Surveyed (by domicile)

Institution	Total HE Students	UK HE Students	Non-UK Students	EU Students (%)	Non-EU Students from Africa (%)	Non-EU Students from Asia (%)	% Ratio of Non-EU Course Fees to Total Income
Abertay Dundee (Uni of)	5,225	3,135	1,045	55%	5%	36%	7.82
Anglia Ruskin University	22,305	18,295	2,005	52%	9%	20%	3.09
Bath Spa University	7,320	6,900	210	40%	2%	40%	2.79
Bedfordshire (Uni of)	18,210	10,890	3,660	46%	14%	34%	12.26
Birmingham City University (BCU)	25,715	22,005	1,855	22%	15%	55%	6.52
Bolton (The Uni of)	8,911	7,310	800	21%	46%	26%	9.09
Buckinghamshire New University	10,056	7,785	1,135	23%	41%	28%	2.65
Central Lancashire (Uni of) (UCLan)	32,255	27,435	2,410	30%	6%	52%	6.35
Coventry University	22,285	16,315	2,985	39%	18%	32%	10.09
Derby (Uni of)	15,895	13,525	1,185	54%	13%	24%	4.79
East London (Uni of) (UEL)	22,290	16,320	2,985	31%	18%	38%	13.72
Glasgow Caledonian University	19,130	15,770	1,680	22%	16%	45%	5.83
Greenwich (Uni of)	29,885	19,945	4,970	21%	22%	46%	12.98
Kingston University	26,865	19,145	3,860	39%	9%	32%	10.09
Leeds Metropolitan University	30,080	24,910	2,585	35%	7%	43%	5.29
London Metropolitan University	35,940	21,700	7,120	34%	15%	29%	13.67
London South Bank University (LSBU)	24,965	18,575	3,195	32%	15%	35%	8.91
Middlesex University	28,170	18,400	4,885	26%	13%	49%	14.88
Napier University	17,750	11,330	3,210	51%	7%	36%	9.73
Northampton (The Uni of)	11,785	9,495	1,145	15%	23%	55%	4.74
Roehampton University	9,415	7,655	880	47%	6%	23%	5.22
Southampton Solent University	11,980	9,290	1,345	39%	12%	27%	7.47
Staffordshire University	17,330	13,050	2,140	28%	8%	56%	5.62
Sunderland (Uni of)	24,480	15,950	4,265	20%	12%	60%	13.63
Teesside (Uni of)	24,850	22,210	1,320	44%	22%	16%	2.99
Thames Valley University (TVU)	22,135	16,145	2,995	39%	16%	35%	5.84
West of Scotland (UWS) (Uni of)	15,315	13,225	1,045	41%	5%	50%	3.8
Wolverhampton (The Uni of)	27,035	19,915	3,560	31%	21%	36%	4.83
All Million+ Members	567,581	426,625	70,475	34%	15%	39%	

Source: Higher Education Statistics Agency (2006/2007 data)

Appendix 2: Research Aims, Research Questions and Research Methods

The aims of the research project are:

- To assess the nature and extent of the international partnership activities - teaching, research and knowledge transfer – currently undertaken by Universities which subscribe to Million+
- To gain insights into the educational impact of international partnership activities on the UK HE sector and in overseas countries where partnerships take place (where feasible, given ability to access reliable secondary data sources)
- To gather and review publicly available evidence of the economic impact of international partnership activity on the UK economy as whole
- To compare the ways in which UK and international policy at national levels, funding and regulatory mechanisms related to international partnership activity can promote, support or hinder the development of successful international partnerships
- To provide recommendations for UK policy-makers on how better to facilitate and support international partnership activity

Research Questions

The research questions that have guided the project are as follows:

- What specific types of international partnership activities are currently undertaken by Universities which subscribe to Million+, e.g.?
 - international teaching partnership provision (including country of operation, subject, mode of delivery, levels of study, etc.)
 - international research partnership activity (including country of partners, research field, project type, etc)
 - international knowledge transfer activity (including country of operation, research field, project type, etc)
- What are the different rationales and approaches to international partnership activity adopted by Universities which subscribe to Million+?
- How do these partnerships impact positively on the educational systems in the countries in which they operate (and for whom, e.g. students, staff, institutions)?
- What benefits do these partnerships bring, educationally to the UK partner institution (and for whom, e.g. students, staff, institutions) and economically to the UK as a whole?
- How does the current UK policy, funding and regulatory context facilitate or hinder the development of international partnerships?
- How does the policy, funding and regulatory context in other competitor countries (Australia, USA) compare with the situation in the UK?
- What changes to current UK government policy, funding mechanisms and regulatory regimes are required to support and facilitate UK universities and colleges' international partnerships most effectively?

Research Methods

Other research projects focused on international partnership activity in UK higher education institutions have found that desk research looking only at publicly available information (e.g. web sites, reports, and data sets) provides very partial and patchy information on the range and extent of international activity undertaken by HEIs⁷⁵. International activities cut across traditional structures within institutions and most universities do not hold centralised data on all international partnership activities. Therefore, the research team has been reliant on the information that institutions were able to provide, particularly regarding partnerships below the institutional level (e.g. faculties, departments).

The research approach combined desk research with a survey of the Universities which subscribe to Million+ and interviews with a small number of policy agencies. The following methods were used:

⁷⁵ A number of organisations have sought to collect information on the transnational activities of UK HEIs and have found that most data is not held centrally by institutions. The only available data has been collected from surveys of a sample of UK HEIs undertaken from 2002 to 2004, which has been used to create estimates for the UK HE sector as a whole (see Lenton (2007) and Garrett (2004)).

- A survey of the 28 subscribing Universities⁷⁶ using a guided self-assessment tool designed to help the Universities to provide descriptive information about the nature and educational impact of their international partnership activities at the UK campus, and in the overseas countries in which they operate⁷⁷
- Creation of short 'case studies' of international partnership activities (based on collection of data, telephone enquiries and analysis of relevant documents)⁷⁸
- Interviews with a small number of representatives from relevant policy agencies and government departments:
 - To gain an insight into how current UK (and international) policy, funding mechanisms and regulation either enables or hinders universities' international partnership activity
 - To gain an understanding of the ways in which international partnership activity has made an impact upon the educational sector in the countries where such partnerships are in place
 - To obtain evidence on the educational impact of international partnership activity on UK Higher Education, and the economic impact on the UK as a whole
- Analyse the corporate or strategic plans of selected participating universities to gain an understanding of their rationales and approaches to international partnership activity
- Desk research: a review of relevant policy documents, research literature, and other media such as Observatory on Borderless Higher Education (OBHE) reports and press articles, think-tank analyses, official data and reports (including sources in the UK and elsewhere, e.g. in the US, Australia) to gain an understanding of the international policy context of international partnership activity, and its extent, nature and impact (economic and educational).

⁷⁶ Many other UK HEIs are also heavily involved in international partnership activity. Surveying these institutions was beyond the scope of this research.

⁷⁷ It was beyond the scope of this project to gain insights into educational impacts from overseas institutions themselves, or from students.

⁷⁸ Case study universities included institutions from the different UK regions (e.g. Scotland, South-East, etc.) represented by Million+ members

Appendix 3: The Universities' Research Grants & Contracts Income

Institution	Total RG&C Income (000's)	Total Non-UK RG&C Income (000's)	Non-UK RG&C Income (%)	EU Government RG&C Income (%)	Other Overseas RG&C Income (%)	% Ratio of EU & EC RG&C to Total Income
Abertay Dundee (Uni of)	1,191	96	8%	8%	0%	0.28
Anglia Ruskin University	1,168	400	34%	16%	18%	0.18
Bath Spa University	85	72	85%	0%	84%	0
Bedfordshire (Uni of)	1,319	570	43%	41%	3%	0.66
Birmingham City University (BCU)	2,867	537	19%	12%	6%	0.35
Bolton (The Uni of)	2,071	601	29%	24%	5%	1.27
Buckinghamshire New University	522	50	10%	2%	7%	0.05
Central Lancashire (Uni of) (UCLan)	4,076	470	12%	10%	2%	0.29
Coventry University	3,379	1,272	38%	38%	0%	1.04
Derby (Uni of)	299	4	1%	0%	1%	0
East London (Uni of) (UEL)	1,566	424	27%	14%	13%	0.24
Glasgow Caledonian University	4,481	294	7%	2%	4%	0.27
Greenwich (Uni of)	7,127	2,924	41%	19%	22%	0.95
Kingston University	2,923	720	25%	12%	13%	0.29
Leeds Metropolitan University	2,432	494	20%	2%	18%	0.08
London Metropolitan University	4,148	1,243	30%	20%	10%	0.53
London South Bank University (LSBU)	3,677	420	11%	10%	2%	0.3
Middlesex University	3,655	734	20%	17%	3%	0.52
Napier University	2,309	657	28%	26%	3%	0.67
Northampton (The Uni of)	2,428	780	32%	2%	30%	0.1
Roehampton University	1,041	337	32%	2%	30%	0.05
Southampton Solent University	102	37	37%	34%	2%	0.05
Staffordshire University	725	63	9%	2%	6%	0.07
Sunderland (Uni of)	4,759	1,163	24%	6%	19%	0.72
Teesside (Uni of)	2,601	1,373	53%	52%	0%	1.3
Thames Valley University (TVU)	513	4	1%	0%	1%	0
West of Scotland (UWS) (Uni of)	1,829	1,075	59%	41%	18%	1.18
Wolverhampton (The Uni of)	2,706	589	22%	17%	5%	0.35
All Million+ Universities	65,999	17,400	26%	16%	10%	

Source: Higher Education Statistics Agency (2006/2007 data)

Appendix 4: The Universities' Funding from UK Funding Schemes

A: British Degrees in Russia Programme (BRIDGE)

Focus: Sustainable full degree or continuous professional development partnerships and research collaborations

Year	UK HE institution(s)	Russian HE institution(s)	Subject Area	Award
B1 (2004)	Kingston University	Academy of National Economy, Moscow / Togliatti Academy of Management	MBA	MSc
B1 (2004)	Kingston University	St Petersburg Pavlov's State Medical University	Healthcare Education & Management/Nursery & midwifery	MSc/CPD
B2.5 (2005)	University of Northampton	Moscow State Aviation Technology University	Business Administration	CPD
B2.5 (2005)	Leeds Metropolitan University	Amur State University	Global Business Management with English	CPD
B3 (2006)	Anglia Ruskin University	Ural State University of Economics	Corporate Governance for Business	MA
B3 (2006)	University of East London	Irkutsk State Railway University	Managing Technological and Organisation Change in Safety Critical Systems	MSc
B3 (2006)	University of East London	Ural State University of Economics	International Logistics and Supply Chain Management	CPD
B3 (2006)	Buckinghamshire New University	Saratov State Socio-Economic University	International Management	CPD
B3.5 (2006)	University of Central Lancashire	Samara State University of Architecture and Civil Engineering	Fire Safety for Gas and Oil Industries	MA
B4 (2007)	London Metropolitan University	Russian State University of Trade and Economics	International Tourism Management	MA
B4 (2007)	University of Bedfordshire	Moscow University of Industry and Finance	Information Systems Security	CPD
RC7 (2007)	Middlesex University, School of Computing Science	South Federal University (SFU), A.B.Kogan Research Institute for Neurocybernetics (KRINC)	Head Motion Detection for Positron Emission Tomography (PET) Imaging Scanning	Research

B: Prime Minister's Initiative 2 (PMI2) Connect

Successful year 1 projects (2007-8)

Research Co-operation

PMI2 Research Co-operation programme is designed to grow high quality research co-operation between higher education institutions in the UK and agreed priority countries. Funding is intended as pump priming to initiate and stimulate projects of excellence that have the potential to be sustainable in the long term.

9 out of 86 projects involved Universities that took part in this study.

Country	UK Institution	Overseas Partner Institution	Project Title
Malaysia	Coventry University	Universiti Teknologi Malaysia	A study of lecturing styles in Malaysia and the UK
Japan	Kingston University	Kyoto Seika University	The Art of Intervention: Critical Enquiries into the Intersections of Private and Public Memory through Contemporary Visual and Textural Practices in Art, Film and Performance Practice and Writing
Japan	Middlesex University	Keio University	Older workers in the UK and Japan: how employment institutions and work history impact on decisions over work and retirement
Japan	Middlesex University	Waseda University	Arts for All? A case study enquiry into the policy and practice of extending participation in contemporary performing arts in Japan
Japan	Roehampton University	University of Miyazaki	Anxiety symptoms across two generations of the same families in Japan and in the UK
Japan	University of Greenwich	Kyoto University	Long-life: An experimental and Modelling Research Project into Predicting Reliability of Microsystems
Japan	University of Teesside	Future University (Mirai Daigaku)	Processes, outcomes and metrics for assessing synchronous and asynchronous collaboration in Virtual Worlds
Japan	University of Teesside	Kyoto University	Development of environmentally benign sustainable chemical technologies. Better fuels, improved catalysts, and microreactors as options for pollution prevention in process development and design.
South Korea	University of Teesside	Gyeongsang National University	Visualisation and optimisation of construction schedules

UK-Pakistan Research Co-operation

Specific focus on building research partnerships with Pakistan.

No participating Universities were involved in this scheme.

Collaborative Programme Delivery

Grants to encourage the development of joint / dual awards programmes and collaborative programme delivery at undergraduate and postgraduate levels.

7 out of 14 projects involved Universities surveyed

Country	UK Institution	Overseas Partner Institution	Title of Course
Pakistan	Coventry University	IQRA University	M.Sc. in Engineering Business Management, M.Sc. in Manufacturing Systems Engineering
Malaysia	Coventry University	Kolej Poly-Tech MARA	BEng (Hons) Electrical and Electronics Engineering BEng (Hons) Electrical Systems Engineering BEng (Hons) Electronics Engineering BEng (Hons) Civil Engineering BSc (Hons) Construction Management
Malaysia	Napier University	Unity College International	BSc (Hons) Nursing
Malaysia	Roehampton University	University Science Malaysia, Penang	Certificate – Fundamentals of Arts & Play Therapies
Malaysia	Roehampton University	Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris	Postgraduate Certificate in Learning and Teaching in Higher Education (PGCertLTHE)
Malaysia	University Of Greenwich	SEGi College	BEng/MEng Civil Engineering
Vietnam	University of Sunderland	Academy of Bank	B.A. (Hons) Banking and Finance (Top Up)

Partnership Development Grants

Developing strategic alliances and partnerships with international institutions

10 out of 47 projects involved participating Universities

Institution	Institution to be visited	Country
Anglia Ruskin University	Academy of Business Studies, Colombo	Sri Lanka
Napier University	International Medical University in Kuala Lumpur	Malaysia
Roehampton University	Nanyang Technological University, Singapore	Singapore
University of Bedfordshire	University of Ibadan, University of Lagos & National Open University of Nigeria	Nigeria
University of Central Lancashire	University of Lagos, Nigeria	Nigeria
University of East London	Ramkhamhaeng University, Institute of International Studies (two campuses in Bangkok and Hat Yai).	Thailand
University of Northampton	School of Labour Economics, Capital University of Business and Economics (CUBE), Beijing	China
University of Teesside	University Putra Malaysia	Malaysia
University of Wolverhampton	Federal University of Technology, Michael Okpara University of Agriculture, Imo State University, University of Port Harcourt	Nigeria
University of Wolverhampton	N/A	Ghana

International Mobility of UK Students

Developing and delivering innovative programmes to facilitate the outward mobility of UK students.

7 out of 26 projects involved Universities surveyed

Country	UK Institution	Overseas Partner Institution	Summary																		
Korea	Bath Spa University	Dongguk University	Study opportunity for students on Study of Religions and Philosophy & Ethics degree programmes. Dongguk University offers an annual International Summer School in June/July. The International Mobility Programme has been developed around this Summer School for one month. Aim of developing employability skills and meeting their professional aspirations. Target number of students: 5																		
India	Coventry University	MS Ramaiah School of Advanced Studies	Coventry University delivered programme in MSRSAS version of the four-week module delivered in Bangalore, India. Target student number: 20																		
India	Kingston University	Shri Vile Parle Kelavani Mandal	The project is to provide a new study abroad opportunity for Kingston University (KU) students in Mumbai, which would form part of their Kingston degree course. Target student number: 10																		
India	Leeds Metropolitan University	Symbiosis, Mondo Challenge and Sanjay Nagar. Symbiosis. Whistling Woods. Youth Commonwealth Games Committee and Symbiosis. American College and Maduri.	<p>A total of 62 students will take part in the 5 strands. The programme will take place during Summer 08.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Strand</th> <th>Partner in India</th> <th>Students</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1 - Applied Global Ethics</td> <td>Symbiosis Mondo Challenge Sanjay Nagar</td> <td>17</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2 – Business</td> <td>Symbiosis</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3 – Film, Television and Performing Arts</td> <td>Whistling Woods</td> <td>10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4 – Sport</td> <td>Youth Commonwealth Games Committee, Symbiosis</td> <td>20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5 - Youth and Community Work</td> <td>American College, Maduri</td> <td>10</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Strand	Partner in India	Students	1 - Applied Global Ethics	Symbiosis Mondo Challenge Sanjay Nagar	17	2 – Business	Symbiosis	5	3 – Film, Television and Performing Arts	Whistling Woods	10	4 – Sport	Youth Commonwealth Games Committee, Symbiosis	20	5 - Youth and Community Work	American College, Maduri	10
Strand	Partner in India	Students																			
1 - Applied Global Ethics	Symbiosis Mondo Challenge Sanjay Nagar	17																			
2 – Business	Symbiosis	5																			
3 – Film, Television and Performing Arts	Whistling Woods	10																			
4 – Sport	Youth Commonwealth Games Committee, Symbiosis	20																			
5 - Youth and Community Work	American College, Maduri	10																			
India	Staffordshire University	The University of Madras	Initial stage in the Staffordshire University's International Study Programme for students from any undergraduate course. Students will make visits of six weeks to the University of Madras, in the long vacation before the final year of study. Students preparing final-year dissertations or projects will be encouraged to gather relevant material while in India. Target student number: 8																		
India	University of Wolverhampton	NIFT NI	Study trip conducted in collaboration with institutional partners in New Dheli and Ahmedabad, India, and four weeks in duration. Target number of students: 20																		
Malaysia	Leeds Metropolitan University	MALAYSIA Pantai Integrated Rehab Services	MSc (pre-registration) Physiotherapy & Occupational Therapy students to experience a 5-10 week elective extended placement. The elective placement will take place at Pantai Integrated Rehab Services, Pantai Group of Hospitals in Malaysia. Target student number: up to 10																		

China-UK Collaborative Partnerships in Employability and Entrepreneurship

To provide pump-prime funding for UK HE institutions to develop partnerships with Chinese institutions in the areas of employability and entrepreneurship.

4 out of 7 projects involved Universities surveyed

UK Institution	Overseas Partner Institution	Focus
Coventry University	Shanghai Institute of Foreign Trade	The implementation of a Masters programme in Global Entrepreneurship to help to facilitate the creation of sustainable opportunity-orientated globally competitive entrepreneurial businesses.
Leeds Metropolitan University	Zhejiang University of Technology	To map the provision of CPD locally in Hangzhou City to support business enterprise, innovation and city and region economic development. To identify local company requirements for enterprise and innovation support delivered as part of a current Masters programme. To develop new CPD programmes that reflect needs locally. Such programmes could be delivered in Hangzhou or in Leeds. To determine the most appropriate optional module(s) and developments to incorporate into existing masters and provision, and the most effective forms of delivery. To grow Leeds Met expertise in Chinese business, enterprise and innovation through cross-cultural comparison and analysis.
University of Central Lancashire	Shanghai Institute of Foreign Trade	Development of core curriculum to underpin an appropriate range of developmental programmes for social enterprise in both countries – ranging from short workshops to year-long programmes for a range of participants including policy-makers, managers and students. Dissemination of developed curriculum through a range of media. Staff development: mini-conferences for university academics at both institutions.
University of Northampton	Capital University of Economics and Business, Beijing	To produce a deeper shared understanding of best practices in developing graduate Employability and Entrepreneurship; to produce a plan for the strategic development of Employability and Entrepreneurship at both SIFT and Uclan; to define and test a transferable model for Employability development. The outcome will be that students in SIFT and Uclan are more employable and enterprising as a result of incorporating into the student experience a range of interventions drawn from best practice for example student exchange and a conference on student enterprise.

B: England Africa Partnerships (EAP)

Two rounds of projects were selected during September 2006 and March 2007 resulting in support for 32 EAP projects: 11 in South Africa and 21 throughout the rest of Sub-Saharan Africa. Projects are focused upon many diverse themes, such as health, climate change, and agriculture. All have a common aim to build capacity at the African partner institutions and address key areas of need for Africa and African higher education.

Round 1 (2006)

8 of 16 partnerships involved participating Universities

Title	Country	Subject	UK Partner	African Partner (s)	Aim
Cross-Cultural Management and Health Sector Project Delivery in Sub-Saharan Africa	South Africa	Health sector management	Middlesex University	Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University (NMMU); Stellenbosch University; Rhodes University and University of Botswana	Through conceptual and empirical joint research, to develop a critical, cross-cultural stakeholder basis for effective and appropriate management of health sector programmes and projects, initially in the area of HIV/AIDS and TB, to identify and tackle the reasons for the gap between resources and achievement in combating these diseases, by focusing on multicultural, policy and management issues in South Africa and contrasting this with policy and management issues in Botswana.
Design4Life Africa	South Africa/Ghana	Ethical fashion and textile design	Tabeisa - University of Greenwich	Cape Peninsula University of Technology; Walter Sisulu University for Science and Technology; Durban University of Technology; Tshwane University of Technology, South Africa; Coventry University, UK and University of Education, Winneba, Ghana	Increased capacity of African HEIs to impact on poverty reduction
Skills for South African Communities: economic development in the Gauteng region	South Africa	Economic and community development	University of East London	Vaal University of Technology (VUT), South Africa	To make higher education provision and skills development initiatives available to adult workers.
"Developing and setting up Higher Education Institutions Careers Services For Ghanaian Graduates" - Know-how Transfer	Ghana	Institutional capacity building for career and	University of East London	University of Ghana, Legon	To ensure the development and implementation of a self- funding sustainable careers service model that can be replicated across Africa.

of University of East London's WorkBank experience of developing and running a successful full range of Careers Services.		employment skills			
Capacity development for curriculum reform and quality assurance in Malawi Higher Education for wider access, increase participation and enhanced student mobility.	Malawi	Human and institutional capacity building	Leeds Metropolitan University	The University of Malawi	To design a relevant, modular, constructively aligned outcome based curriculum aligned with international standards and the organisational capacity to deliver it.
Capacity building for degree-level initial police training in Rwanda	Rwanda	Initial police training	University of Teesside	Kigali Institute of Education, National University of Rwanda	To develop a mentoring relationship between UK and Rwandan university-level police trainers.
Training a Tanzanian Task Force as an agent to develop the quality, standards and capacity of Tanzanian Tertiary Technical Institutions	Tanzania	Quality and standards in tertiary technical institutions	Leeds Metropolitan University	Dar es Salaam Institute of Technology/ National Council for Technical Education	To train a Tanzanian task force so that it will be able to act as an agent of change in the development and improvement of the quality and standards of awards in tertiary technical institutions across Tanzania
Enhancing the capacity of the Department of Agricultural Extension/Education (DAEE) Makerere University, to offer innovative, demand-driven, need-based modular degree programs for private agricultural advisory service providers	Uganda	Agriculture	University of Greenwich	Makerere University, Uganda	Enhancing the capacity of DEES to offer innovative, demand-driven, need-based modular degree programs for private agricultural advisory service providers and to respond and adapt to demands of clientele in a changing policy environment.

Round 2 (2007)

3 of 17 partnerships involved participating universities

Title	Country	Subject	UK Partner	African Partner (s)	Aim
Institutional capacity building in support of the establishment of an academic and community focused "Centre of Excellence" in soccer development at the North-West University, South Africa.	South Africa	Sports Science, Life Skills	Academy of Sport, Physical Activity and Wellbeing, London South Bank University	Faculty of Health Sciences, North-West University, South Africa	1) To provide NWU with "in-house" capacity to deliver soccer coaching, sports administration and practical community engagement programmes in support of its Soccer Institute. 2) To initiate collaborative sports science research and academic course development projects as potential future developments for the Institute.
Development of institutional capacity in organic agriculture	Nigeria	Organic Agriculture, Commercial Development	Faculty of Business, Environment and Society, Coventry University	Faculty of Plant Sciences and Crop Production, University of Agriculture, Abeokuta	To increase the level of professional expertise in all aspects of organic agriculture in Nigeria
Capacity building through distance learning to reduce maternal and neonatal morbidity and mortality in the East Central and South Africa (ECSA) region	Tanzania/Malawi/Swaziland	Health, Distance Learning	Faculty of Health, University of Central Lancashire (UCLAN)	The East Central & Southern African College of Nursing, Tanzania; Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Swaziland; Muhimbili University College of Health Sciences, Tanzania; Kamuzu College of Nursing, University of Malawi	To reduce maternal and neonatal morbidity through improved midwifery education in the ECSA region

C: Development Partnerships in Higher Education programme (DeIPHE)

The programme provides funding to support partnerships between Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) working on collaborative activity linked to the UN Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). The overall goal of DeIPHE is to enable HEIs to act as catalysts for poverty reduction and sustainable development. DeIPHE aims to achieve this by building and strengthening the capacity of HEIs to contribute towards the MDGs and promote science and technology related knowledge and skills.

Target Countries:

Africa: Democratic Republic of Congo, Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Lesotho, Malawi, Mozambique, Nigeria, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Sudan, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

Asia: Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Cambodia, China (mainland only), India, Indonesia, Nepal, Pakistan and Vietnam.

Round 1 (2006)

4 out of 42 projects involved Universities surveyed

Partner Countries (& Institutions):	Title/ Subject Area:	Summary/ Aim:
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> India, Tata Institute of Social Sciences London Metropolitan University University of Warwick University of York 	Teaching and researching women's issues	Enhance the quality of teaching and research into gender equality and the empowerment of women. Develop new courses and a research centre in violence and abuse.
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Malawi, University of Malawi UK, Bell College, Scotland 	Sustainable community-based healthcare	Improve teaching, research, and practice in community based healthcare in order to reduce poverty and promote sustainable development.
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> South Africa, University of Johannesburg – South Africa Medical Research Council (UK) London South Bank University 	Urban environment & health	Support the formation of evidence based policy making in order to reduce poverty and inequality
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Vietnam, Cantho University Bangladesh, Independent University Middlesex University 	Developing courses in floodplain & flood risk management	Analyse needs, identify and share best practices, and develop courses in risk management for current and future professionals.

Round 2 (2007)

3 out of 41 projects involved Universities surveyed

Partner Countries (& Institutions):	Title/ Subject Area:	Summary/ Aim:
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Royal University of Phnom Penh (RUUP), Cambodia University of Brighton Roehampton University 	Strengthening and Expanding the Curriculum at the Royal University of Phnom Penh, Cambodia, Psychology Department	Revise existing teaching capabilities in research methods; develop a new Psychology Masters programme; equip new graduates with counselling skills and research techniques to explore the various areas of need in Cambodia, particular those related to HIV/AIDS in families and communities.
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Dar es Salaam Institute of Technology, Tanzania Chainama College of Health Sciences, Zambia 	Solid Waste Management for small and medium enterprises in Tanzania and Zambia	Develop a network of CBOs and CBEs providing solid waste services as part of regional trainers network to share

3. Leeds Metropolitan University		knowledge, skills, experience and ideas. Encourage regional educational institutions to provide community level short courses and courses for local governments, CBOs/CBEs, SMEs and donor agencies.
1. University of Zimbabwe 2. University of Greenwich	Alleviating Chronic Hunger and Malnutrition among the Rural Poor of Zimbabwe through Effective and Sustainable Utilization of Traditional Wild Plant-based Foods	Wild food's contribution in preventing malnutrition and survival strategies is often undervalued. We aim to collect indigenous knowledge on wild plant foods in the Buhera district and analyze their nutritional value. The objective is to prepare seasonal diet timetables linked to nutrient requirements.

Round 3 (2008)

3 out of 32 projects involved Universities surveyed

Partner Countries (& Institutions):	Title/ Subject Area:	Summary/ Aim:
1. Bahir Dar University, Ethiopia 2. Leeds Metropolitan University 3. Adama University, Ethiopia	Development of institutional qualifications framework in Ethiopian Higher Education Institutions (Bahir Dar & Adama)	To establish a credit based curriculum system for the university sector in Ethiopia and, through the train the trainer model, a develop significant number of institutional 'experts' in this field, trained and ready to act as in-house trainers as well as to cascade further across the sector.
1. University of Western Cape (UWC), South Africa 2. London Metropolitan University	Capacity building of practicing health professionals through distance learning programmes that adopt an emphasis on health determinants and health systems	To assist students to move from a biomedical emphasis towards a social model of health. To improve the knowledge base, skills and capacity of the students and staff in both institutions through curriculum improvement, which in the long term, will have the impact of making health systems more effective. Partners will review and updating modules, introduce short courses in Health Management, and Globalisation & Health. Graduate students will have an increased awareness of the importance & application of social determinants of ill health to improve health & increase knowledge & skills to participate in strengthening health systems.
1. Chainama Hills College, Zambia 2. Leeds Metropolitan University, UK	Developing the mental health workforce in Zambia to meet the challenge of a new Mental Health Policy	The development of a new certificate in Community Mental Health at Chainama College. This will support the further development of education and training for the mental health workforce as the new mental health policy and strategic plan is implemented. The project will provide support for the transition from hospital based to community based mental health services, including opportunities for updating/ training staff currently working at the college and assist in the development of a cascade model of training for existing and new groups of mental health workers. Community health workers will have an increased awareness of the knowledge and skills needed to respond to mental health and associated HIV/AIDS challenges.

D: UK-INDIA Education and Research Initiative (UKIERI)

This initiative supports staff and student exchanges, promoting new links between Higher Education (HE) institutions and research centres of excellence. Research cooperation projects include staff secondments, researcher exchanges and support for postgraduate research students in both UK and India. Collaborative delivery projects include taught Master's courses (Full Awards), and shorter postgraduate professional courses (Short Awards). Collaborative delivery projects normally receive support for a 3 year start-up period.

Research Awards

2007 - 0/13 awards involved participating universities

UKIERI-DST Science and Technology Awards

2007 - 1/24 awards involved participating universities

Title	Institutions	Focus
Distance education for sign language users	University of Central Lancashire & Gandhi National Open University. Delhi	This project develops new approaches to distance education and e-learning for deaf sign language users.

Collaborative Delivery Awards:

2006: 2/6 awards involved participating universities

Title	Institutions	Focus
Corporate MSc (Engg) Programmes for the Indian Industry	Coventry University & M S Ramaiah School of Advanced Studies	N/A
Development of Joint BSc (Hons) programmes in Bioinformatics, Biotechnology and Biosciences	University of Central Lancashire & The Dr D Y Patil Institute for Biotechnology and Bioinformatics	N/A

2007: 8/12 awards involved participating universities

Title	Institutions	Focus
Professional Practice Certificate in Approaching Learning Difficulties in Special and Inclusive Education (Primary)	Roehampton University & Amar Jyoti Rehabilitation and Research Centre	Three month course of Special and Inclusive Practices in Learning Difficulties" from October 2008 at Amar Jyoti Centre for Special Education, New Delhi.
MSc in Clinical Physiotherapy	Coventry University & M.S. Ramaiah Institute of Health Science	To develop an MSc Clinical Physiotherapy for Indian Physiotherapists to undertake advanced, clinically-based studies in India
Professional Development Certificate in Mental Health	Roehampton University London & The M.S. University of Baroda	A professional development course in mental health assessment designed for those working in primary care
Masters of Science in International Marketing Communications	Southampton Business School, Southampton Solent University & Mudra Institute of Communications	Collaborative double Masters award in International Marketing Communications
MSc Mobile Computing and Wireless Networks	University of Greenwich & ITM Universe	Aimed at IT graduates seeking continued professional development in this field
MBA Information Technology Management	University of Greenwich & ITM Universe	Will enable graduates to operate effectively in the Indian business environment
Executive MBA	Coventry University & Society for Computer Technology and Research - School of Technology and Management	To design and deliver an multidimensional postgraduate programme, providing an international business practice perspective.
MSc/MA Transnational Sociology and International Development	University of Teesside & Punjab University	To develop a dual Masters award in Transnational Sociology and International Development

E: European Commission Asia-Link Programme

The Asia Link was set up by the European Commission in 2002 to promote regional and multilateral networking between higher education institutions in Europe and developing countries in Asia. The programme aims to develop new and existing partnerships between European and Asian universities. From 2007 Asia-Link Programme has been replaced by the Erasmus Mundus External Cooperation Window.

5 out of 155 projects funded between 2002 and 2005 involved participating Universities

Title	Network
Implementation and Realisation of an Asian-European Master's Degree and Continuing Training Session in Food Science and Technology (Collaborative Delivery)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ecole Nationale Supérieure des Industries Agricoles et Alimentaires, Montpellier (FR) 2. Wageningen University (NL) 3. Greenwich University (UK) 4. SEAMEO Regional Centre for Graduate Study and Research in Agriculture, Laguna (PH) 5. Kasetsart University, Bangkok (TH) 6. University Putra Malaysia, Selangor Darul Ehsan (MY)
Developing an International Master Programme on Entrepreneurship and Innovation (Collaborative Delivery)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. University of Central England in Birmingham (BCU UK) 2. Harbin Institute of Technology (CN) 3. Kunming University of Science and Technology (CN) 4. Hong Kong Polytechnic University (CN) 5. Centre for Applied Sciences, Hochschule für Technik und Wirtschaft, Dresden (DE) 6. Indian Institute of Management Bangalore (IN)
MOVE: new curriculum for international transfer of technologies for entrepreneurial development	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Università degli Studi del Sannio (IT) 2. University of Luton (UK) 3. Indian Institute of Management Bangalore (IN) 4. Tribhuvan University of Kathmandu (NP)
Academic exchange of soil biophysics: the fundamental science behind the improvement of degraded soils (Human Resources Development)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Nanjing Institute of Soil Science, Chinese Academy of Sciences (CN) 2. Nanjing Agricultural University, College of Natural Resource and Environmental Sciences (CN) 3. Christian-Albrechts-University Kiel, Institute of Plant Nutrition and Soil Science (DE) 4. Kathmandu University, Department of Biological and Environmental Sciences (NP) 5. University of Abertay Dundee, SIMBIOS Centre (UK)
A management and QA framework to support ICT-based learning in sustainable livelihoods in the Himalayan region	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. University of Wolverhampton - Centre for International Development and Training (UK) 2. International Agricultural Centre, Wageningen University (NL) 3. Institute of Forestry, Tribhuvan University (NP); 4. Natural Resources Training Institute, Ministry of Agriculture (BT)
Education to Meet the Requirements of Software Industry and Beyond--Establishing; Implementing and Evaluating an Industry-Oriented Education Model in China (Human Resources Development)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Dublin Institute of Technology (IE) 2. Harbin Institute of Technology (CN) 3. University of Wolverhampton (UK)

Appendix 5: Policy Agency Interviews

Representatives from the following government departments and policy agencies were interviewed as part of this research project:

1. Association of Commonwealth Universities
2. British Council
3. Department for International Development (DfID)
4. Department for Innovation, Universities' and Skills (DIUS) – Science and Innovation Team
5. Department for Innovation, Universities' and Skills (DIUS) – Higher Education Strategy and Implementation Directorate
6. Department for Business, Enterprise and Regulatory Reform – UK Trade and Investment (UKTI)
7. Higher Education Funding Council for England
8. UK Higher Education International Unit
9. Joint International Unit (DIUS-DWP)
10. Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA)
11. Research Councils UK (RCUK)
12. Universities UK (International Policy)

Appendix 6: International higher education policies and partnerships in the US and Australia with some lessons for the UK

1. Introduction & Context

The United States (US) and Australia, together with the UK, are currently the three most active major English-speaking destination countries (MESDCs) in terms of international education. OECD and UNESCO data demonstrate that the three countries are the top MESDCs in terms of in-bound international student recruitment, although their market share (though not student numbers) is being threatened by increases in recruitment from emerging education systems in the Middle East and Asia.

The three countries are also generally thought to be the most active countries in international partnership activity (particularly in terms of overseas teaching provision). We therefore thought it valuable to review the international activities of universities in the US and Australia to see what lessons could be learned.

2. United States of America

International Higher Education in the US

The US currently has the world's largest market share of internationally-mobile international students and its international student numbers are growing. The US also has a large and important private sector, and the larger for-profits have become major players in international education and international teaching partnership activity. In 2006/7 there were 582,984 international students in the USA (from over 200 countries) a 10% rise in new international enrolments on the previous year⁷⁹. As in the UK, there is a greater proportion of international students amongst postgraduate taught and research students than at undergraduate level. The USA's three major (and growing) markets are in India, China and Korea, although other regions are beginning to show significant growth (especially in the Middle East), and the USA also recruits students from its neighbouring North American countries. The two most popular fields of study are Business and Management (17.8% of enrolments), and Engineering (15.3%).

International students represent just 3.9% of total enrolment in US HEIs, much less than the UK and Australia, although this rises to nearly a quarter in advanced research programmes (still less than the UK, but much higher than Australia). This suggests that the US may be capable of significantly increasing its overseas recruitment, both on and off-shore, by engaging more institutions in international recruitment or by increasing enrolments in internationally active HEIs. Currently only 156 institutions (out of over 2,700 HEIs) enrol more than 1,000 international students. A 2007 survey on international enrolments highlighted that 60% of institutions have taken steps to maintain or increase international enrolments – for a third of these institutions this included international programmes or collaboration - and that the key barriers to maintaining or increasing overseas enrolments were visa delays and refusals, and tuition costs.

In 2006/2007 the net contribution to the U.S. economy by foreign students and their families through their tuition and fees and associated living expenses⁸⁰ was \$14.5bn⁸¹. US Department of Commerce data suggest that the higher education sector is the country's fifth largest service sector export.

US National Policy on International Higher Education in the US

As in Australia, responsibility for education policy and funding in the US is decentralised to State governments. The Federal government is responsible for funding research and providing financial aid for students, whilst the States provide institutional funding and the legal framework. Institutional and programme accreditation is undertaken by independent bodies at regional level.

US HEIs are largely autonomous and able to engage in international activities without government direction or control (especially private institutions). The US Federal government has much less influence on

⁷⁹ Institute of International Education (2007). *Open Doors Report 2007*. Available at: <http://opendoors.iienetwork.org/>

⁸⁰ E.g. room and board, books and supplies, transportation, health insurance, support for accompanying family members, and other miscellaneous items

⁸¹ Institute of International Education (2007). *Economic Impact of International Students 2007*. Available at: http://www.opendoors.iienetwork.org/file_depot/0-10000000/0-10000/3390/folder/58653/Economic+Impact+2007.pdf

international education and quality assurance and regulation of international education activities than in either the UK or Australia.

The American Council on Education (ACE) acts as an umbrella organisation for the multitude of different associations that represent different interests in international education in the USA. Since 2002, ACE and 32 national associations have campaigned for a comprehensive Federal-level government policy on international higher education, although this has yet to materialise. The proposed policy would relate to study abroad, international recruitment, international programmes (e.g. foreign-language and area studies) and community-based exchange activities.

International higher education policy in the US is largely developed at institutional level, and is rarely the topic of national level debate. However, recent issues that have reached the national agenda include the sector's opposition to the Federal government's proposal on GATS to the WTO in 2000 on the basis of safeguarding institutional autonomy, and the need to protect international student recruitment (which fell in 2003/4), due to its importance for student recruitment in Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) subjects, national research capacity and associated economic competitiveness, and to a lesser extent institutional revenue. The HE sector is also concerned about how the implementation of the Student and Exchange Visitor Information Service (SEVIS), a computer tracking system for foreign students, and tighter visa requirements – and increased costs - imposed by the Homeland Security Office will affect the flow of international students, researchers and faculty to the USA. However, the concern has mainly focused on the potential loss of the academic contribution of overseas students rather than the loss of the revenue that they bring. In January 2006, the U.S. Department of State's Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs (ECA) held a summit of higher education leaders which highlighted the importance of international education to the national interest⁸². State Departments of Education also organise an annual International Education Week (IEW) that promotes the benefits of international education and exchange worldwide.

The Federal government influences international education through a combination of funded activities and programmes via the Department of Education, the Department of State Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, USAID and the National Science Foundation (NSF). These programmes are dominated by national security and foreign policy objectives and link international activities with the need to respond to the growing multiculturalism of US society. The programmes focus on student and faculty mobility, developing language skills and national capacity in area studies, and supporting development co-operation and international research collaboration in key fields such as science and engineering. The size and scope of these programmes is relatively small, and represents only a very small proportion of total HE funding. There is very little Federal-level support specifically targeted on developing overseas teaching partnerships in key recruitment markets (e.g. India and East Asia), or for developing broad-based institutional-level links in these countries.

Institutional Approaches to International Education in the US

Institutional-level rationales for international education in the US are diverse both within and between institutions. ACE takes a broad 'internationalisation' perspective on international education although, as in the UK and Australia, institutions vary in their own understanding of the scope of international education.

ACE conducts regular research into campus internationalisation, and has found that international education is often of marginal importance on most US campuses. ACE's most recent survey of 2,746 institutions in 2006 found that internationalisation is still not a high priority for most respondents, although there have been improvements since the last survey in 2001, particularly related to study abroad opportunities.⁸³ Less than 40% of respondents mentioned international or global education in their mission statements and 27% of institutions had no students at all studying abroad. It also found that academic (e.g. developing the quality of teaching and research, promoting liberal education, and increasing institutional prestige) and social (e.g. developing students' global citizenship skills, HEI capacity-building overseas, and fostering international understanding and world peace) are generally the main drivers for internationalisation on US campuses, although there is some evidence of economic and commercial rationales (e.g. student employability, revenue

⁸² Outcomes from the Summit included \$26m in annual funding for language learning under the President's National Security Language Initiative (NSLI); \$7m in funding to help Community Colleges engage in international exchange; an increase to \$6m in funding for the Benjamin A. Gilman International Scholarship Program to support undergraduate study abroad (see below); the creation of the \$7m International Fulbright Science and Technology Award to support PhD study at top US institutions, and senior level promotional delegations to key markets in Asia, South Asia, and Latin America. In addition, since 2000 the U.S.

⁸³ Green, M. et al. (2008). *Mapping internationalisation on US campuses: 2008 Edition*. Washington: ACE.

generation and contribution to local economic development and competitiveness) especially in the for-profit sector.

International Academic Partnerships in US Institutions

ACE separates international partnerships into academic partnerships (focusing on student and faculty exchange and collaboration around teaching and learning, research, and development issues) and more 'entrepreneurial' partnerships which can include exporting programmes and degrees, delivered through technology, branch campuses, or partnerships with other non-university private-sector institutions.

As in the UK, US HEIs (especially the larger research institutions) have a multitude of academic linkages and partnerships, both formally at the institutional level and below (at faculty and department level) that cover a range of different activities. There is no national data collection system related to such partnerships, and often no up-to-date register of such links at institutional level.

However, a recent report published by the American Council on Education⁸⁴ suggests that US HEIs are becoming more interested in internationalisation and global engagement, and are seeking to diversify their academic partnerships beyond the traditional focus on Western Europe to include Asia. They highlight the growth in importance of international partnerships over the last 10 years and suggest that they are becoming essential to the challenges that colleges and universities face in responding to their global environment. They suggest that long-term sustainable international partnerships can help support core institutional goals (e.g. improvements to teaching, research and service), help prepare students to operate in a globalised world, and contribute to the development of mutual understanding between US citizens and overseas citizens, and to addressing global problems via collaborative research and development assistance. They outline three types of international partnership agreements involving US HEIs - friendship and cooperation; broad institutional; and program-specific – each with a different degree of institutional commitment and complexity. Friendship agreements involve less commitment and are often a first step to deeper partnerships; program-specific partnerships are more focused; whilst broad institutional agreements usually involve a long-term commitment to co-operation and mutual support. There are parallels here with the three levels of international partnerships identified by Fielden in the UK.⁸⁵ Common foci of broad-based partnerships include research, internships and study abroad, development cooperation, training (e.g. pedagogy, student services, fundraising), and shared library facilities.

The Office of Postsecondary Education (OPE) in the US Department of Education provides most of the funding for institution-to-institution partnerships overseas that are not focused only on developing countries. Its Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) provides four international programmes that involve collaboration between the OPE and overseas government agencies (e.g. the European Commission's Directorate General for Education) to fund international consortia programmes for projects involving study abroad, staff and student exchange, curriculum development and collaborative degrees⁸⁶: The EU-U.S. Atlantis Program (collaborative degrees and student mobility); The Program for North American Mobility in Higher Education (student exchange and curriculum development); The U.S.-Brazil Higher Education Consortia Program (student mobility) and the U.S.-Russia Program (student mobility). In addition the National Science Foundation (NSF) provides grant support for Partnerships for International Research and Education (PIRE), which has funded collaborative partnerships a Masters level in Europe in subjects such as business, the sciences and engineering.

International partnerships focused on Student and Faculty Mobility involving US institutions

For many US institutions international education is understood to relate to short (usually a semester or less) periods of study or work abroad, or exchanges, for US students and faculty. In some cases it also relates to inward mobility of overseas students for part of or a whole programme of study; 'Study Abroad' has for long been the bedrock of the US approach to internationalisation.

⁸⁴ Van de Water, J. et al. (2008). *International Partnerships: Guidelines for Colleges and Universities*. Washington: ACE

⁸⁵ Fielden, J. (2007). *Global Horizons for UK Universities*. London, Council for Industry and Higher Education.

⁸⁶ In addition, the International Education Programs Service (IEGPS) provides grants that are designed to strengthen the capability and performance of American education in foreign languages and in area and international studies. Some of these support study abroad, and research and other projects work, sometimes in partnerships with overseas institutions and organizations.

US institutions are likely to have a range of bi-lateral or multi-lateral partnerships with overseas institutions to support such mobility, generally funded by the institutions or students themselves. The Federal government provides small amounts of funding for particular types of mobility. The Department of State, Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs manages the Fulbright-Hayes programmes that supports faculty and student dissertation research abroad, and supports numerous educational and cultural exchange programmes, many of these managed by the Institute of International Education (IIE)⁸⁷. The IIE manages over 250 mobility programmes involving 18,000 students and other internationally mobile citizens each year. These programmes are funded by US government, corporations, foundations and international agencies such as the World Bank⁸⁸. Recently the federal government has decided to be more aggressive in its support for study abroad and the Commission on the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Programme has recommended that a target of one million students is set for studying abroad; roughly double the present numbers. It also calls for federal funding to help to make this possible. This will now happen, following Congress' decision in July 2007 to establish the Senator Paul Simon Study Abroad Foundation as the vehicle for funding.⁸⁹

IIE data from 2006/2007 show that 241,791 US students were studying abroad, 95.6% for less than a year, and 55.4% for less than a semester. US students prefer shorter periods of study abroad, and vacation programmes as they tend to have jobs whilst studying⁹⁰. Around 57% of US students travel to Europe and 15% to Latin America, there has been a 20% increase in students travelling to Asia (10% of total). IIE data doesn't include students who study for the whole of their degree abroad. There were 98,239 International Scholars (i.e. Faculty and researchers) in the US in 2006/7, 39% of whom came from China, India or Korea. Most such Scholars are involved in the health sciences (24%), biological and medical sciences (20%), engineering (12%) and physical sciences (12%).

At regional level (i.e. related to Canada and Mexico), the NGO, the Consortium for NA HE Collaboration (CONAHEC), assists institutions in developing international partnerships – particularly related to student exchange.

International Partnerships focused on Collaborative Teaching and Curriculum Development involving US institutions

There is no comprehensive data collection related to overseas partnerships focused primarily on teaching, often called 'overseas campuses' in the USA. Therefore it is difficult to measure how many institutions offer programmes overseas and how many programmes or students are involved. In 2002 the Center for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) published data that indicated that 225 US-accredited institutions or programmes were operating outside the US. Anecdotal evidence and data from other countries (e.g. China, India, Singapore, Malaysia) suggests that along with the UK and Australia, the USA is a major provider of overseas teaching programmes, especially related to overseas campuses, with US branch campuses being established as early as the 1970s and 1980s. A growing region for such US branch campuses is the Middle East, for example there are currently six US institutions operating in Qatar's Education City which has a 2,500 student campus.

US branch campuses are rapidly expanding, and data from Verbik and Merkley at the Observatory on Borderless Higher Education (OBHE) in 2006⁹¹ suggest that US branch campuses account for more than a half of all overseas branch campuses. However, most US colleges and campuses overseas serve US students studying abroad rather than international students.

⁸⁷ The Institute of International Education (IIE) is an independent non-profit organisation that aims to promote educational relations between the US and other countries, to increase student and researcher mobility and contribute to the internationalisation of the higher education sector.

⁸⁸ Key mobility programmes are the Education Partnerships Programme which supports partnerships and exchanges between US and foreign HEIs, the Benjamin A Gilman programme which helps support overseas study for undergraduates, the Fulbright Student and Scholars Programs, the International Visitors program, Development Training II in Egypt, the Exchange Program for Sustainable Growth in Asia, and EcoLinks in Central and Eastern Europe and Russia. In addition, other US Departments of State also support faculty and student mobility (e.g. Labor, Energy and Commerce, and Defense),

⁸⁹ No decision has been made regarding the level of funding, although \$2 million has been voted for start up costs. See http://www.nafsa.org/public_policy.sec/commission_on_the_abraham

⁹⁰ IIE Open Doors Survey 2007, *op cit*.

⁹¹ Verbik, L. and Merkley, C. (2006). *The international branch campus - models and trends*. London: Observatory on Borderless Higher Education.

In 2007, the IIE undertook a survey of 43 overseas 'branch campuses' identified in the OBHE survey⁹². Nineteen institutions (40%) responded, 6 in the Middle East (Qatar, UAE, and Israel), 6 in the Asia/Pacific (China, Japan, Singapore, and Australia), 4 in Europe (Belgium, Hungary, Cyprus, and the Netherlands) three in Latin America (Mexico and Panama) and one in Canada. In total, these campuses enrolled over 9,357 (52.5%) international students – students who were not nationals of the country in which the campus was located. The highest proportion of international students, rather than students from the country of operation, was reported in Europe (mainly US students) and the Middle East (students from neighbouring countries). Student numbers ranged from 15 to over 3,000 and the main fields of study were Business and Management, Social Sciences, and Technology (Engineering, Maths, and Computer Science).

In addition to branch campuses, there are a number of examples where US HEIs operate with partners. Such partnerships can involve collaboration on course development, teaching and support (often using technology). The depth of collaboration ranges from part of a course to a full or joint degree, and can include dual/double and joint degrees as well as US programmes delivered in partnership overseas. ACE's 2006 survey on campus internationalization in US HEIs⁹³ found that only 8% of US institutions offered degree programmes outside the USA that recruit non-US students, although a further 7% were developing such programmes. Most degree programmes offered abroad were in China (40%), Western Europe (30%) and in the fields of business and management (64%). Doctorate-granting institutions were most likely to offer such programmes. In 2007, ACE published findings from a mapping exercise focused on nature and extent of overseas program delivery involving U.S. institutions⁹⁴. This was the first survey of its kind, and provides examples of U.S. overseas teaching partnerships around the world (e.g. in Qatar Education City, Dubai Knowledge Village and in China and India), although these only represent a sample of the total amount of provision (which is still unknown).

Collaborative degree programmes (e.g. joint or dual degrees) are an increasingly popular type of international partnership activity for US HEIs, and a Council of Graduate Schools (CGS) 2007 survey of US graduate schools, indicated that 29% of respondents had established collaborative degree programmes with overseas partners, most notably in Europe, China and India⁹⁵. In China, the 'Sino American 1-2-1 Dual Degree Programme' is a joint initiative between the China Centre for International Educational Exchange (CCIEE) and the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) which seeks to maximise higher education collaboration between the two countries. In place since 2001, it is designed to enable Chinese students to complete the first year of undergraduate studies in their home country, study at a US institution for two years, and then obtain two degrees after completing the final year in China. In 2008 eight US universities⁹⁶ and twelve Chinese universities⁹⁷ were involved in the programme. In addition, in 2004, US Cornell University formed new partnerships with several universities in China, including Peking University and Tsinghua University, to develop joint degree programmes (with Peking University). Cornell University has also formed a partnership with Nanyang Technological University in Singapore to offer a joint Master's programme in Hospitality Management.

Van de Water, et al.⁹⁸ suggest that international teaching partnerships involving US institutions are increasing at least in part due to the rise in demand for English-language provision, and developments in technology infrastructure which have enabled teaching and support to be delivered at a distance. Although they stress that most international partnerships have an academic rationale, they highlight a trend for 'entrepreneurial' international activities which provide a source of revenue to the US partner (e.g. overseas programmes or campuses).

The US for-profit sector is very active overseas and is likely to become more so in the future. US for-profits are increasingly operating campuses or buying institutions in other countries. Laureate International Universities has a network of 20 institutions in four continents serving 215,000 students, and Apollo International (which owns the University of Phoenix) has five overseas campuses. De Vry University owns

⁹²Institute of International Education (2007). *Overseas Branch Campuses Survey 2007*. Summary available at: <http://opendoors.iienetwork.org/?p=branchcampuses>

⁹³Green, M. et al. (2008), *op cit*.

⁹⁴Green, M. et al. (2007). *Venturing Abroad: Delivering U.S. Degrees Through Overseas Branch Campuses and Programs*. Washington: ACE.

⁹⁵Van der Water, J. et al. (2008), *op cit*.

⁹⁶George Mason University, Ball State University, University of North Carolina at Pembroke, Eastern Washington University, University of Nebraska at Kearney, Northern Arizona University, Troy University and California State University San Bernardino.

⁹⁷Beijing Normal University, Nanjing Normal University, Shandong University at Weihai, Soochow University Southwest Jiaotong University, Wuhan University of Technology, Yunnan University, Communication University of China, Chang'an University, Chongqing University, Liaoning University and Nanjing University of Information Service and Technology.

⁹⁸Van der Water, J. et al. (2008), *op cit*.

Ross University in the Caribbean and Career Education Corporation owns the American Intercontinental University and its overseas campuses as well as a French educational company.

Many US institutions are involved in providing distance and on-line education, which includes enrolments of overseas students in their home countries. There is very little data collection in this area, but the for-profit Phoenix and Cardean Universities have significant numbers of enrolments overseas (but many of these may be US citizens). Anecdotal evidence suggests that US institutions offering online MBAs are seeking to expand overseas enrolments, either alone or via bi-lateral or multi-lateral partnerships (consortia) with other US or international higher education institutions (e.g. Cornell University and Queen's University in Canada) and other types of organisation.

The US government has not sought to develop a national policy framework or to regulate the transnational provision of US HEIs, and institutions are responsible for the quality and standards of their overseas teaching provision. The ACE has produced a check-list for cross-border education and signed a joint declaration with the International Universities' Association and the Association of Universities and Colleges in Canada in 2004 on guidelines for transnational activity, although this is not binding for institutions. CHEA is focusing on quality issues in cross-border education, and there are efforts to register and accredit providers. However it has proved very difficult to develop measures to quality assure overseas delivery offered by US providers, particularly from the for-profit sector.

Research and Development-Focused Partnerships involving US institutions

Although data is not collected at national level in this area, anecdotal evidence suggests that many US institutions are involved in multi-institutional international partnerships, consortia and networks, either regional or global. Most commonly, these support research and involve research universities collaborating on joint research projects or graduate research student supervision.

The National Science Foundation (NSF) through its Office of International Science and Engineering (OISE) provides funding, advice and guidance to help facilitate international activities such as fostering institutional frameworks that facilitate international co-operation (bi-lateral and multi-lateral) in research and education, supporting research programmes and training graduate students. The NSF helps to fund US participation in global-scale projects and research, international facilities, and professional training for scientists and engineers. It also signs intergovernmental agreements of science and engineering cooperation and joint programmes designed to facilitate involvement of NSF-supported US scientists and engineers in international collaboration.

The US higher education sector is also engaged in what is usually described as 'development cooperation' in a number of developing countries, particularly in Asia and Africa. These partnerships are focused on mutual benefit (capacity building and study abroad opportunities) rather than just aid. The United States Agency for International Development (USAID), via Higher Education for Development (HED), supports academic involvement in international development projects and overseas co-operation (in fields including HIV/AIDS, teacher training, renewable energy, judicial training, and local governance) in selected developing countries (Africa; Asia and the Near East; Europe and Eurasia; and Latin America and the Caribbean).

3. Australia

International Higher Education in Australia

Since the 1980's Australia has become a significant recruiter of international students, both to campuses within Australia, and 'offshore' at Australian universities' branch campuses or via international partnership activities. As in the UK, once quota restrictions on full-fee international student recruitment were lifted in the 1980's, universities began to increase their overseas recruitment, and international student fees are now a major source of income for Australian universities.

Australia recruits significant numbers of international students, despite having a much smaller HE sector than either the US or the UK. Education services (at all levels) are Australia's third-largest export earner (after coal and iron ore), and were worth around AUD\$12.5 billion in 2007. In 2007 IDP Education Australia reported that there were 210,956 international students enrolled in Australian Universities, a 3.5% increase from 2006 (18.3% of all Australian university students – the highest of all OECD member countries). Of these, it is estimated that there are 61,331 transnational students, of whom approximately 11,622 are studying off-campus (distance/online) and 49,709 students are studying onshore abroad. In total, 149,625

international students (70%) were studying onshore in Australia, including 5% on exchange and study abroad programmes. Nearly half (67,470) of the students studying in Australia were from growing markets in China, India or Malaysia. Other key (but declining) markets include Hong Kong and Indonesia. Some universities are intending to address their high level of dependence on a small number of markets by diversifying to regions such as India, Middle East and South America (Chile, Mexico). Japan, Taiwan and the USA are regarded as hard markets for Australia to access for student recruitment.

Australia's rapid growth⁹⁹ as a major international student recruiter has been assisted by its low living costs compared to the UK and the US, its location close to key markets in Asia, its English-language provision, its preferential visa treatment for overseas students in key professional disciplines (e.g. Business & IT), and its reputation as a relatively cosmopolitan and low-risk environment. A significant proportion of overseas students are already living in Australia before they enter higher education, either studying at educational institutions or in employment. There are also large numbers of home students that speak English as a second language.

Australia differs from the UK and the US in terms of the subject profile and level of its international student enrolments. For example, Australia has a lower proportion of international students in Engineering and Arts & Humanities subjects and more in Business, ICT and Social Science Programmes. It also recruits fewer international students in advanced research programmes than the US and the UK (less than 5% of all international students).

Australian National Policy on International Higher Education

Compared with the UK and the US, Australia has a more highly developed national-level strategy and policy framework related to international higher education and is pursuing a 'whole-of-government' international strategy (supported by a range of different government departments) which has four key priorities: promoting bilateral and multilateral engagement on international education and training; addressing Australia's skills shortages; safeguarding educational standards; and pursuing market diversification. The focus on international engagement, overseas student recruitment, and maintaining standards is very similar to the international education policies promoted in the UK, albeit articulated and promoted in a more comprehensive manner.

Australian Education International (AEI) is part of the Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations (DEEWR) and has responsibility for international education at all levels. Its role encompasses government-to-government relations, national quality systems and export marketing support for industry. AEI works with sector representatives, other government agencies, and states and territories to pursue a co-ordinated approach to delivering the Commonwealth government's international education agenda.

In terms of bilateral and multilateral engagement, AEI engages in government representation via government-to-government activities (e.g. developing bilateral relationships, regional links such as the Brisbane Communiqué to engage with the mobility agenda in Europe, and free trade agreements) and through engaging in governmental representation (e.g. in UNESCO, with the EU, and in Asia-Pacific networks). Universities Australia - the national level sector body that represents 38 of Australia's universities – also pursues international linkages with education-related organisations overseas (e.g. ACE, the EUA), and helps promote inter-institutional international links.

In terms of addressing Australia's skills' shortages, AEI manages the AEI-NOOSR program which provides a coherent framework for skills and qualifications' recognition for international students it supports Australia's Skilled Migration Program and administers the Endeavour Program of merit-based scholarships for students (mainly from the Asia-Pacific region) to study, research and undertake professional development in Australia, and provides a number of scholarships that enable Australian students to study abroad. It is also involved in the National Language Centre which provides intensive training for all Australians in key languages, and supports the development of cross-cultural skills to help facilitate engagement in business, trade and cultural exchanges.

In terms of safeguarding educational standards, AEI co-ordinates Australia's comprehensive approach to quality assurance in international education. Australia has a regulatory framework related to its international education activities focused on consumer protection, visa and immigration policies, and information for

99 Between 1994 and 2007 the number of international students enrolled in public HE in Australia almost quadrupled from 43,732 to 149,625 (IDP 2007)

international students on studying in Australia (e.g. under the Education Services for Overseas Students (ESOS) Act 2000¹⁰⁰, the Commonwealth Register of Institutions, Courses for Overseas Students (CRICOS) and the National Code of Practice for Registration Authorities and Providers of Education and Training to Overseas Students. In addition, the Australian government has supported projects focused on developing good practice models and a quality framework for offshore provision led by the Australian Universities Quality Agency (AUQA). In 2005 the Commonwealth government published a Transnational Quality Strategy aimed at promoting the quality of Australian education and training (all levels) that is delivered in other countries, thus helping to safeguard Australia's reputation in international education. The Strategy recognises that the delivery and outcomes of TNE provision should be equivalent to that delivered within Australia – as assessed by AUQA institutional audits. As in the UK and the USA, the growth in the threats from terrorism and a renewed emphasis on national security has led to a tightening of visa controls in Australia, which has the potential to harm international student and staff recruitment.

Finally, AEI has an extensive offshore network that promotes and markets Australian education, science and training, and the Study-in-Australia brand, overseas. It also provides market information and analysis for the sector on a number of overseas countries. AEI has an international network of 26 offices and four Australian Education Centres (AECs) in Vietnam, India, and Indonesia. These seek to promote Australian education, research and training, and provide strategic policy advice. In addition, Austrade undertakes promotional marketing activities in Europe on behalf of AEI.

There are also other bodies helping to promote Australian higher education overseas. IDP Education Australia which is half owned by Universities Australia works with individual institutions to help in recruiting overseas students through a network of 75 offices in 29 overseas countries. In addition some States have created regional support services for their universities' international marketing and such entities exist in Adelaide, Perth and Melbourne.¹⁰¹ These agencies work alongside Australian Education International (AEI) - a government body - and IDP Education Australia (IDP).

Prior to the adoption of the 'trade-orientated' perspective in the 1980s', Australia's international education policy was largely aid-based and focused on supported scholarships to students in neighbouring developing countries (via the Colombo Plan) and other types of developmental assistance in the Asia-Pacific Region. The legacy of this approach continues, and in addition to the strategic priorities outlined above there is also a focus on engaging with Australia's regional partners for mutual benefit, for example in promoting cultural and academic exchanges, and collaborating in research and capacity-building activities. For example, in 2001 AusAID and the World Bank initiated a five-year 'Virtual Colombo Plan' designed to use ICT to provide cross-border distance learning for students in the developing world. The Federal government has also supported collaborative projects with Malaysia, Thailand, China and India focused on improving administrative and academic management and research management.

Institutional Approaches to International Education in Australia

Australian universities have a reputation for a strong commitment to internationalisation. However, this reputation is mainly related to the long and active engagement of Australian universities in recruiting, teaching and supporting overseas students. All Australian institutions take international education very seriously, and most have reorganised their management structures to give clearly designated leadership responsibility for international development (e.g. a PVC or DVC responsible for international affairs). Many Australian universities have well-articulated strategies for international development, although a recent AUQA study¹⁰² demonstrated that the metrics for the measurement of progress toward these goals are not always well developed.

Australian universities' success in overseas recruitment, both on and off shore, is evident from the statistics, although in terms of campus internationalisation it is questionable just how international Australian universities have become in comparison with universities in the US and the UK. On some of the key

¹⁰⁰ The Education Services for Overseas Students (ESOS) Act 2000 outlines an internal quality assurance regime, which heavily regulates Australian HE institutions recruiting international students. The ESOS Act has an emphasis on safeguarding the interests of the student. It is perceived amongst many to be an important guarantor (or even service level agreement) for overseas governments, students and parents.

¹⁰¹ These are all funded by the State governments and market their city to international students at all levels. See www.studyadelaide.com, www.studymelbourne.vic.gov.au/ and for Perth Education City see www.doir.was.gov.au It is interesting to note that Education Adelaide has 9 staff.

¹⁰² Stella, A. and Liston C. (2008) Internationalisation of Australian Universities: Learning from Cycle 1 Audits. Canberra: AUQA.

performance indicators— for example curriculum reform, and student exchanges and mobility - the Australian government and universities are only just beginning to make changes. Given the cosmopolitan nature of many Australian campuses there have been some criticisms that the Anglo-centric curricula and pedagogy are becoming less appropriate and lack cross-cultural sensitivity, whilst there are also concerns that there is insufficient mixing between international students and local populations.

International Academic Partnerships in Australian Institutions

In general, Australian universities, like their counterparts in the USA and the UK, tend to focus on carefully chosen bi-lateral relationships rather than rely upon relationships within large consortia (e.g. Universitas 21 or the World University Network).

As in the UK and the US, at institutional level there are numerous bi-lateral agreements between Australian and overseas institutions. Universities Australia conducts regular surveys of its members on their formal international links and offshore programmes. The most recent survey findings were published in 2007. The 2007 'Formal links between Australian universities and higher education institutions overseas' survey identified formal institution-to-institution agreements between Australian institutions and institutions overseas. Such agreements can include the following components: student exchanges, study abroad arrangements, staff exchanges and academic/research collaboration. The survey findings identified 5,168 formal agreements, the highest number in Asia (2,029) then Europe (1,796) followed by the Americas (1,190). The top 5 countries were the USA, China, Japan, Germany and the UK. Student exchange is included in 67% of agreements, staff exchange in 57%, and study abroad in 22% of agreements.

The federal government supports the EU-Australia Cooperation in Higher Education and Vocational Education and Training Programme, which is now in its fourth round. This programme funds projects that seek to increase academic cooperation and student mobility between partner institutions in Australia and the EU. Projects range from studies in international relations and security to developing environmental sustainability programmes.

Partnerships focused on Student and Faculty Mobility involving Australian Institutions

The Australian government is seeking to expand the international experience of Australian students so that 20 per cent of students undertake part of their studies abroad. Australia currently has one of the lowest rates of student mobility across the OECD countries. IDP produces figures on the numbers of Australian full-degree students studying abroad on exchange and other mobility schemes, and 2007 data show that only 2,684 Australian students were studying abroad (2,194 of these were on exchange programmes) although the numbers are probably an underestimate, as there are no formally agreed means of calculating accurate numbers.

Australia receives many more exchange students than it sends overseas, particularly from Western Europe and the USA. In 2007, around 5% of all international enrolments (on- and off-shore) were students on study abroad or exchange programmes, or over 10,000 students.

There are a number of issues behind this lack of mobility including; lack of co-ordination of term dates; cost and distance; language barriers and a culture of studying close to home. Students and young people are more likely to travel on vacation for a period of overseas employment.

The Commonwealth-funded University Mobility in Asia and the Pacific Programme (UMAP) and the UMAP Credit Transfer Scheme, co-ordinated by Universities Australia, involve cooperation between government and non-government representatives of the higher education sector in the Asia-Pacific region. Since 1993 the UMAP program has sought to achieve enhanced international understanding through increased co-operation between universities, especially through increased mobility of university students and staff (e.g. exchanges/credit transfer). The recently-developed UMAP Credit Transfer Scheme is designed to assist UMAP members and their universities to develop standard arrangements for academic recognition of exchange studies undertaken by UMAP students. The Australian Commonwealth government also cooperates with the Cheung Kong Group in Hong Kong on Australia Cheung Kong Exchange Funding. In addition, most Australian HEIs have institutional or departmental links with other institutions for reciprocal exchanges of students and staff.

Recently, the Federal government introduced the Overseas Fee HELP (OS-HELP) income-contingent loan scheme to assist full-time undergraduate students to take a period of study abroad. This scheme is intended

to enable more students to acquire the sorts of knowledge, skills and experience that will enable Australia to develop effective international relationships and engage in international trade in the future.

Partnerships focused on Collaborative Teaching and Curriculum Development in Australian Institutions

Australian universities have developed numerous off-shore activities since the 1980's mainly via branch campuses, franchised or twinning programmes, or articulation agreements. Universities Australia collects data on Australian universities' overseas delivery and in 2007 it published 'Australian Universities Offshore Programs, November 2007'¹⁰³. The survey findings reported 1,002 Australian offshore programmes, a drop from 1,569 in 2003. The majority of both programmes and enrolments are in four countries: Malaysia, Singapore, China and Hong Kong, all of which have over 8,000 enrolments and over 100 programmes. Singapore hosts over 240 Australian programmes, and both Malaysia and Hong Kong over 180. Malaysian partnerships are estimated to enroll over 14,000 students, Singapore programmes around 12,000, and Chinese partnerships around 11,000 students.

In 2007, according to IDP data¹⁰⁴, offshore enrolments accounted for 29% of all international HE enrolments, or 61,331 students (a growth of 1.3% compared with 2006). 49,709 enrolments were at offshore campuses or partner organizations and 11,622 via distance or online learning. The majority (38,867) of on-campus offshore students were in Singapore (13,958), Malaysia (11,225), Hong Kong (7,529) or China (6,155). Distance-based or on-line offshore provision tends to involve a combination of face-to-face and distance or on-line delivery and academic support. The primary motivation for such provision, as in the UK, is financial, especially amongst the newer universities.

Given the number of programmes, it appears that each programme only enrolls a few hundred students at most, and many less than 100 students. All but one university had some kind of offshore provision, ranging from 1 programme (Bond University) to 124 programmes (Monash University). Ten universities had branch campuses overseas: Central Queensland in Fiji and New Zealand, Charles Sturt in Canada, Curtin in Malaysia, James Cook in Singapore, Monash in Malaysia and South Africa, RMIT in Vietnam, Swinburne in Malaysia, Newcastle: 2 campuses in Singapore, Southern Queensland in Fiji, and Wollongong in Dubai. Six Australian universities were involved in joint programmes: Charles Sturt in Mauritius (BA programme), Swinburne in China (PhD), ANU in Singapore (BA), Melbourne in Malaysia (PGCerts) and Singapore (BEng), Queensland in France and Switzerland (PhDs), and Tasmania in China (2 BAs). Most programmes were in the fields of Business and Management or ICT, with smaller numbers of programmes in the Healthcare Sciences, Education, Art and Design and Engineering. All programmes were either delivered totally overseas, or via a combination of distance and overseas delivery. Usually such programmes are delivered in English in partnership with local providers who provide physical facilities, administration and market promotion whilst the Australian institution is responsible for all academic matters.

The first Australian institution to develop an overseas campus was Monash, which has a commercial campus in Malaysia and a fully-owned operation in South Africa. RMIT University has recently become the first foreign private university in Vietnam with two purpose-built campuses in Hanoi and Saigon, partly financed through World Bank and Asian Development Bank loans. A planned University of New South Wales Campus in Singapore was shelved following concerns about financial viability and academic independence.

The Australian Federal government also encourages Australian HEIs to develop collaborative or joint degree programmes with overseas institutions, although there are currently limited examples of such provision. There is a major focus on the EU and Australia is one of the few non-European countries to have ratified the 1997 Convention on the Recognition of Qualifications concerning Higher Education in the European Region (commonly referred to as the Lisbon Recognition Convention), thus recognising all European qualifications including joint degrees. In 2002, an Australian-EU cooperation programme was launched, aimed at supporting higher education co-operation, mainly through staff and student mobility, but also through the development of mutually recognised credit transfer arrangements. The scheme had three pilot projects which involved consortia of Australian and EU universities delivering joint course-work Master's programmes.

¹⁰³ Based on data collected from member institutions on 'offshore programmes' which are based on formal agreements between an the Australian university and an overseas institution or organization, are taught partly or wholly offshore, lead to a recognised higher education qualification, and in which the Australian university has developed the program and has a responsibility for overseeing the academic standards

¹⁰⁴ http://www.idp.com/research/fast_facts/higher_education.aspx

Individual universities have also begun to develop their own bi- and multi-lateral international collaborative degree provision. In 2005, RMIT University collaborated with the Australian Embassy in Tehran to enhance academic co-operation with higher education institutions in Iran and announced plans to offer joint degree programmes with a number of Iranian universities. In 2004, the National Universities of Singapore (NUS) and Australia (ANU) signed a partnership to develop joint degree programmes which involve a period of study at both institutions.

Australia probably leads the world in terms of its attention to quality assurance and the provision of information related to offshore provision. There is no direct regulation or legislation related to overseas teaching provision, although the Federal government is concerned about the reputational and financial risks associated with such provision. In November 2005 the State Education Ministers agreed a national Transnational Quality Strategy, focused on ensuring the quality of offshore teaching programmes (at all levels of education) through ensuring that they maintain equivalent standards to programmes delivered in Australia, and providing information to parents, students and other stakeholders. The main intention of this approach is to safeguard the reputation of Australian higher education in key overseas markets. In May 2008 the Australian government launched an online directory of Australian providers and courses delivered offshore called 'AusLIST'. AusLIST provides information on approved Australian education and training providers, the courses they deliver offshore that involve face-to-face delivery, and the locations where courses are delivered¹⁰⁵.

An interesting feature of the Australian QA system is that each institutional audit undertaken by AUQA includes all academic activities carried out in the name of that institution, wherever or with whomsoever they occur – including offshore activities. Each AUQA audit contains 'commendations' for good practice and 'recommendations' for areas of improvement, and examples of good practice are published on a Good Practice Database. In terms of offshore provision Curtin University of Technology, the University of South Australia and Edith Cowan University have been identified as exemplifying good practice in quality assurance for overseas programmes. In addition, the International Education Association of Australia (IEAA) has established a Transnational Education Forum (TNEF) to disseminate and enhance good practice in Australian offshore provision.

A recent AUQA review of institutional audits¹⁰⁶ found that although partnership activities were well managed on the whole, offshore provision attracted more 'recommendations' than other types of international education activities. A key issue related to the decentralisation of responsibilities for such activities within institutions which often lead to a lack of monitoring of activity and alignment with institutional policy and strategy. Common 'recommendations' related to insufficient business planning and due diligence, consistency in standards for admission, teaching assessment, the availability of learning resources and student support, accountability, risk management and the equivalence of awards. In recent years Macquarie University and Southern Queensland University have both been criticised for the management of their offshore operations, and the latter was de-licensed by the Dubai Knowledge Village (DKV) following investigations that uncovered serious shortcomings including lack of direct control by the university and lack of academic materials and other learning resources.¹⁰⁷

As a result of these 'recommendations' Australian HEIs have begun to review and, in many cases, improve their institutional level management and quality control of their offshore activity. Some universities have begun to question the value (financial and reputational) of off-shore provision¹⁰⁸, especially within China, and some have begun to downsize their overseas course delivery significantly. They are also becoming anxious about the regulatory burden imposed by governments at home and overseas. Some institutions (e.g. Adelaide) have focused their offshore delivery on 'bricks and mortar' campuses in order to control the quality of the student experience.

Research and Development-Focused Partnerships involving Australian Institutions

Although there is limited data collected in this area, anecdotal evidence suggests that, as a whole, Australia is less involved than either the UK or the US in overseas research collaborations. In comparison with

¹⁰⁵ See: <http://www.auslist.deewr.gov.au> for more details.

¹⁰⁶ Stella, A. and Liston C. (2008) *op cit*.

¹⁰⁷ Quality Assurance Agency (QAA). Quality Update International: July-August 2007.

¹⁰⁸ For example, the University of New South Wales (UNSW) withdrew from its planned UNSW Asia campus in Singapore mainly because of a perceived lack of financial sustainability.

Western Europe and North America, university research constitutes a smaller share of national research and development activity than in Western Europe and North America, since more is undertaken in government research laboratories. This limits the university sector's capacity for basic research and doctoral training and ultimately its capacity to recruit advanced research students and to engage in high-level international research collaborations.

The most recent data available come from an IDP-commissioned study from 1996 on internationalisation in higher education¹⁰⁹ which reported that by 1995 Australia's universities had established a total of 1,020 international research links, and had set up a total of 519 research centres with international links. The Australian National University (ANU) has a number of linkages in the Asia-Pacific region related to research and other types of inter-institutional international collaboration and is a founder member of the International Alliance of Research Universities (IARU), a cooperative alliance of some of the world's leading research universities.

At Commonwealth government level the International Science Linkages Program provides funding for Australian scientists from both the public and private sectors to collaborate with international partners on leading-edge science and technology projects. In 2003/4 the Federal Government provided AUS\$35.5m in seed-funding for five International Centres of Excellence that are intended to build Australia's international profile, and enhance its capacity and national skills base and research and professional development through strategic collaborations with domestic and international organizations in a range of fields (e.g. education, sports science, waste management, area studies, tourism and hospitality management). Collaboration includes developing formal networks to support research, consultancy and staff and student mobility, and collaborative projects and events.

AusAID is the Australian Government's overseas aid agency and part of its remit is to increase access to, and the quality of, education and training for people in partner countries, via selective assistance in distance education, higher education and institutional strengthening through exchange and institutional links. This includes supporting scholarships and fellowship awards, mainly for students and leaders in Asia-Pacific countries, but also from other developing countries (e.g. in Africa). Scholarship schemes include Australian Development Scholarships (ADS), Australian Leadership Awards (ALA), Australian Regional Development Scholarships, Carnegie Mellon University-AusAID Scholarships, and Australia Africa Fellowships. AusAID also supports developmental research projects, including academic research partnerships focused on supporting collaboration on topics of key strategic importance to Australia's development cooperation program involving project work and partnership building activities. A key programme is the AusAID Development Research Program (ADRP) which supports multi-year partnerships with overseas institutions for research and outreach projects, managed by the partner.

4. Lessons for the UK HE Sector from the US and Australia

Lessons that the UK HE sector can learn from US

The general policy background is not yet very positive, since there is a striking absence of federal policy on international HE and limited federal funding for internationalisation. Where it exists, the primary linkages are to foreign policy interests and to the multi-culturalism of society. However, there are some developments emerging, for example:

- Policy worries about a falling share of the international student market are based on fears for national academic capacity rather than loss of income.
- State governments actively promote international higher education through their promotion of an International Week.
- Information about the extent of internationalisation in universities is published at regular intervals based on surveys by the American Council on Education (ACE).
- These surveys show that motives for international activity within universities are primarily academic rather than financial.
- ACE has also recently published two publications focused on international partnership activity which suggests that the US sector is becoming more interested in developing such partnerships.

¹⁰⁹ Back, K., Davis, D., & Olsen, A. (1996). *Internationalisation and higher education: Goals and strategies*. Canberra, Australia: Department of Employment, Education, Training and Youth Affairs. Accessible on-line at <http://www.dest.gov.au/archive/highered/eippubs/eip9615/front.htm>

- There is funding from agencies such as FIPSE for four international programmes for collaboration with overseas institutions, focussed on the EU, Brazil, Russia and student mobility respectively.
- The IIE is another agency that manages overseas study programmes which have many sources of funding: corporations, foundations and agencies as well as government.
- There is now a national policy aim to increase the number of students studying abroad fourfold from 0.25 m to 1m. The new Paul Simon Study Abroad Foundation established in February 2008 will fund this.
- NAFSA, the Association of International Educators, assists institutions in developing international partnerships and publishes booklets advising foreign institutions on how to make links with US HEIs.
- The National Science Foundation helps to facilitate and fund international research linkages.

Lessons that the UK HE sector can learn from Australia

The Australian picture is very different to that in the US due to the heavy reliance of HEIs on the income generated from international students and the consequent weight given to international education by governments at both State and Federal levels. Some useful points to emerge are:

- There is a well-developed and well-co-ordinated federal-level strategy and policy framework as regards international students, which is followed by several government departments with four stated policy priorities.
- The provision of information and data on international partnerships and related international activity of Australian HEIs is systematic and regularly collected and published at federal level.
- Australia has developed a comprehensive approach to the quality assurance of international education including offshore programmes offered by Australian HEIs and good practice is captured and publicised.
- The federal government has agreed preferential visa treatments for students in key professional disciplines such as IT.
- AEI is the federal body which promotes bilateral and multilateral HE activities overseas through all its offices, but also works closely with Universities Australia – the vice-chancellors' body - and IDP Education Australia. It also manages the Endeavour scholarships programme.
- Some of the larger states have an agency that promotes their state to international students.
- A Transnational Quality Strategy was agreed between all the States in 2005 focussed on ensuring that quality is maintained and the AUQA always looks at all overseas provision. AUQA identifies and disseminates good practice in offshore provision.
- A national target has been set of having 20% of Australian students studying abroad.
- There is an income contingent loan scheme to provide financial help to students studying abroad (OS-HELP).
- Large numbers of international students come to Australia to learn English first and then move to HEIs. In some cases the HEIs own and run secondary schools teaching English and study skills in order to guarantee themselves a flow of students.
- A federal Science Linkages programme funds international collaboration in some scientific subjects and five International Centres of Excellence get special funding.
- Australian HEIs take international education very seriously, and most have clearly designated leadership responsibility for international development (e.g. a PVC or DVC responsible for international affairs).

Acronyms Used in the Report

APIIT	Asia Pacific Institute of Information Technology
ARU	Anglia Ruskin University
AUQA	Australian Universities Quality Agency
BCU	Birmingham City University
BRIDGE	British degrees in Russia, a partnership programme.
COMETT	Community Programme for Education and Training for Technology
CPD	Continuing Professional Development
CSC	Commonwealth Scholarship Commission
CVU	Council of Validating Universities
DAAD	<i>Deutsche Akademische Austausch Dienst</i> (Academic Exchange Service)
DELPHE	Development Partnerships in Higher Education
DfID	Department for International Development
DIUS	Department of Innovation, Universities and Skills
ERASMUS	European Co-operative Programme for Higher Education
ERC	European Research Council
FEC	Further Education College
GATS	General Agreement on Trade in Services
GCU	Glasgow Caledonian University
GUNI	Global University Network for Innovation
HEFCE	Higher Education Funding Council for England
HEPI	Higher Education Policy Institute
IAU	International Association of Universities
IU	The HE International Unit
KT	Knowledge Transfer
LEONARDO	European training for the UK
LKW	Lim Kok Wing University
LSBU	London South Bank University
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
MESDC	Major English Speaking Destination Country

MoC	Memorandum of Contract
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
NGO	Non Governmental Organisation
OS-HELP	Australian loan scheme helping students to study abroad
PMI	Prime Minister's Initiative
PVC	Pro Vice-Chancellor
QAA	Quality Assurance Agency
RAE	Research Assessment Exercise
RCUK	Research Councils UK
RDA	Regional Development Agency
SBCS	<i>a place in Trinidad (last para of D2) - ??</i>
SEGI	Systematic Education Group International
SIU	Norwegian Centre for International Co-operation in Higher Education
SLZ	Soft Landing Zones programme
SOCRATES	An EU programme until 2006, replaced by the Lifelong Learning Programme
STEM	Science, Technology, Engineering and Medicine
TEMPUS	Trans European Mobility Scheme for University Studies
TNE	Trans-National Education
TVET UK	Technical and Vocational Education and Training UK
TVU	Thames Valley University
UAE	United Arab Emirates
UCE	University of Central England
UCLan	University of Central Lancashire
UEL	University of East London
UKIERI	UK-India Education and Research Initiative
UKTI	UK Trade and Industry
UWS	University of West of Scotland
VLE	Virtual Learning Environment
WP	Widening Participation
WUN	World University Network