Article

READY OR NOT? CONSIDERING BEST PRACTICE PRINCIPLES FOR DELIVERY OF TRANSNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION – A LITERATURE REVIEW

Claire Goode

INTRODUCTION

This paper is a review of the existing literature on best practices in offshore education in a tertiary context, and considers at what stage of programme delivery such practices should be implemented. With education rapidly progressing as a global commodity for export, the need to consider organisational capabilities and readiness to deliver quality educational experiences offshore is unavoidable. "Attention to the international dimension of higher education has become increasingly visible in institutional strategies as well as national and international agendas" (Jones, 2015, p. ix).

Educators, curriculum leaders, and other stakeholders could all benefit from reflecting on the multiple elements that contribute to effective offshore delivery, and the pedagogical approaches related to an internationalised curriculum and to offshore education. These include the relevance of course content for particular cultural contexts, the student experience (including, for example, student expectations, challenges experienced by students, and factors affecting student performance), and the demand for excellence in all aspects of teaching and learning. Investing time in planning and preparation can enable tertiary institutions to deepen their understanding of the complexities of offshore delivery, and help articulate different interventions that could be offered to raise standards and student achievement, while developing best practice from staff, before embarking on offshore delivery.

In 2001, Adam drew attention to offshore or 'transnational' education as "an under-researched and often misunderstood area" (p. 5). Twelve years later, an article by the British Council confirmed that there continued to be significant gaps in the literature and asserted that "it is time for the various stakeholders to work together to improve the evidence base" for the delivery of higher education programmes overseas (British Council, 2013a). Still in 2017, while recognising that growth in transnational education has been considerable, Henderson, Barnett and Barrett agreed that substantial gaps in knowledge remain, and emphasised the need for educators to "share learning and emerging best practice, and to explore how [offshore education] can best be developed" (pp. 11-12).

Investigating educational programmes, in relation to recognised effective practices, contributes to further understanding of best practice in education (in similar contexts), and helps identify aspects of learning, teaching, and delivery which may be applicable in many contexts, such as face-to-face, fully online and/or blended delivery, and the offshore delivery of cross-cultural educational programmes:

> *Academic [programmes], the students who study them, and the academics who design, deliver, and assess them are at the heart of [institutional] endeavours. Research both informs and results from these [programmes]; outreach and enterprise activities are fuelled by and support them*
>
> (Jones, 2015, p. x).

In examining the literature, I begin by considering existing research into transnational education in general, before moving to focus on quality standards in offshore education, and issues around academic assessment. I conclude with a synthesis of principles of best practice which should be implemented before, during, and after delivery of an offshore programme.

WHAT IS 'BEST PRACTICE'?

Educators use the phrase 'best practice' for a variety of systems, procedures, and behaviours which "may or may not have been rigorously evaluated" (Arendale, 2018). While questioning the frequent use of the term, Arendale defines best practice as the "wide range of individual activities, policies, and programmatic approaches to achieve positive changes in student attitudes or academic behaviors" (ibid.). These "positive changes" are one aspect of best practice, certainly, but Hargreaves and Fullan go one step further, defining best practice as "existing practices that already have a good degree of widely agreed effectiveness" (2012, p. 51). In this paper, then, I review the literature relating to educational practices which are widely agreed as effective, and which can have a positive impact on learning and teaching.

OFFSHORE EDUCATION

Offshore education is "the provision of academic courses to students who are physically situated overseas" (Seah & Edwards, 2006, p. 297). Sometimes referred to as "transnational," "cross-border," or "borderless" education (Kosmützky & Putty, 2016), it is seen as a fast-growing opportunity for educational institutions (O'Mahony, 2014; Smith, 2009; Waterval, Frambach, Driessen, & Scherpbier, 2015), with demand for offshore education forecast to exceed demand for onshore delivery to international students (Chapman & Pyvis, 2006a, 2006b; Knight, 2014; Pearl, 2013; Waterval et al., 2015). Providers and their programmes are increasingly crossing borders to build their own profiles, to meet students' demand for quality, and to respond to students' reluctance to leave home in order to gain a qualification. As the British Council (2013b) highlights:

> *The differences between educational sectors, institutions and the landscape of particular countries are increasingly blurred: countries which traditionally held a role as a source of international students have become study destinations and play host to international students; new alliances both international and national are being formed; and private and corporate sectors are increasingly active as providers* (p. 1).

As well as being a new source of income, the transnational model offers institutions the opportunity to build their brand and develop their reputation (Department for Business, Innovation and Skills, 2013): "In today's age of global knowledge and technology, an interconnected network and global awareness are increasingly viewed as major and sought-after assets" (Hénard, Diamond, & Roseveare, 2012, p. 7). Research prospects, too, are enhanced with these international connections, as are opportunities for increased staff and student mobility (Shams & Huisman, 2012; Wilkins & Huisman, 2012) and enrichment of staff learning and development (Keevers et al., 2014).

While there are several advantages for institutions, then, there are also concerns. These include power relationship inequalities (Keevers et al., 2014), questions around the "difficulties in assuring quality at a distance" (Adam, 2001, p. 35), and possible "conflict between quality and profit" (ibid.), as well as issues with the dominance of Western-centric curricula (Knight, as cited in Matthews, 2013; Trahar & Lazarus, 2015; Whitsed & Green, 2015), opposing cultural expectations (Keevers et al., 2014), and a fear that transnational education is "exacerbating [the] brain drain and in some case[s] not meeting technical and science skills gaps" (Knight, as cited in Matthews, 2013). Offshore teaching involves "multiple people, cultures, roles, settings, programs, and modes of delivery" (Hicks & Jarrett, 2008, p. 239), so that its complexity and challenges, alongside the opportunities it presents, should not be underestimated.

For institutions looking to enter the cross-border market, they must decide if they wish to either compete with or collaborate with local institutions (Knight, 2014). A third option is to co-exist, with the foreign provider perhaps offering something unique in the local context. Regulations and policies can also be challenging, including concerns around quality assurance. As Knight (2014, p. 53) underlines, while "more national quality assurance and accreditation agencies have been created, … [they] have generally not focused their efforts on assessing the quality of imported and exported programs." Other considerations for stakeholders include whether to invest in offshore infrastructure or to rely on that which is provided by the 'host' country (Hénard et. al., 2012), and how to adapt their pedagogical approaches to best meet different learning styles in different global regions (Heffernan, Morrison, Basu, & Sweeney, 2010).

There has been very limited research into the value of transnational education for the learners themselves (O'Mahony, 2014). O'Mahony's analysis of the existing literature on transnational education (2014, pp. 13-15) highlighted 12 key themes that appeared in the material, and ranked them according to frequency. 'Learning' ranked seventh out of twelve, just behind 'teaching,' with the themes of 'globalisation,' 'policy,' and 'trade' at the top of the table. This is surprising when we consider that "[o]ne of the main goals of internationalised higher education is to provide the most relevant education to students, who will be the citizens, entrepreneurs and scientists of tomorrow" (Hénard et al., 2012, p. 8). Investigating students' perceptions of the value they see in courses delivered in an offshore setting would be valuable for any institution, and would also contribute to the academic literature.

While there is little available research focusing on students in transnational programmes, the views of learners travelling overseas to study at a tertiary institution have been examined. Ramsden, for example, asserts that students' "expectations are as varied as their experiences" (2008, p. 2) and calls for a radical rethink of curricula so that they may be "imbued with international perspectives" (ibid., p. 10).

Internationalisation of the curriculum, then, can be included in a model of best practice. Mahat and Hourigan (2007) investigated the satisfaction levels of international students attending Australian universities, while Russell, Rosenthal, and Thomson (2010) examined the needs and well-being of international students attending a particular university in Melbourne. Hart and Coates (2011) considered how East Asian students studying at a university in the United Kingdom respond to dissatisfaction with their tertiary experience, and several researchers (including Heggins & Jackson, 2003; Lin, 2012; Sultana & Smith, 2011; Tummala-Narra & Claudius, 2013) have explored the experiences of international students at different North American universities. For example, in their 2005 research into international students enrolled in undergraduate programmes in the United States, Zhao, Kuh, and Carini asserted that "relatively little is known about the extent to which international students are satisfied with their experience" (p. 211) – although this could be perhaps because their paper preceded the real explosion in institutions competing on a global level to attract students, the "rising percentages of international students" (Montgomery, 2010, preface), and higher levels of student mobility. International attendees of tertiary courses may have specific expectations regarding, for example, the advantages that their course or context enjoys over equivalent programmes in their respective home countries.

Educators, institutions, and researchers may question the impact of studying in one's home country compared with studying overseas, and what best practice principles might be applied to minimise this. It could, for example, be argued that international students studying abroad are faced with cultural challenges, displacement, and family commitments (whether their family has moved with them or has decided to stay in their home country), while local students must manage their home life and potentially ongoing professional commitments alongside their academic studies. Investigating expectations of best practice in student support and pastoral care is a gap in the literature.

The establishment of student identity in offshore programmes has also been challenged (Chapman & Pyvis, 2006b; Evans & Tregenza, 2001). In Chapman and Pyvis' research into postgraduate students in transnational programmes, for instance, participants "expressed the shared view that it was not possible for offshore students to feel that they were part of the university community" (2006a, p. 295), despite the students' efforts to create a sense of belonging. Similarly, the concept of staff identity may be tested. Unlike delivering extramural courses or teaching international students in a university's home country, "the offshore experience can position the academic as a minority in a foreign culture" (Seah & Edwards, 2006, p. 299). Removed from their usual institution and their customary classroom context, "teachers undertaking transnational programs have to be equipped with skill sets marked by high levels of intercultural understanding" (Kosmützky & Putty, 2016, p. 18). Furthermore, Keevers et al. (2014) highlight the need for continuous professional development explicitly tailored to transnational teaching teams. Offshore delivery, then, may suit some academics but not others, and some students but not others. A model of best practice should include factors which contribute to identity.

Linked to the concept of identity, offshore education has been criticised for "eroding national cultural identities and leading to cultural homogenisation, most often in the form of Westernisation" (Knight, 2014, p. 55). The implications of using materials designed by Western educators for learners in non-Western countries are the subject of considerable research (for example, Doherty & Singh, 2005; Gulati, 2008; Luke & Dooley, 2009; Wright, Dhanarajan, & Reju, 2009). Luke and Dooley (2009, p. 3) go so far as to say that "the international spread of English via Western curriculum and language teaching methods is a form of 'linguistic imperialism' (Phillipson, 1992)." Cousin (2011), on the other hand, while agreeing that there is a need for sensitivity, challenges "issues of imperial power and hegemonic grip" (p. 585) and calls for educators "to look with a fresh lens at what it takes to produce an internationalised curriculum" (p. 592).

While I agree entirely with the idea that "the changing global environment requires people to engage – and be able to work – with people from cultural, religious and/or linguistic backgrounds or world views that are very different from their own" (Bolstad et al., 2012, p. 3), I wonder whether Western approaches to course delivery impact on student performance in any way. Students from all countries may be impacted by their national values, for instance, when it comes to critical thinking and reflective practice. In some cultures, for example, "authority is seldom criticised" (Prescott, 2002, p. 247), and students may be uncomfortable or even unwilling to critique published material or to challenge something which is presented in class. Cultural sensitivities, then, merit further enquiry, and would again contribute to understanding how effective courses are considered to be, particularly by students who are not from Western countries, whether English is their first language or not. Institutions seeking to enter the transnational market need to be willing to review the cultural and contextual appropriateness of their curricula, materials, and pedagogical approaches.

The relationships between key players in offshore projects also need to be considered, in order to understand the roles of different stakeholders. In terms of relationships, it is important to reflect too on the teacher–student connection, investigating, for instance, whether students respond differently to different lecturers, such as those from a Western background compared with those from a non-Western background, staff with or without particular professional experience, or male versus female academics. These relationships may vary, depending on the cultural background of the individuals concerned and their professional experience. Understanding these intricacies will be of help to other educators involved in offshore or multicultural education.

QUALITY STANDARDS IN OFFSHORE EDUCATION

We cannot identify principles of best practice without reflecting on the importance of quality, and how this is reported in the existing literature. As Hénard et al. emphasise, "internationalisation of programmes entails … ever more demanding expectations in terms of quality of pedagogy, student assessments and the learning environment" (2012, p. 8). While the concept of 'quality' may be difficult to define (AbdiShahshahani, Ehsanpour, Yamani, Kohan, & Hamidfar, 2015; Stake & Schwandt, 2006; Stufflebeam, 2016), I tend to agree with Stufflebeam's argument: "It would be a cop-out to conclude that a program's merit is only in the eyes of different beholders and could legitimately be judged good or bad depending on who is doing the judging" (2016, p. 47). It is possible, indeed necessary, to look at quality and best practice from an objective stance, and to seek input from as many points of view as possible, in order to present a balanced picture.

The principal challenge facing educational institutions working in transnational contexts is to "demonstrate continuity in their scholarship and aptness of teaching, while at the same time convincing their market place that their degree retains its integrity, irrespective of location or mode of delivery" (Castle & Kelly, 2004, p. 56). Pyvis (2011) calls for "context-sensitive measures of quality" to be used in transnational higher education, and argues that discussions around quality need to respect diverse education traditions, rather than assuming that "a programme delivered in one country [can be] used as the reference point for quality in a programme implemented in another country" (p. 733). However, while a "universalist mindset" (Hoare, 2013, p. 561) can hinder quality in education, it is also important to bear in mind that "agreements on, for example, international benchmarks and standards … are not reached easily" (Altbach, Reisberg, & Rumbley, 2009, p. v). Furthermore, academics and administrators working in offshore programmes may feel that they are "serving two masters" (Dobos, 2011), if the 'home' campus and transnational stakeholders cannot agree on key aspects such as quality standards. One principle of best practice, then, is to ensure that these standards are negotiated and agreed upon before a course begins, and then reviewed at regular intervals.

In 2005, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) published its 'Guidelines for Quality Provision in Cross-Border Higher Education,' in collaboration with the United Nations' Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO), in order to "sustain the development of quality cross-border higher education that meets human, social, economic and cultural needs" (OECD, 2005, p. 3). The guidelines encourage all stakeholders to take responsibility for good practice, and to "strengthen the dynamics of openness, collaboration and transparency" (Vincent-Lancrin, Fisher, & Pfotenhauer, 2015, p. 3). A 2015 report released by the OECD asserts that, while "further progress is still required" (ibid.), the guidelines have been adopted by multiple governments and educational institutions. This is significant when we consider that the report incorporates input from 32 (ibid., p. 11) of its 35 member countries. I reiterate, though, that they recognise the need for further progress.

The Council of Europe's 'Code of Good Practice in the Provision of Transnational Education' (Council of Europe, 2014) also makes several suggestions for ensuring quality in offshore contexts, and focuses these on three main drivers. The first is that the quality of education delivered in a foreign country should be equivalent to that of other institutions and should meet the basic expectations of the 'host' nation. The second recommendation is that quality assurance is the responsibility of the institution awarding the qualification. The third major principle relates to clarity and transparency: clear information should be provided about the qualification, including "the nature, duration, workload, location and language(s) of the study programme" (ibid.), and "the quality of educational services … should be based on specific criteria, which are transparent, systematic and open to scrutiny" (ibid.). Other commentators echo these recommendations, while also emphasising the importance of "localiz[ing] the curriculum" (Shams & Huisman, 2012, p. 110), the need for "regular communication and feedback, including inter-institutional visits and joint programme evaluations" (Dunworth, 2008, p. 106), and for "regular reviews of student performance and … feedback from staff and students" (Castle & Kelly, 2004, p. 55). The Australian Department of Education, Science and Training (2005) proposes a transnational quality strategy which fulfils four principles, again centred on accountability, transparency, and equivalence, while also requiring that "[q]uality arrangements … seek to promote a culture of continuous improvement, of which a key element is regular self-review" (p. 8). We can see, then, how these examples mirror the OECD's calls for collaboration, openness and transparency, and can guide discussions around best practice in offshore education.

ACADEMIC ASSESSMENT

As Wiggins (1992, p. 33) underlines, "good teaching is inseparable from good assessing," and, just as in any other educational context, practices regarding assessment design and administration should be regularly reviewed in transnational programmes.

Some researchers (for example, Angélil-Carter, 2014; Ferguson, 2007; Lillis & Curry, 2010; Starfield, 2002) have found that the written work of native and non-native speakers is often assessed differently, albeit perhaps subconsciously, by markers who perceive a native speaker's ability to manipulate language and structure as an indication of greater understanding of the subject content, while second-language speakers are often seen as relying too heavily on recognised authorities in the subject area. Starfield emphasises that, if this type of "patchwork plagiarism" does occur, that it may be "a survival strategy rather than a conscious effort to deceive" (2002, p. 126). It is also worth noting that, for particular cultures, using the exact words of a published author, for instance, is seen as a sign of the utmost respect, rather than a case of academic theft, and that plagiarism is considered a very Western concept (Adiningrum & Kutieleh, 2011; Bloch, 2007; Flowerdew & Li, 2007; Pennycook, 1996). In multicultural contexts, clear guidelines and expectations would help students understand how to cite the work of others in their own academic writing and presentations.

Questions of plagiarism aside, though, Starfield goes on to assert that "[s]tudents … who speak and write the legitimate language have a greater likelihood of becoming successful; their writing appears to be subjected to a lesser degree of scrutiny" (2002, p. 138). This echoes Bourdieu's (1991) much-cited work around inequality and power imbalances in language use. Although student and tutor understanding of what exactly is required to produce a 'successful' piece of work might differ (Lea & Street, 1998; Starfield, 2004), principles of best practice should be investigated here. Is it enough for teaching staff to provide instructions and marking guides, for instance, for each assessment? It may well be that students and stakeholders, possibly from different countries and cultures, have different expectations of how much information and support should be available to learners, so that they might succeed in an assessment.

CONCLUSION

A synthesis is provided in Table 1, which shows principles of best practice which should be implemented before, during, and after delivery of an offshore programme, as identified in the literature. Since these practices are iterative, and for ease of reference, the recommendations for the pre-delivery or planning phase and the post-delivery phase have been combined.

Further research is still needed, with particular research gaps in the following areas: the value of transnational education for learners, best practice regarding student support and pastoral care in offshore settings, and the challenges of cultural sensitivities and appropriateness of curricula, materials, and pedagogies.

Transnational education is here to stay, and institutions would do well to reflect on and review their capabilities and readiness to compete in offshore markets before embarking on new ventures.

Claire Goode is a member of Otago Polytechnic's Learning and Teaching Development team. Her career has spanned 20 years in a variety of education contexts in New Zealand, France and the UK. She enjoys seeing how educational technology can enhance learning and teaching opportunities, and is particularly interested in teacher development.

Table 1: Summary of best practice principles for offshore education, identified in the literature

PHASE	*BEST PRACTICE PRINCIPLE*	*AUTHORS*
PRE-DELIVERY and POST-DELIVERY	Deciding on relationship between delivery and host institutions (e.g., collaboration, competition, or co-existence?)	Bordogna, 2018; Council of Europe, 2014; Dobos, 2011; Healey, 2015; Henderson, Barnett, & Barrett, 2017; Knight, 2014; OECD, 2005; Stafford & Taylor, 2016; Wilkins, 2016
	Negotiating and agreeing on quality standards across institutions	Altbach, Reisberg, & Rumbley, 2009; Council of Europe, 2014; Department of Education, Science, and Training, 2005; Dobos, 2011; Henderson, Barnett, & Barrett, 2017; Keevers et al., 2014; Knight, 2014; OECD, 2005; Pyvis 2011; Stafford & Taylor, 2016; Vincent-Lancrin, Fisher, & Pfotenhauer, 2015
	Reviewing quality of imported/exported programmes	Altbach, Reisberg, & Rumbley, 2009; Castle & Kelly, 2004; Council of Europe, 2014; Department of Education, Science, and Training, 2005; Henderson, Barnett, & Barrett, 2017; Knight, 2014; Stafford & Taylor, 2016
	Reviewing infrastructure	Hénard, Diamond, & Roseveare, 2012; Henderson, Barnett, & Barrett, 2017; Wilkins, 2016
	Reflecting on appropriateness of pedagogical approaches	Bordogna, 2018; Castle & Kelly, 2004; Council of Europe, 2014; Department of Education, Science, and Training, 2005; Gulati, 2008; Heffernan et al., 2010; Hoare, 2013; Lamers & Admiraal, 2018; Luke & Dooley, 2009; Wright, Dhanarajan, & Reju, 2009
	Reviewing relevancy, currency, and appropriateness (e.g., cultural, contextual) of curricula and learning materials	Caniglia et al., 2018; Castle & Kelly, 2004; Council of Europe, 2014; Cousin, 2011; Doherty & Singh, 2005; Gulati, 2008; Healey, 2015; Hénard, Diamond, & Roseveare, 2012; Henderson, Barnett, & Barrett, 2017; Hoare, 2013; Knight, 2014; Luke & Dooley, 2009; Pyvis, 2011; Shams & Huisman, 2012; Wilkins, 2016; Wright, Dhanarajan, & Reju, 2009
	Ensuring internationalised curricula	Bolstad et al., 2012; Caniglia et al., 2018; Cousin, 2011; Doherty & Singh, 2005; Hénard, Diamond, & Roseveare, 2012; Henderson, Barnett, & Barrett, 2017; Hoare, 2013; Keevers et al., 2014; Knight, 2014; Pyvis, 2011; Ramsden 2008; Trahar & Lazarus, 2015; Whitsed & Green, 2015; Wilkins, 2016
	Managing expectations of students and of institutions (through transparency and clarity of information)	Council of Europe, 2014; Hart & Coates, 2011; Henderson, Barnett, & Barrett, 2017; Lin, 2012; Mahat & Hourigan, 2007; OECD, 2005; Ramsden, 2008; Russell, Rosenthal & Thomson, 2010; Stafford & Taylor, 2016; Sultana & Smith, 2011; Tummala-Narra & Claudius, 2013; Vincent-Lancrin, Fisher, & Pfotenhauer, 2015; Zhao, Kuh, & Carini, 2005
	Recruiting staff with high levels of intercultural understanding	Bordogna, 2018; Hoare, 2013; Knight, 2014; Kosmützky & Putty, 2016; Lamers & Admiraal, 2018; Seah & Edwards, 2006; Wilkins, 2016
	Reviewing academic rigour and integrity of qualification	Castle & Kelly, 2004; Council of Europe, 2014; Department of Education, Science, and Training, 2005; Henderson, Barnett, & Barrett, 2017; OECD, 2005; Stafford & Taylor, 2016; Wilkins, 2016
	Ensuring equivalency of qualifications (across delivery and host institutions) by reviewing mode of delivery, workload, course duration …	Castle & Kelly, 2004; Council of Europe, 2014; Department of Education, Science, and Training, 2005; Henderson, Barnett, & Barrett, 2017; OECD, 2005; Stafford & Taylor, 2016

Table 1 (continued): Summary of best practice principles for offshore education, identified in the literature

PHASE	*BEST PRACTICE PRINCIPLE*	*AUTHORS*
DELIVERY	Maintaining agreed, transparent quality standards across institutions	Altbach, Reisberg, & Rumbley, 2009; Council of Europe, 2014; Department of Education, Science, and Training, 2005; Dobos, 2011; OECD, 2005; Pyvis, 2011; Stafford & Taylor, 2016; Vincent-Lancrin, Fisher, & Pfotenhauer, 2015
	Providing pastoral care and support for students and staff	Heggins & Jackson, 2003; Henderson, Barnett, & Barrett, 2017; Lin, 2012; Russell, Rosenthal & Thomson, 2010; Sultana & Smith, 2011; Tummala-Narra & Claudius, 2013; Zhao, Kuh, & Carini, 2005
	Ensuring clear channels of communication	Castle & Kelly, 2004; Council of Europe, 2014; Department of Education, Science, and Training, 2005; Dunworth, 2008; OECD, 2005; Stafford & Taylor, 2016; Vincent-Lancrin, Fisher, & Pfotenhauer, 2015
	Conducting joint programme evaluations	Dunworth, 2008
	Establishing transparent and systematic feedback processes, including academic reviews, course evaluations, and a complaints process	Castle & Kelly, 2004; Council of Europe, 2014; Department of Education, Science, and Training, 2005; Dunworth, 2008; Hart & Coates, 2011; Henderson, Barnett, & Barrett, 2017; Lin, 2012; OECD, 2005; Pyvis, 2011; Stafford & Taylor, 2016; Sultana & Smith, 2011; Tummala-Narra & Claudius, 2013; Vincent-Lancrin, Fisher, & Pfotenhauer, 2015; Zhao, Kuh, & Carini, 2005;
	Organising and facilitating regular inter-institutional visits	Dunworth, 2008
	Establishing a sense of community among students and staff	Chapman & Pyvis, 2006a, 2006b; Keevers et al., 2014; Knight, 2014; Lin, 2012; Seah & Edwards, 2006;
	Reviewing assessment practices	Council of Europe, 2014; Hénard, Diamond, & Roseveare, 2012; Henderson, Barnett, & Barrett, 2017
	Maintaining academic rigour	Castle & Kelly, 2004; Council of Europe, 2014; Department of Education, Science, and Training, 2005; Henderson, Barnett, & Barrett, 2017; OECD, 2005; Wilkins, 2016
	Embracing a culture of self-improvement	Department of Education, Science, and Training, 2005; Keevers et al., 2014; OECD, 2005

REFERENCES

AbdiShahshahani, M., Ehsanpour, S., Yamani, N., Kohan, S., & Hamidfar, B. (2015). The evaluation of reproductive health PhD program in Iran: A CIPP model approach. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 197, 88–97. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.07.059.

Adam, S. (2001). *Transnational education project: Report and recommendations*. London, UK: University of Westminster. Retrieved from http://cc.unze.ba/download/Report%20on%20Transnational%20Education%20Project.pdf

Adiningrum, T. S., & Kutieleh, S. (2011). How different are we? Understanding and managing plagiarism between east and west. *Journal of Academic Language and Learning, 5*(2), A88–A98. Retrieved from http://journal.aall.org.au/index.php/jall/article/viewFile/159/111

Altbach, P. G., Reisberg, L., & Rumbley, L. E. (2009). *Trends in global higher education: Tracking an academic revolution*. Paris: UNESCO.

Angélil-Carter, S. (2014). *Stolen language? Plagiarism in writing* (2nd ed.). Abingdon, UK: Routledge.

Arendale, D. (2018). What is a best education practice? Retrieved from http://www.besteducationpractices.org/what-is-a-best-practice/

Bloch, J. (2007). Plagiarism across cultures: Is there a difference? *Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching, 3*(2), 1–13. Retrieved from http://ojs.atmajaya.ac.id/index.php/ijelt/article/view/133

Bolstad, R., Gilbert, J., McDowall, S., Bull, A., Boyd, S., & Hipkins, R. (2012). *Supporting future-oriented learning and teaching: A New Zealand perspective*. Wellington, NZ: Ministry of Education. Retrieved from http://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/publications/schooling/109306

Bordogna, C. M. (2018). Transnational higher education partnerships and the role of operational faculty members: Developing an alternative theoretical approach for empirical research. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 22*(1), 3–19. doi: 10.1177/1028315317724555.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power* (G. Raymond & M. Adamson, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

British Council. (2013a). *The positive impact of transnational education*. London: Retrieved from https://www.britishcouncil.org/organisation/press/positive-impact-transnational-education

British Council. (2013b). *The shape of things to come: The evolution of transnational education: Data, definitions, opportunities and impact analysis*. London: Retrieved from https://www.britishcouncil.org/sites/default/files/the_shape_of_things_to_come_2.pdf

Caniglia, G., John, B., Bellina, L., Lang, D. J., Wiek, A., Cohmer, S., & Laubichler, M. D. (2018). The glocal curriculum: A model for transnational collaboration in higher education for sustainable development. *Journal of Cleaner Production, 171,* 368–376. doi: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.09.207.

Castle, R. G., & Kelly, D. J. (2004). International education: Quality assurance and standards in offshore teaching: Exemplars and problems. *Quality in Higher Education, 10*(1), 51–57. doi: 10.1080/1353832042000222751.

Chapman, A., & Pyvis D. (2006a). Dilemmas in the formation of student identity in offshore higher education: A case study in Hong Kong. *Educational Review, 58*(3), 291–302. doi:10.1080/00131910600748190.

Chapman, A., & Pyvis D. (2006b). Quality, identity and practice in offshore university programmes: Issues in the internationalization of Australian higher education. *Teaching in Higher Education, 11*(2), 233–245. doi: 10.1080/13562510500527818.

Council of Europe. (2014). *Code of good practice in the provision of transnational education*. Strasbourg, France: Retrieved from http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/highereducation/recognition/Code%20of%20good%20practice_EN.asp#TopOfPage

Cousin, G. (2011). Rethinking the concept of 'western.' *Higher Education Research & Development, 30*(5), 585–594. doi: 10.1080/07294360.2011.598449.

Department for Business, Innovation and Skills. (2013). *International education: Global growth and prosperity*. London, UK: Department for Business, Innovation and Skills. Retrieved from https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/340600/bis-13-1081-international-education-global-growth-and-prosperity-revised.pdf

Department of Education, Science, and Training. (2005). *A national quality strategy for Australian transnational education and training: A discussion paper*. Canberra: Retrieved from http://www.csu.edu.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0020/51473/Transnational-Ed_QualStrat_.pdf

Dobos, K. (2011). "Serving two masters:" Academics' perspectives on working at an offshore campus in Malaysia. *Educational Review, 63*(1), 19–35. doi: 10.1080/00131911003748035.

Doherty, C., & Singh, P. (2005). How the west is done: Simulating western pedagogy in a curriculum for Asian international students. In P. Ninnes & M. Hellstén (Eds.), *Internationalizing higher education: Critical explorations of pedagogy and policy* (pp. 53–73). The Netherlands: Springer.

Dunworth, K. (2008). Ideas and realities: Investigating good practice in the management of transnational English language programmes for the higher education sector. *Quality in Higher Education, 14*(2), 95–107. doi: 10.1080/13538320802278099.

Evans, T., & Tregenza, K. (2001). Creating new educational structures and processes for off-shore distance education. In *Education odyssey 2001: Continuing the journey through adaptation and innovation – Collected papers from the Open and Distance Learning Association of Australia 15th biennial forum* (pp. 1–7). Sydney, New South Wales: ODLAA. Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/10536/DRO/DU:30004441

Ferguson, G. (2007). The global spread of English, scientific communication and ESP: Questions of equity, access and domain loss. *Ibérica, 13*, 7–38. Retrieved from http://www.aelfe.org/documents/02%20ferguson.pdf

Flowerdew, J., & Li, Y. (2007). Plagiarism and second language writing in an electronic age. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 27*, 161–183. doi: 10.1017/S0267190508070086.

Gulati, S. (2008). Technology-enhanced learning in developing nations: A review. I*nternational Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning, 9*(1), 1–16. Retrieved from http://www.irrodl.org/index.php/irrodl/article/view/477/1011

Hargreaves, A., & Fullan, M. (2012). *Professional capital: Transforming teaching in every school*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Hart, D., & Coates, N. (2011). International student complaint behaviour: Understanding how East-Asian business and management students respond to dissatisfaction during their university experience. *International Journal of Management Education, 9*(4), 57–66. doi:10.3794/ijme.94.380.

Healey, N. (2015). Managing international branch campuses: What do we know? *Higher Education Quarterly, 69*(4), 386–409. doi: 10.1111/hequ.12082.

Heffernan, T., Morrison, M., Basu, P., & Sweeney, A. (2010). Cultural differences, learning styles and transnational education. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 32*(1), 27–39. doi: 10.1080/13600800903440535.

Heggins, W. J., & Jackson, J. F. L. (2003). Understanding the collegiate experience for Asian international students at a midwestern research university. *College Student Journal, 37*(3), 379–391. Retrieved from http://www.cobleskill.edu/library/SB354_01.pdf

Hénard, F., Diamond, L., & Roseveare, D. (2012). *Approaches to internationalisation and their implications for strategic management and institutional practice: A guide for higher education institutions*. Paris, France: Retrieved from https://www.oecd.org/edu/imhe/Approaches%20to%20internationalisation%20-%20final%20-%20web.pdf

Henderson, M., Barnett, R., & Barrett, H. (2017). New developments in transnational education and the challenges for higher education professional staff. *Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education, 21*(1), 11–19. doi: 10.1080/13603108.2016.1203366.

Hicks, M., & Jarrett, K. (2008). Providing instruction, orientation and professional development for all staff involved in transnational teaching. In L. Dunn & M. Wallace (Eds.), *Teaching in transnational higher education: Enhancing learning for offshore international students* (pp. 204–215). New York: Routledge.

Hoare, L. (2013). Swimming in the deep end: Transnational teaching as culture learning? *Higher Education Research & Development, 32*(4), 561–574. doi: 10.1080/07294360.2012.700918, 561.

Jones, E. (2015). Introduction. In B. Leask, *Internationalizing the curriculum* (pp. ix–xi). Abingdon, UK: Routledge.

Keevers, L., Lefoe, G., Leask, B., Sultan, F. K. D., Ganesharatnam, S., Loh, V., & Lim, J. S. Y. (2014). 'I like the people I work with. Maybe I'll get to meet them in person one day': Teaching and learning practice development with transnational teaching teams. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 40*(3), 232–250. doi: 10.1080/02607476.2014.903024.

Knight, J. (2014). Three generations of cross-border higher education: New developments, issues and challenges. In B. Streitwieser (Ed.), *Internationalisation of higher education and global mobility* (pp. 43–58). Oxford: Symposium Books.

Kosmützky, A., & Putty, R. (2016). Transcending borders and traversing boundaries: A systematic review of the literature on transnational, offshore, cross-border, and borderless higher education. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 20*(1), 8–33. doi: 10.1177/1028315315604719.

Lamers, A. M., & Admiraal, W. F. (2018). Moving out of their comfort zones: Enhancing teaching practice in transnational education. *International Journal for Academic Development, 23*(2), 110–122. doi: 10.1080/1360144X.2017.1399133.

Lea, M. R., & Street, B. V. (1998). Student writing in higher education: An academic literacies approach. *Studies in Higher Education, 23*(2), 157–172. doi: 10.1080/03075079812331380364.

Lillis, T. M., & Curry, M. J. (2010). *Academic writing in a global context: The politics and practice of publishing in English*. Oxford, UK: Routledge.

Lin, M. (2012). Students of different minds: Bridging the gaps of international students studying in the US. *US-China Education Review, A*(3), 333–344. Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED532905.pdf

Luke, A., & Dooley, K. T. (2009). *Critical literacy and second language learning*. Retrieved from http://eprints.qut.edu.au/28199/1/c28199.pdf

Mahat, M., & Hourigan, C. (2007). *International student experience: What it is, what it means and why it matters*. Retrieved from http://www.aair.org.au/app/webroot/media/pdf/AAIR%20Fora/Forum2006/Mahat.pdf

Matthews, D. (2013, May 14). Transnational education 'brain drain' warning. *Times Higher Education*. Retrieved from https://www.timeshighereducation.com/news/transnational-education-brain-drain-warning/2003844.article

Montgomery, C. (2010). *Understanding the international student experience*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

OECD. (2005). *Guidelines for quality provision in cross-border higher education*. Paris, France: Retrieved from http://www.oecd.org/edu/skills-beyond-school/35779480.pdf.

O'Mahony, J. (2014). *Enhancing student learning and teacher development in transnational education*. York, UK: Retrieved from https://blogs.shu.ac.uk/internationalnetwork/files/2012/08/EnhancingTNE_final_080414.pdf

Pearl, H. (2013, June 15). Universities meeting demand for western degrees. *Waikato Times*. Retrieved from http://www.stuff.co.nz/waikato-times/news/8799246/Universities-meeting-demand-for-Western-degrees

Pennycook, A. (1996). Borrowing others' words: Text, ownership, memory, and plagiarism. *TESOL Quarterly, 30*(2), 201–230. doi: 10.2307/3588141.

Prescott, D. L. (2002). Reflective discourse in teacher education in Brunei Darussalam. In A. Kirkpatrick (Ed.), *Englishes in Asia: Communication, identity, power and education* (pp. 245–260). Melbourne, Australia: Language Australia.

Pyvis, D. (2011). The need for context-sensitive measures of educational quality in transnational higher education. *Teaching in Higher Education, 16*(6), 733–744. doi: 10.1080/13562517.2011.570436.

Ramsden, P. (2008). *The future of higher education teaching and the student experience*. Retrieved from http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/+/http://www.bis.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2009/10/HE-Teaching-Student-Experience.pdf

Russell, J., Rosenthal, D., & Thomson, G. (2010). The international student experience: Three styles of adaptation. *Higher Education*, *60*(2), 235–249. doi: 10.1007/s10734-009-9297-7.

Seah, W. T., & Edwards, J. (2006). Flying in, flying out: Offshore teaching in higher education. *Australian Journal of Education, 50*(3), 297–311. doi: 10.1177/000494410605000306.

Shams, F., & Huisman, J. (2012). Managing offshore branch campuses: An analytical framework for institutional strategies. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 16*(2), 106–27. doi: 10.1177/1028315311413470.

Smith, L. (2009). Sinking in the sand? Academic work in an offshore campus of an Australian university. *Higher Education Research & Development, 28*(5), 467–479. doi: 10.1080/07294360903154118.

Stafford, S., & Taylor, J. (2016). Transnational education as an internationalisation strategy: Meeting the institutional management challenges. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 38*(6), 625–636. doi: 10.1080/1360080X.2016.1202811.

Stake, R. E., & Schwandt, T.A. (2006). On discerning quality in evaluation. In I. F. Shaw, J. C. Greene, & M. M. Mark (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of evaluation* (pp. 405–418). London, UK: SAGE Publications.

Starfield, S. (2002). "I'm a second-language English speaker": Negotiating writer identity and authority in sociology one. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education, 1*(2), 121–140. doi: 10.1207/S15327701JLIE0102_02.

Starfield, S. (2004). Word power: Negotiating success in a first-year sociology essay. In L. Ravelli & R. A. Ellis (Eds.), *Analyzing academic writing: Contextualized frameworks* (pp. 66–83). London: Continuum.

Stufflebeam, D. L. (2016). Factors that influenced my conduct of evaluations and evaluation training programs. *New Directions for Evaluation, 2016*(150), 41–49. doi:10.1002/ev.20188.

Sultana, Q., & Smith, R. (2011, November). *Evaluation of international students' perceptions of Eastern Kentucky University*. Paper presented at the 40th Annual Conference of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, Oxford, Mississippi. Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED532280.pdf

Trahar, S., & Lazarus, E. (2015). Internationalising a transnational higher education programme: Pursuing sameness or disrupting educational imperialism? In W. Green & C. Whitsed (Eds.), *Critical perspectives on internationalising the curriculum in disciplines* (pp. 107–120). Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense.

Tummala-Narra, P., & Claudius, M. (2013). A qualitative examination of Muslim graduate international students' experiences in the United States. *International Perspectives in Psychology: Research, Practice, Consultation, 2*(2), 132–147. doi: 10.1037/ipp0000003.

Vincent-Lancrin, S., Fisher, D., & Pfotenhauer, S. (2015). *Ensuring quality in cross-border higher education: Implementing the UNESCO/OECD guidelines*. Paris, France: Retrieved from http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/education/ensuring-quality-in-cross-border-higher-education_9789264243538-en

Waterval, D. G. J., Frambach, J. M., Driessen, E.W., & Scherpbier, A. J. J. A. (2015). Copy but not paste: A literature review of crossborder curriculum partnerships. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 19*(1), 65–85. doi: 10.1177/1028315314533608.

Whitsed, C., & Green, W. (2015). Internationalising the curriculum in education. In W. Green & C. Whitsed (Eds.), *Critical perspectives on internationalising the curriculum in disciplines* (pp. 85–90). Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense.

Wiggins, G. (1992). Creating tests worth taking. *Educational Leadership, 49*(8), 26-33. Retrieved from http://www.ascd.org/ASCD/pdf/journals/ed_lead/el_199205_wiggins.pdf

Wilkins, S. (2016). Establishing international branch campuses: A framework for assessing opportunities and risks. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 38*(2), 167–182. doi: 10.1080/1360080X.2016.1150547.

Wilkins, S., & Huisman, J. (2012). The international branch campus as transnational strategy in higher education. *Higher Education, 64*(5), 627–645. doi: 10.1007/s10734-012-9516-5.

Wright, C. R., Dhanarajan, G., & Reju, S. A. (2009). Recurring issues encountered by distance educators in developing and emerging nations. *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning, 10*(1), 1–25. Retrieved from http://www.irrodl.org/index.php/irrodl/article/view/608/1181

Zhao, C-M., Kuh, G. D., & Carini, R. M. (2005). A comparison of international student and American student engagement in effective educational practices. *Journal of Higher Education, 76*(2), 209–231. doi: 10.1353/jhe.2005.0018.