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Executive summary

This report is of a project to apply a framework of quality principles to Australian university transnational teaching and learning, that is, to educational practices in Australian university programmes delivered and conducted ‘offshore’. The broad aim of the project was quality enhancement of Australian transnational higher education. It is documented that the quality of Australian transnational higher education is uneven (see, for example, Senate Employment, Workplace Relations, Small Business and Education References Committee, 2001, National Tertiary Education Union 2004, McBurnie 2008, Ewen 2009). Flawed quality puts at risk the reputation and financial security of Australian universities, the goodwill of host-countries and institutions and education’s position as Australia’s largest service export industry (Australian Education International, 2011). In 2006, Australian universities called for the development of principles of quality to inform transnational teaching and learning practice (International Education Association of Australia, 2006). The ‘Quality Principles’ were subsequently developed, by team members of this project, as an outcome of a 2008-9 Australian Learning and Teaching Council-funded project entitled ‘Enhancing frameworks for assuring the quality of learning and teaching in university offshore education programmes’. The project reported here transported the Principles into practice.

Partnering four universities, the project strategically employed a collaborative and participatory approach to enlist universities in developing applications of the Quality Principles effective for their educational delivery styles and approaches. The project utilised an Action Learning model (Revins, 1982), in which academics involved in the delivery of Australian university transnational programmes were the focus of professional development. Participants on Australian campuses and at points of delivery overseas developed and implemented Action Learning projects to apply the Quality Principles to enhance curriculum and pedagogy in their ongoing activity in programme delivery.

The outcomes of the project were:
(a) a professional development workshop on applying the Quality Principles to enhance learning and teaching for academics delivering Australian university transnational education;
(b) implementation of the Quality Principles in nine Australian university transnational programmes across the range of models of delivery;
(c) a set of case studies of the applications of the Principles by participating institutions; and
(d) sustainable, collaborative, cross-institutional networks of onshore/offshore academics aimed at ensuring and safeguarding quality in offshore programme delivery.

The outcomes can be found at the website address www.transnationalquality.curtin.edu.au

Recommendations are that:
1. the Quality Principles be promoted to all Australian universities;
2. Australian university staff development programmes include a component on teaching and learning in transnational higher education;
3. the professional development workshop materials be promoted to all Australian university staff development directors and coordinators.
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Chapter 1: Project outcomes and impacts

Outcomes
The outcomes the project achieved were as follows:

a) a professional development workshop on applying the Quality Principles to enhance learning and teaching for academics delivering Australian university transnational education (TNE);

b) implementation of the Quality Principles in nine Australian university transnational programmes across the range of models of delivery;

c) a set of case studies of the applications of the Principles by participating institutions; and

d) sustainable, collaborative, cross-institutional networks of onshore/offshore academics aimed at ensuring and safeguarding quality in offshore programme delivery.

Approach and Methodology
Partnering four universities, this project strategically employed a collaborative and participatory approach to enlist universities in developing effective applications of quality principles to their transnational teaching and learning practice. For these purposes, a framework of quality principles pertaining to TNE teaching and learning was provided. Sets of quality principles had been developed by members of the project team through work with transnational educators in a 2008-9 Australian University Learning and Teaching Council (ALTC) project entitled ‘Enhancing frameworks for assuring quality in Australian university offshore education programmes’. In this report, these developed principles are identified as the Quality Principles.

The project utilised an Action Learning model (Revins, 1982), in which academics involved in the delivery of Australian university transnational programmes were the focus of professional development. Action Learning provides a structural approach directed to learning in a social setting, linking learning with action through a reflective process within small cooperative learning groups (McGill & Beaty, 1995). A series of one-day workshops targeted the developmental needs of academics to improve transnational teaching and learning, provide knowledge about the Quality Principles, and facilitate the development of small team Action Learning projects to manage the integration of the Principles into teaching and learning situations. Participants were encouraged to use the Principles to design and implement strategies for transnational programme delivery and to analyse and monitor the success or otherwise of these strategies over a period of time.

The Action Learning project is located within the qualitative, interpretive tradition of social science. The theoretical framework of the interpretive paradigm acknowledges that the social world is subjective, and accepts humans’ interpretations of social reality as an integral part of that reality. Each individual constructs their own social reality. In order to understand social reality, it is therefore necessary to study how individuals interpret the world; “Social life can be adequately understood only from the point of view of the actors themselves” (Hitchcock and Hughes, 1993, p. 28). Qualitative, interpretive approaches to inquiry provide the means for those engaged in teaching and learning to devise pedagogical strategies that are “attuned to the realities of students’ lives” (Stringer, 2004). The project therefore adopted an interpretive action research approach, which draws on the expert knowledge of practitioners; people whose experience provides knowledge that can be applied to the solution of problems under investigations (Stringer, 2004).

Action research is a form of self-reflective inquiry undertaken by participants in social situations “to improve the productivity, rationality and justice of their own practices, as well as the understanding of those practices” (Kemmis and McTaggart, 1988). Punch (1998)
describes action research as: “Projects [which] attempt directly to change people’s behaviour, and gather and analyse data concurrently. They intervene and study in a continuous series of feedback loops. Action and evaluation “proceed simultaneously” (p.143). Action research thus proceeds in a spiral of steps: plan, act and evaluate. The action research was undertaken with the assumption that the project participants, whose professional lives were affected by the issue under study, would be engaged in all processes of investigation (Tripp, 1997). Following the framework of Participatory Action Research (Atweh, Kemmis & Weeks, 1996), several cycles of investigation were completed by each team. Participants engaged in a process of rigorous inquiry-in-action, acquiring information (collecting data) and reflecting on that information (analysing) in order to transform their new understandings about quality enhancement in transnational programme delivery (theorising). This new set of understandings was then applied to plans for resolution of the problem (action), which, in turn, provided the context for testing hypotheses derived from group theorising (evaluation).

A professional development workshop was designed and conducted for key academic stakeholders involved in the delivery of Australian transnational programmes, including those located offshore. The aim of the workshop was to (1) share knowledge of the Quality Principles with key academic stakeholders, and (2) facilitate Action Learning projects which would apply the Principles in programme delivery across a range of delivery models.

Key academic stakeholders were defined as:

a) academics at the individual university level who were involved in the formation of policy for the delivery of Australian university TNE programmes and associated units;

b) academics who taught units within TNE programmes of Australian universities;

c) academics involved in the design, moderation and coordination of TNE programmes and associated units for Australian universities, but who did not necessarily teach offshore.

Team members delivered the workshop, generally during non-teaching periods, at home campuses and relevant offshore sites of programme delivery. Relevant offshore sites included those where academics teaching in Australian transnational programmes were permanently located, offshore branch campuses of the Australian university, and partner institutions that provided local tutors for Australian university programmes. The workshop was held at locations convenient to participants where possible, so as to enable collaboration and discussion and provide a broad range of institutional perspectives. The workshop provided a forum for the dissemination of knowledge about the development and application of the quality principles. It brought together academic stakeholders with the shared agenda to improve teaching and learning in transnational higher education. The workshop identified and addressed participants’ professional development needs with regard to ensuring quality in teaching and learning. Participants developed team action plans to apply the Quality Principles to their own situations; they designed and implemented strategies to enhance curriculum and pedagogy in their ongoing activity in programme delivery.

Three key questions were addressed by team members implementing the Quality Principles throughout the project:

1. What are the perspectives of key academic stakeholders on what constitutes a quality university TNE programme, with particular reference to quality learning and teaching in the context of their particular programme?

2. What are their perspectives on the issues involved in the application of the Quality Principles to learning and teaching in the context of their particular programme?

3. How do they respond in the light of their perspectives to the various issues that arise for them in applying the Quality Principles in their programme delivery?
This data collected from the Action Learning projects was reported through ongoing email communication among team members and participants and through discussion forums following completion of the Action Learning projects and provided the basis for the development of a set of case studies. The case studies delivered rich portrayals of the outcomes of each Action Learning project, with particular reference to the feature of alignment of the quality principles across curriculum, pedagogy and assessment within and across the delivery mode, academic area, university type, country of focus, and level of programme. A website was developed to provide information about the aims, methods and outcomes of the project, in order to promote the application of the Quality Principles to Australian university transnational teaching and learning practice. The Quality Principles and guiding questions used in project evaluation were also placed on the website.

The project proceeded in the following stages:

Stage 1: Design and development

Design and development of the professional development workshop; preparation of workshop materials, including education kits and DVDs; design and development of website, ongoing communication among participants and team members following the workshops, and dissemination of project outcomes; and design and development of surveys for evaluation of the workshop and subsequent applications of the Quality Principles by participants.

*Outcome: A professional development workshop on applying the Quality Principles to practice for academics delivering Australian university TNE*

Stage 2: Workshop delivery

Delivery of workshop to facilitate the development of team action plans to implement the Quality Principles in teaching and learning practice.

Stage 3: Action Learning activity

Application of the Quality Principles via Action Learning projects, with ongoing email communication regarding workshop evaluation, implementation of individual team plans, and the development and extension of long-term links and continuing exchanges between individuals and institutions in Australia and offshore partners concerning future use of the quality framework.

*Outcome: Implementation of the Principles in nine Australian university transnational programmes across universities and across the range of models of*

Outcome: Sustainable, collaborative networks of onshore/offshore academics across institutions aimed at ensuring and safeguarding quality in offshore programme delivery

Stage 4: Review and refinement

Follow-up discussion forums for project participants; development of project case studies; survey evaluation of workshop; development and preparation of resources for dissemination; embedding of Principles within staff development and/or teaching and learning organisational units of universities; preparation of final report for the Office of Learning and Teaching.

*Outcome: A set of case studies of the various applications of the Quality Principles*

Selection of programmes and participants
The initial sample was based on the selection of ten programmes from the following classification of ‘types’ of modes of delivery:

**Twinning programmes**: Programmes of Australian universities offered partly or fully offshore with the involvement of an overseas partner. Students generally have the same material, lectures and examinations as those at the onshore campus;

**Franchised programmes**: A local offshore institution delivers Australian university programmes;

**Moderated programmes**: A local offshore institution teaches its own programmes, with quality assurance provided by an Australian university. The Australian university then offers ‘advanced standing’ to graduates of the local programme;

**Offshore campuses**: An Australian university establishes a campus offshore where local and Australian academics are hired to deliver programmes, and onshore staff also may teach for periods;

**Online programmes**: Programmes are delivered through the internet, with support from Australian onshore staff and sometimes from staff employed overseas.

The models outlined above are ‘pure types’ and there is significant overlap between them in reality. Five programmes were selected in the first instance, each corresponding as much as possible to each ‘pure type’. Five other programmes were then selected, each representing a variation on the ‘pure types’. One of the programmes was discontinued shortly after a workshop delivery, resulting in a selection of nine programmes. Selection criteria ensured variation in programmes in terms of academic areas, university types, countries of focus and level of programme including undergraduate and postgraduate programmes. Selection of participants in relation to each programme was guided by a desire to cast as widely as possible for a variety of perspectives and situations, rather than by selecting a random sample or choosing a sample that would be representative of the total population of possible participants (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 181). Action Learning participants included, as a majority, academics who had taken part in case studies in a previous ALTC project, from which the quality principles were developed. Approximately 100 academics took part in the workshops and approximately 75 remained involved for the duration of the Action Learning projects.

**Data collection**

Collaborative semi-structured interviews (Taylor & Bogdan, 1984, p. 76) and dialogical conversations (Aspland, 2003) were used as the primary means of data collection at the workshops and follow-up discussion forums. Ongoing email communication and discussion groups formed an integral part of the Action Learning projects across the participating universities, facilitating the interviews and conversations. As themes arose, they were pursued with the participants in a “lengthy conversation piece” (Simons, 1982). Document collection included Action Learning plans, policy documents, programme and curriculum materials and teaching resources. Participants were asked to provide data in the form of reflective journal accounts of the implementation of the Quality Principles. Action Learning teams were also asked to provide informal and/or formal reports describing and evaluating applications.

**Data analysis**

The data from the interviews, journal entries, reports and conversations was transcribed for analysis. This analysis involved three major types of coding, namely open coding, axial coding and selective coding (Strauss & Corbin, 1990; Glaser, 1992). These coding procedures were applied flexibly and in accordance with the changing circumstances throughout the period of data gathering, analysis and theory formulation. Diagrams and detailed notes of ideas about the data and the coded categories were also be used to assist in analysis.
Standard safeguards were utilised to ensure that the research was authentic, trustworthy and credible. From this analysis, case studies were made of the various Action Learning project applications of the Quality Principles was developed. The project thus has two layers, improving the quality of a number of ‘cases’ using action research and then using the case studies developed as models to show how this might be done. The analytic findings helped further refine both the Quality Principles and the professional development workshop.
Chapter 2: How the project uses and advances existing knowledge

ALTC Programme Priority: Internationalisation

The project directly addressed the nominated key issue of transnational higher education in the ALTC priority area of Internationalisation, targeting the critical problem of inconsistent educational quality across Australian transnational programme delivery. The project applied to teaching and learning practice, across a variety of delivery modes, programmes and universities, principles which embrace and reflect intercultural and international dimensions particularly appropriate to enhancing and ensuring the quality of Australian university transnational education. For example, the principles applied drew on UNESCO/OECD (2005) quality guidelines on cross-border delivery to which Australia is a signatory. They also reflected and spoke to the experience of educators delivering Australian programmes in different educational and cultural environments in, for example, Malaysia, Singapore, China and Hong Kong. Application enfolded such international and intercultural dimensions into teaching/learning. Integration was facilitated by: the inclusive, collaborative project approach; the professional workshop which enabled academics to achieve the most appropriate and effective applications for their purposes; the incorporation of the Quality Principles into learning and teaching practice in nine university programmes; cases that supplied empirical evidence on applying the Principles; and the development of networks of academics working to enhance and ensure quality in Australian university transnational learning and teaching.

The project was strongly supportive of the objectives and principles for action endorsed by the ALTC. It was geared to quality enhancement of learning and teaching and targeted at achieving change and improvement across the university sector. It promoted teachers by emphasising their indispensability to quality formation. The project and its outcomes functioned to identify, disseminate and embed good individual and institutional practice in learning and teaching. It built reciprocal national and international dimensions by bringing to Australian university teaching and learning practice, principles relevant to the sector as a whole and which reflect and respect international understandings on quality formation. The project was inclusive, oriented to systematic change and to developing the capacity of Australian universities to deliver quality education to meet their obligations and the needs of a varied range of stakeholders. It supported diversity by enlisting onshore and offshore academics in applying the Quality Principles in terms of their particular contexts and individual needs. The project expanded the existing knowledge base on teaching and learning in TNE with new empirical evidence. The project concentrated on developing quality through collaboration, through its aims, approach and method, and outcomes. It contributed knowledge relevant to enhancing and ensuring quality in Australian university TNE teaching and learning delivery, benefitting an industry worth $581 million to the Australian economy (Australian Education International, 2011).

Previous ALTC work

In 2008-9, the ALTC funded a project generated by this team entitled ‘Enhancing frameworks for assuring quality in Australian university offshore education programmes’. A key outcome of the project was the development of sets of quality principles for Australian university offshore teaching and learning. The need to identify quality principles was well established and urgent. There was concern (Senate Employment, Workplace Relations, Small Business and Education References Committee, 2001, National Tertiary Education Union 2004, McBurnie 2008) that the quality of teaching and learning in Australian transnational higher education was uneven. It was recognised that flawed educational quality risked student investments, the reputation and financial security of Australian universities, the goodwill of host-countries and institutions and education’s position as Australia’s largest service export industry (Australian Education International, 2011). In 2006, Australian universities called for the development of principles of quality to inform...
transnational teaching and learning practice (International Education Association of Australia, 2006).

The 2011-12 project furthered the design outcome of the 2008-9 project, embedding the Quality Principles into Australian university transnational teaching and learning activities. That is, design in the first project was followed by application in the second project. Importantly, academics who participated in the 2011-12 project developed plans and strategies for incorporating the Principles, and for altering practice to align with the Principles, according to their professional needs. This not only ensured that the adoption of Principles was relevant to contextual priorities and concerns, but that the 2011-12 project maintained integrity with the 2008-9 project by recognising academics working in Australian offshore higher education as actively and professionally engaged in the pursuit of quality in educational delivery. Essentially, the 2011-12 activities advanced a major project of quality enhancement of university teaching/learning enabled by the ALTC.

Factors impeding/contributing to the success of the project approach

Factors critical to the success of the approach
Contributing strongly to the success of the approach was the enlistment of academics as change agents. The project was represented to academics as an opportunity for them to utilise their professional expertise to meet their professional obligations. The project assumed that academics would have a professional commitment to quality enhancement of teaching and learning. It assumed that practitioners were well placed to establish how to improve learning and teaching practice and it assumed these educators had the expertise to carry out implementation. Through the workshop design and carriage and the method of Action Learning, the project articulated to academics that it respected and relied on their professionalism. In short, the representation made was that academics were indispensable to quality enhancement of learning and teaching. Based on feedback given to the team, active and enthusiastic participation was delivered largely because the process was focussed on enabling academics to pursue professional goals. The approach was successful because the project was meaningful, valuable and empowering to participants.

Providing participants with thoroughly developed workshop materials ensured project aims were well understood and aided the carriage of the project. A policy of maintaining ongoing communications with participants also helped the project stay on track, promoted the relationship between researcher and participant, and ensured rich data was collected. The factor of the principle of collegiality was very important to the success of the approach. The project team consciously adopted collegiality as the model for the relationship between project team members and between team members and participants. For the Action Learning projects, participants were also asked to work together in teams. Collegiality enabled and promoted the exploration of issues and avenues and the resolution of concerns. Cooperation generated through adherence to the principle of collegiality served to progress the project. Collegiality also enabled the project team to employ flexibility where it was needed in respect to the approach. Members’ knowledge of the field and expertise with the selected research methodology were also very significant factors contributing to the success of the approach.

Factors impeding the success of the approach
The role required of participants threatened initially to be a major impediment to the success of the approach. Team members who delivered the first workshop found academics were cautious about committing to the project because they were worried about the workload. The demands were considerable. The approach relied on participants shouldering the burden of designing, implementing, evaluating and reporting on Action Learning projects. As a team approach was called for, and there was a need to share and exchange views, and deal with issues and design and chart progress, meetings had to be scheduled. If a project team incorporated onshore and offshore academics, the challenge of generating a team approach increased. The ALTC project team consulted on the problem following the workshop and refined the presentation for workshops to orient more specifically to the professional benefits flowing to practitioners from implementing the Action Learning plans.
This strategy proved effective. However, the initial difficulties indicate that approaches may stumble or fail if requests for extensive and committed participation do not establish professional gains from involvement.

An impediment to the success of the approach was that the means of accessing data through face-to-face interviews was often limited with the project being carried out in several countries. It was simply not feasible for the team to make frequent visits to all sites to collect data. The problem was resolved by having volunteers on teams on site act as ‘collection points’ for Action Learning project data. The volunteers then passed on the data to team members and served too as conduits for communications between Action Learning teams and the project team. While the strategy was successful, the lesson learned was that in TNE research it is very important to plan carefully for the ‘natural’ impediment of geographical distance and divides. It also needs to be noted that it is hard for team members to maintain a unified approach to a project when working at a distance from other members and across cultural and geographic divides. Team members addressed the geographical challenge to organisational unity and a coherent, holistic approach by consciously maintaining a consensual and collegial stance on decision-making and by observing a protocol of routine and inclusive communication involving face-to-face meetings and regular telephone and email contact.

The closing of one of the programmes selected for the case study sample, in the wake of the delivery of a workshop for academics working in the programme, was a surprise and a potential impediment to the success of the approach. However, a sufficiently large case sample had been selected to allow for such attrition.

**Amenability of approach/outcomes to implementation in other institutions/locations**

As identified earlier in this discussion, the Australian university sector clearly desires and needs its transnational learning and teaching to be informed by quality principles. A key outcome of this project, application of the Quality Principles to practice, is then clearly amenable for implementation by Australian universities. What makes the application of the Principles particularly amenable for university implementation is that they were developed from an analysis not only of existing quality frameworks but of practitioner experience and perspective across modes of delivery and programme types. They emerged from an analysis of Australian university TNE practice and therefore are particularly suited to implementation by Australian universities. In this project, the approach broadly was to enlist academics as agents of change meaningful in their environments. Practice was mapped to the Quality Principles, by onshore and offshore academics, across a range of delivery modes of transnational education, in a variety of programmes of various levels in a diverse range of institutions. The diversity and success of the engagement shows that the approach can accommodate universities across the sector. The professional development workshop (including the workshop material) was a vital contributor to the process and was also an outcome of the project. The workshop is certainly amenable to implementation by Australian universities. The approach, consisting of providing academics with a framework of principles for guidance and employing Action Learning methods to empower/enable academics to formulate and introduce changes meaningful to them and beneficial to their practice, will translate from the project case sites more generally to Australian university transnational provider and host organisations.
Chapter 3: Dissemination

Materials/outcomes available to the higher education sector
The project workshop materials, which include the Quality Principles, have been made available to the higher education sector and to other interested bodies by provision of a project website. The set of case studies and extensive information about the project also feature on the website. The website address is <www.transnationalquality.curtin.edu.au>

The outcomes have been disseminated both nationally and internationally as follows:

National Dissemination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Organisation, Location, Audience</th>
<th>Category of Dissemination</th>
<th>Presenters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23/1/12</td>
<td>University of Canberra, TNE educators</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Prof. Tania Aspland &amp; Dr Marcelle Cacciattolo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/3/12</td>
<td>Curtin University, TNE educators</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>A/Prof. David Pyvis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-18/7/12</td>
<td>University of Adelaide, Faculty of the Professions</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Prof. Tania Aspland &amp; Prof. Tom O’Donoghue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/7/12</td>
<td>University of Western Sydney, TNE educators</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Prof. Tania Aspland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/8/2012</td>
<td>The University of Western Australia, TNE educators and the Faculty of Education International Committee</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Prof. Anne Chapman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/8/2012</td>
<td>Queensland University of Technology, TNE educators</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Prof. Tania Aspland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/8/2012</td>
<td>Macquarie University, TNE educators</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Prof. Tania Aspland &amp; Prof. Tom O’Donoghue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/8/12</td>
<td>Victoria University, TNE educators</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Dr Marcelle Cacciattolo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

International Dissemination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Organisation, Location, Audience</th>
<th>Category of Dissemination</th>
<th>Presenters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29/3/12</td>
<td>University College, Cork, Ireland, Educational Studies</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Prof. Tom O’Donoghue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Team members will disseminate information about the project and its findings and implications through the submission of papers to peer-reviewed international journals and through additional conference presentations.
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Links with projects undertaken on behalf of the ALTC
This project took the view that the application of quality principles to Australian university transnational teaching and learning practice should be by academics working in the area. The project essentially set out to aid academics working in transnational higher education to introduce and implement quality principles meaningfully into their practice. This orientation to recognise academics as effective and committed change agents in respect to quality enhancement of practice and to deliver support to enable them to implement changes relevant to them establishes a philosophical and practical link to ‘2012 Working from the centre: supporting unit/course coordinators to implement academic integrity policies, resources and scholarship’, a project of Victoria University (leader), James Cook University, RMIT University, Southern Cross University, The University of Queensland and the University of Canberra.

The project also took the view that change was best effected through creative collaboration. To this end, the project employed the method of team design and implementation of strategies to incorporate quality principles into practice. The project also aimed to develop collaboration and networking, on the understanding that ongoing creative collaboration would enable quality gains and also help with quality maintenance. These views and ambitions link the project to ‘2012 Creating a collaborative practice environment which encourages sustainable interprofessional leadership, education and practice’, a project of Curtin University (leader), and Charles Sturt University.

This project aimed to enhance the professionalism of academics working in Australian university TNE. It did enable academics, associated with a number of Australian universities, and working onshore and offshore in these programmes, to address their professional obligation to pursue and ensure quality in learning and teaching. In this respect, the project connects with ‘2012 Professionalisation of the academic workforce project’, a project of Murdoch University (leader), Curtin University, Edith Cowan University, The University of Notre Dame and The University of Western Australia.

This project was a contribution to professionalising university teaching. It provided professional development and an Action Learning methodology to enable academics to better address their professional obligation to deliver and ensure quality in teaching and learning. The project pursued this aim with academics from a variety of institutions, teaching in a variety of programmes across differentiated modes of programme delivery. It therefore addressed the sector as its target audience. In delivering successful applications of the Quality Principles to practice across the sector, the project established possibilities for the sector. In indicating how quality in transnational teaching (and learning) can be improved and assured, the project has challenged the sector to act. In its focus on professionalising university teaching and its quest to see principles thoroughly embedded in practice across the sector, the project links to ‘2012 Academic Workforce 2020: framing a national agenda for professionalising university teaching’, a project of The University of Melbourne (leader), The Australian National University, the University of Tasmania and the University of Western Sydney.

Disciplinary and interdisciplinary linkages
Disciplinary linkages emerged through the professional development workshops, conducted onshore and offshore, which comprised teams of academics working together on the delivery of Australian university transnational programmes. The disciplinary linkages were expanded as participants reported back to colleagues at their universities on the progress and outcomes of their Action Learning projects.

Interdisciplinary linkages emerged through the dissemination seminars which brought together academics who had participated in the Action Learning projects and other
transnational educators from a wide range of disciplines. Close linkages were also forged across the four universities involved in the project, including across disciplines.
Chapter 5: Evaluation

Formative
Evaluation was on-going throughout the life of the project. This approach was built into the project method, with further provision for staged evaluations. The project method incorporated consultative feedback mechanisms for participants to evaluate project aims, approaches and outcomes. A collaborative approach to managing the project was deliberately introduced to encourage open and critical reflection. To ensure evaluation was thorough and did engage all team members and all parts, processes and outcomes of the project, team meetings included evaluation as a regular agenda item.

Summative
Summative evaluation was achieved through an evaluation survey, which was adapted at need within the individual projects and used to provide guiding questions for dialogical conversations team members had with participants. A further means of summative evaluation was a cross-case evaluation of reports on the Action Learning activities to determine the success of the project and refinements of Quality Principles.

Evaluation outcomes

Impact of the project
The project demonstrated the successful implementation of the Quality Principles in a variety of Australian transnational university programmes, expressed through diverse modes of delivery, across a spread of Australian universities and overseas partner institutions. Participant feedback indicates significant quality enhancement of Australian university TNE teaching and learning as a direct result of the implementation of the Quality Principles.

Value to the university sector
The project evaluation found a consistently positive response to the workshop and the workshop materials including the Quality Principles. There was strong agreement that the Action Learning projects enabled participants to enhance the quality of their teaching and learning approaches and processes. There was also strong agreement that the Action Learning projects promoted sustainable collaborations beneficial to delivering teaching and learning quality. In cases where academics onshore and offshore worked together on implementing the Principles, there was strong agreement that an outcome of the Action Learning project was sustainable, collaborative, cross-institutional networks of onshore/offshore academics aimed at ensuring and safeguarding teaching/learning quality. These findings, the successful application of the Quality Principles in a cross-section of Australian university transnational programmes and the achievement of all project outcomes indicate the project delivered value to the Australian university sector as follows:

a) The sector has been provided with an effective professional development workshop on applying the Quality Principles to enhance learning and teaching for academics delivering Australian university TNE.

b) The sector has been provided with a demonstrated successful action learning approach to enhancing TNE teaching and learning quality.

c) Sustainable improvements have been made to teaching and learning approaches and processes in a number of Australian university TNE programmes as a result of the application of the Quality Principles.

d) Academics involved with the delivery of Australian university TNE programmes have been given access through the project website to a variety of cases and Action Learning projects which illustrate application of the Quality Principles.
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Appendix A: Principles to assist in quality assurance

Appendix B: Workshop materials
## Principles that Apply to Curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Stakeholders</th>
<th>For policy makers</th>
<th>For administrators</th>
<th>For teachers who travel from Australia</th>
<th>For local based tutors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural sensitivity should always be considered in the preparation of course material, its delivery and the assessment of students’ work.</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum design and delivery should be responsive to local offshore policies, practices and procedures to enhance student engagement.</td>
<td></td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum packages should be comprehensive and should evince clear quality controls.</td>
<td></td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directors of Academic Programmes in Australian universities should be members of off-shore Advisory Academic Councils to ensure quality auditing of curriculum, pedagogy and assessment.</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In order for the Australian university to maintain its credibility it should ensure that offshore programmes for a particular degree should have the same entry requirements as apply to those students who wish to enrol in the same degree programme onshore.</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulations relating to advanced standing, transfer of credit, student failure and withdrawal from off-shore programmes should be made clear to offshore students at the outset rather than at the point of crisis.</td>
<td></td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offshore staff should have autonomy in adapting the curriculum to suit the local context and the culturally diverse backgrounds of students. Teaching materials should reflect the cultural context of the course and provide an international dimension to the curriculum.</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme delivery should be financially viable in order to sustain quality in teaching/learning</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There should be clear guidelines for curriculum implementation, curriculum adaptation and curriculum renewal</td>
<td></td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units delivered both offshore and onshore should be equivalent, rather than necessarily identical to each other. Unit outlines, topics and learning outcomes should be the same, but curriculum content and pedagogical practice should be adapted to suit cultural differences.</td>
<td></td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Principles that Apply to Pedagogy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>For policy makers</th>
<th>For administrators from Australia</th>
<th>For teachers who travel from Australia</th>
<th>For local based tutors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment in offshore programmes should be moderated and controlled by Australian university academics. Grade distribution should be a key responsibility of the Australian university so as to ensure, moderation, equity and parity of esteem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention should be given to the possibility of ensuring that offshore programmes are delivered through a blended medium, implemented by a small and consistent team of academics from Australia, combined with local tutors who are trained by the host university.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before finally deciding to offer a programme offshore, the Australian university and the offshore ‘partner’ should be clear about all requirements and expectations. The absence of such clarity has the potential to generate serious mistrust within a very short period of time after the programme has commenced.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication protocols should be established in advance of programme delivery.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continual use of web-based learning, including for the provision of resources for learning, could enhance ongoing connections between academic staff and students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinators of programmes should consider establishing a Joint Academic Board (consisting of Australian and offshore executives, teaching staff from the host university, tutors and student representatives from the offshore country) to ensure the existence of quality audits, transparent communication and a strong ongoing relationship between organisations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In respect to the assessment of student work, feedback and moderation processes should be monitored for effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levels of English competency required to undertake courses by students whose first language is other than English, should be reviewed regularly to ensure congruency between the required level and course materials.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme delivery should be of sufficient financial viability to sustain quality in teaching/learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Principles to assist in quality assurance
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programme delivery should be responsive to culturally-determined teaching/learning practices.</td>
<td>![ ] ![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme design and programme evaluations should be responsive to the views of both onshore and offshore academic stakeholders.</td>
<td>![ ] ![ ] ![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision should be made to ensure programme delivery is underpinned by strong teaching relationships between staff in Australia and those based permanently offshore.</td>
<td>![ ] ![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student achievement of learning outcomes should be the arbiter for evaluating the merit and effectiveness of curriculum delivery</td>
<td>![ ] ![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching visits and teaching exchanges should be routinely implemented</td>
<td>![ ] ![ ] ![ ] ![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The delivery of curriculum is best facilitated by one key contact point in each country. Directors should take responsibility for student selection, induction of staff, programme review, assessment moderation, and quality of teaching.</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The delivery of the curriculum should be implemented according to the specification documents approved by all partners, so as to avoid student dissatisfaction and lack of respect for the Australian institution</td>
<td>![ ] ![ ] ![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The pedagogies adopted for off-shore teaching of the curriculum should be innovative, “state of the art”, evidenced-based and linked to contemporary research in the field.</td>
<td>![ ] ![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The provision of resources for students should be of a high standard, be readily available and be produced in a consistent format prior to delivery of courses.</td>
<td>![ ] ![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel involved in the administration, delivery and assessment of the programme in both countries should be treated equally if the programme is to be respected in the offshore context.</td>
<td>![ ] ![ ] ![ ] ![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visits to the ‘home’ campus by offshore students should be encouraged, at least once, during their candidature.</td>
<td>![ ] ![ ] ![ ] ![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching spaces and IT facilities in the off-shore context should be equivalent to those available in Australia so as to facilitate effective pedagogical engagement.</td>
<td>![ ] ![ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Principles that Apply to Welfare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Stakeholders</th>
<th>For policy makers</th>
<th>For administrators</th>
<th>For teachers who travel from Australia</th>
<th>For local based tutors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Offshore Facilities and Resources

Before the deployment of staff offshore, universities should ensure that the provision of appropriate facilities exist for staff to undertake the work required, while at the same time providing opportunities to service pre-existing commitments at the Australian university through internet access.

- ●
- ●
- ●
- ●

Program coordinators should ensure that offshore students have access to appropriate learning resources, including computers, readings and other library services and facilities.

- ●

### Professional Issues

Universities should have formal processes whereby:
1. the quality of offshore programs can be regularly reviewed and concerns resolved in a transparent manner; and
2. coordinators of programs should have the right to veto the appointment of locally engaged staff.

- ●
- ●
- ●

### Staff Development

All staff, including those newly appointed and those experienced in offshore work, should be provided with professional development covering all aspects of offshore experience at least annually.

- ●
- ●

Formal comprehensive training of staff engaged to provide offshore teaching should take place before their deployment commences.

- ●
- ●

Staff appointed offshore should fulfil the expectations of the Australian university with regard to their academic qualifications, training and experience, as well as their general suitability for appointment, including English language competency.

- ●
- ●
All staff should be provided with an ‘offshore manual’ which addresses matters as
as:
1. accommodation;
2. personal safety and any security issues;
3. vaccinations and health care concerns, including the use of Australian
   prescription medicines offshore;
4. passport and visa arrangements;
5. appropriate clothing;
6. local currency, including exchange rates and banking facilities.
7. shopping and restaurants
8. transportation and communication including internet and email facilities; and
9. important contact numbers.

**Staff Consultation**

Faculties/Departments should establish management committees to establish and
monitor the effectiveness of offshore activities.

**Composition**

Such committees should consist of the following staff and provide for gender
balance, where possible:

1. experienced and inexperienced offshore teachers;
2. administrators involved in the activity;
3. a senior academic member of the Faculty/Department as chair; and
4. coopted members as considered appropriate by the committee.

**Purpose**

The purpose of the committees should be to ensure that:

appropriate staff are involved in all key aspects of course delivery and development;
staff development and orientation programs are relevant, up-to-date, useful and
regularly reviewed;
mentoring takes place between newly appointed and experienced staff;
programs are reviewed, at least annually, to determine their viability; and
a ‘clearing house’ for issues raised by staff, both offshore and local.

**Policy**

Activities undertaken offshore should take into account existing university policy
frameworks.

Staff experienced in offshore work should be provided with opportunities to
contribute to any new policies or the revision of existing ones as the need arises.

**Legal**

Activities undertaken offshore must take into account the laws and customs of the
country in which they are conducted.

Contracts of employment relating to offshore activities should be clear and
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>unequivocal in relation to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Employer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Line Manager to whom responsible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Legal jurisdiction of the contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Remuneration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Legal recognition of programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Legal documents for offshore travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Insurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Legal tender in which salary and allowances will be paid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Principles that Apply to Welfare for Staff who Fly-In and Fly-Out**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification of Offshore Work for those who fly-in and fly-out</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offshore work should always be regarded:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. as non-standard;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. voluntary; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. where practicable, distributed among staff who volunteer.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reward and Recognition**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reward and recognition for participation in offshore programs should be consistent.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff undertaking offshore activities should receive a <em>per diem</em> in addition to normal salary which adequately reflects the additional living costs associated with the location. <em>Per diems</em> should comply with the rates published by the Australian Taxation Office. Such payments should reflect the cost of meals and incidental expenses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where a full campus workload is maintained, in addition to undertaking offshore activities, staff members should receive additional payments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Non-monetary Compensation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rewards and recognition for participation in offshore programs may also include:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The incorporation of such activities in academic profiles which contribute to academic assessment and promotion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Weightings for offshore activities in determining workloads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Reductions in onshore activities in both pre and post offshore phases.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expenses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A travel policy should exist which specifies conditions relating to airline travel, accommodation, meals and incidentals.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### Principles to assist in quality assurance
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional expenses on staff when required to travel overseas for the purpose of course delivery, should, as a matter of University policy, be reimbursed by the University. Such expenses may include fees for travel documents, vaccinations and formal entertainment expenses.</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff required to travel overseas should be covered by insurance provided by the university.</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre-Departure</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Before an offshore programme commences staff should agree to a written plan indicating:  
1. the activities to be undertaken;  
2. itinerary/travel plan; and  
3. the expected outcomes. | ✔️ ✔️ |
| **Return Requirements**                       |          |
| Staff returning from offshore commitments should undergo a debriefing session. | ✔️ ✔️ |
| **Dispute Resolution**                        |          |
| Grievances resulting from offshore deployment should be settled in a timely manner in accordance with university policy. | ✔️ ✔️ ✔️ |
| **Code of Ethics / Code of Conduct**          |          |
| Codes of Ethics / Codes of Conduct should cover both on and offshore activities, including offshore and onshore tutors, (if the latter are not already covered by a code acceptable to the University). | ✔️ ✔️ ✔️ |
| **Insurance**                                 |          |
| Universities should provide staff participating in offshore programmes with ‘comprehensive’ personal accident insurance. | ✔️ ✔️ |
| Staff should be advised that they can acquire additional ‘private’ insurance at their own expense, should they wish to do so. | ✔️ ✔️ |

---

**Note:** The ✔️ symbol indicates the level of assurance provided by the University.
# Professional Issues

Staff involved in offshore work should consider the following:

1. the curriculum of offshore courses;
2. the mode of delivery;
3. quality assurance procedures
4. processes through which concerns can be expressed and resolved;
5. how their materials might be used in offshore programmes; and
6. how their offshore commitments might impact upon their onshore students, their research and their colleagues

# Participation

There should be consistent treatment of staff to suit individual circumstance and operational needs.

Inability to participate in offshore programmes should not affect a staff member’s position unless participation in such programmes is part of an agreed job specification.

Staffing needs of offshore programmes should be reviewed, identified and acted upon before the commencement of the academic year.

When determining staff participation in offshore programmes, those responsible should ensure that arrangements have been made to fulfil their on-campus responsibilities.

Where offshore activities are being undertaken in addition to maintaining a ‘full’ academic workload, faculties should ensure that workloads are reasonable.

# Equity

Universities should ensure that all staff have equal opportunity to participate in offshore programmes by ensuring that:

1. family friendly policies are developed that do not disadvantage staff who have familial responsibilities; and
2. adequate compensation is provided for staff who may incur additional expense related to their familial responsibilities.
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Overview

Aim
This project aims to engage academics in the application of a set of quality assurance principles for teaching and learning in Australian university offshore programmes. The principles were developed as part of a previous ALTC funded research project directed at quality enhancement of transnational higher education. The current project involves the trial and evaluation of the principles in ten Australian university programmes delivered in Southeast Asia via a range of models, such as branch campuses, face to face delivery, and franchised courses. Partnering four universities, this project strategically employs a collaborative and participatory approach to enlist universities in developing effective applications of the principles.

Rationale
The Australian tertiary sector provides almost 900 programmes to upwards of 93,500 students studying offshore (Australian Education International, 2010). As has been well documented (Senate Employment, Workplace Relations, Small Business and Education References Committee, 2001; National Tertiary Education Union, 2004; McBurnie, 2008; Ewan, 2009), the quality of teaching and learning in Australian transnational higher education is uneven. Persisting quality failures risk student investments, the reputation and financial security of Australian universities, the goodwill of host-countries and institutions and education’s position as Australia’s largest service export industry (Australian Education International, 2011).

In 2006, Australian universities called for the development of principles of quality to inform transnational teaching and learning practice (International Education Association of Australia, 2006). In 2008-9, in ALTC funded research, a cluster of these principles was established. That project (referred to in these materials as Project Stage 1) ensured these principles would be relevant, grounded in practice and pertinent to the sector’s quality responsibilities, by examining educator perspectives on delivering quality in offshore programmes and pertinent university, national and international quality frameworks and guidelines.

What is clearly required now is a mechanism to bring these principles into university practice. This is the purpose of the current project (Project Stage 2), to progress design to application, and ultimately to widespread incorporation. This project acknowledges the vital role of academics in quality formation and implementation and takes an inclusive, participatory approach. Its outcomes, for example implementation across universities and across delivery modes, recognise that application needs to be fashioned according to needs and context. The project is forward looking, with method and outcomes designed to promote application of quality principles across the university sector.
Outcomes

(a) a professional development workshop on applying principles to enhance learning and teaching for academics delivering Australian university transnational education (TNE);
(b) implementation of the principles in ten Australian university transnational programmes across the range of models of delivery;
(c) a set of case studies of the applications of the quality principles by participating institutions; and
(d) sustainable, collaborative, cross-institutional networks of onshore/offshore academics aimed at ensuring and safeguarding quality in offshore programme delivery.
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The Professional Development Workshop

Aims
The aims of the workshop are to (1) share knowledge of the developed quality principles aimed at enhancing transnational teaching and learning with key academic stakeholders, and (2) facilitate Action Learning projects aimed at the application of the principles in programme delivery across a range of delivery models.

Participants
Workshop participants are academic stakeholders in transnational education, including:

(a) academics at the individual university level who are involved in the formation of policy for the delivery of Australian university offshore programmes and associated units;
(b) academics who teach units within offshore programmes of Australian universities; and
(c) academics involved in the design, moderation and coordination of offshore programmes and associated units for Australian universities, but who do not necessarily teach offshore.

Activities
The workshop will provide a forum for the dissemination of knowledge about the development and application of the quality principles. It will bring together academic stakeholders with the shared agenda to improve teaching and learning in transnational education. The workshop will identify and address participants’ professional development needs with regard to ensuring quality in teaching and learning. Participants will develop individual action plans to apply the quality principles to their own situations; they will design and implement strategies to enhance curriculum and pedagogy in their ongoing activity in programme delivery.

Focus questions
Three key questions will be addressed by academics implementing the quality principles throughout the project:

1) What are the perspectives of key academic stakeholders on what constitutes a quality university offshore programme, with particular reference to quality learning and teaching in the context of their particular programme?
2) What are their perspectives on the issues involved in the application of the quality principles to learning and teaching in the context of their particular programme?
3) How do they respond in the light of their perspectives to the various issues that arise for them in applying the quality principles in their programme delivery?

This data will be reported through ongoing website communication among applicants and participants and through discussion forums following completion of Action Learning projects.
INTRODUCTION: Ensuring quality in transnational higher education
- Aims of the workshop
- Background and context
- Development of the quality principles
- Overview of the principles

ACTIVITY 1: Sharing stakeholder experiences and perspectives on transnational delivery
- What is the situation/context of delivery?
- How does cultural context impact on teaching and learning offshore?
- How do academic stakeholders ensure/safeguard quality of the programme?
- What quality assurance systems are in place for transnational programmes?
- Do existing quality assurance systems attend to teaching and learning?
- What are the challenges/strategies for ensuring quality teaching and learning?

ACTIVITY 2: Mapping principles to practice in teaching and learning
- How do the principles/sets of principles relate to the challenges/strategies identified?
  - Which principles are most relevant?
- What kinds of criteria/indicators can be developed for these principles?
- Are these principles applicable to:
  - The Australian/overseas partnership?
  - The programme/unit?
  - The model of delivery?
  - The cultural context?
  - The site of delivery?

ACTIVITY 3: Development of Action Learning plans to implement and evaluate the principles
- What action/change/improvement is desirable?
- Which principles/sets of principles are applicable?
- What are the possibilities/material constraints for application of the principles?
- What is the general plan of action?
- Who is likely to be involved, both onshore and offshore, and in what ways?
- What is the timeline and schedule of key events?
- How will the action be monitored and evaluated? (See Table 1)
- How can the Action Learning report be written up? (See Table 2)
PLENARY SESSION:
Group discussion of (1) implementation of Action Learning plans, (2) ongoing communication among participants and project leaders, (3) subsequent applications of the quality principles, and (4) the web-based survey for evaluation of the workshop.

Table 1: Sample data collection strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARTIFACTS</th>
<th>OBSERVATIONAL DATA</th>
<th>INQUIRY DATA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher generated</td>
<td>● University/Faculty policy documents</td>
<td>● Observational records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Unit outlines</td>
<td>● Memos/logs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Lesson plans</td>
<td>● Narratives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Reflective journals</td>
<td>● Checklists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Self-assessment</td>
<td>● Video recordings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Peer review</td>
<td>● Photographs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student generated</td>
<td>● Written assignments</td>
<td>● Audio recordings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Self-assessment</td>
<td>● Organisational charts/maps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Peer review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Course evaluations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Teacher evaluations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 2: Writing up the Action Learning report

- A detailed description of the field of action (the context)
- A description of the issue underpinning the action that was taken
- The selected principles and the developed criteria/indicators for successful application of the principles
- Plan and timeline of the Action Learning project
- Data documenting activity in each cycle of the project (eg. artifacts, images, videos etc)
- Reflections and evaluations
Executive summary

In 2008, the provision of education to overseas students constituted Australia’s sixth largest export earner (Universities Australia, 2009). By 2007, the number studying offshore was 149,625, with the top five source countries being Singapore, Malaysia, China, Hong Kong and Vietnam (Australian Education International, 2009).

Programmes are delivered offshore through a number of models, including ‘twinning’, ‘franchised’, ‘online’ and ‘moderated’ programmes, along with various combinations of these. Concerns have been raised regarding the quality of these programmes by key players, including the Australian Government, Universities Australia (previously known as the Australian Vice Chancellors’ Committee), individual universities, and the National Tertiary Education Union representing the collective views of lecturers involved in delivery.

Project Stage 1 was a response to such concerns. In particular, it was a response to a call of the Commonwealth Department of Education, Science and Training (DEST now DEEWR) in 2005 for a national quality strategy for offshore education that would improve communication with stakeholders and lead to an improvement in quality, including quality in learning and teaching.

The specific purpose of the project was to contribute to the enhancement of the quality of teaching and learning in offshore education programmes of Australian universities by addressing the following three objectives.

**OBJECTIVE NO.1: To compile a database of international and national policy documents, empirical studies and quality assurance frameworks relating to such programmes.**

The database is located at: http://www.education.uwa.edu.au/research/frameworks/database

The references which comprise this part of the project have been divided into 13 libraries. These represent a significant cross-section of the literature regarding the involvement of Australian universities in offshore education. All universities are involved to a greater or lesser degree in international activities, with such activities being addressed using various terms including ‘international’, ‘internationalisation’, ‘transnational’, as well as ‘offshore’. Also, various definitions of these terms are put forward from time to time. For example in 1997, The Global Alliance for Transnational Education (GATE) describes transnational education as follows:

> Transnational education…denotes any teaching or learning activity in which the students are in a different country (the host country) to that in which the institution providing the education is based (the home country). This situation requires that national boundaries be crossed by information about the education, and by staff and/or educational materials. (1997: 1).

The libraries reflect not only the importance of internationalisation generally to Australian universities, but also its importance as a world-wide phenomenon, in which there is considerable competition between countries and individual universities.
OBJECTIVE NO.2: To conduct an empirically-based qualitative study of the perspectives of key academic stakeholders on the delivery of such programmes across the range of models which operate.

The resulting case studies are located at:
http://www.education.uwa.edu.au/research/frameworks/case-studies

Ten case studies were undertaken within the qualitative tradition of social science research. The aim was to investigate the perspectives of key academic stakeholders on the delivery of offshore education programmes of Australian universities across a range of models. They provide rich portrayals of the findings at each of the sites investigated. Particular emphasis is placed on ‘giving voice’ to the stakeholders interviewed. Also, a set of principles was developed from each case study to guide those concerned with quality assurance for transnational teaching and conducting professional development programmes for those working transnationally.

The corpus of data was produced by pursuing the following three main research questions:

i. What are the perspectives of key academic stakeholders on what constitutes a quality university off-shore programme, with particular reference to quality learning and teaching?

ii. What are their perspectives on the issues involved in the delivery of quality university off-shore programmes, with particular reference to quality learning and teaching?

iii. How do they ‘respond in the light of their perspectives to’ the various issues that arise for them in providing quality university offshore programmes, with particular reference to learning and teaching?

The case studies will be of value to policy makers, administrators, teachers travelling from Australia and locally-based tutors.
OBJECTIVE NO.3: To develop a set of principles to guide those concerned with:
• quality assurance for transnational teaching by Australian universities; and
• conducting professional development programmes for those working transnationally.

The set of principles is located at:
http://www.education.uwa.edu.au/research/frameworks/principles

The libraries and the case studies were analysed in order to develop principles to assist Australian universities to:

◆ enhance existing frameworks aimed at assuring the quality of learning and teaching in offshore Australian higher education programmes;
◆ inform the design of professional development programmes for key stakeholders which are aimed at maintaining their professionalism in the delivery of quality learning and teaching in university offshore education; and
◆ inform the activities of the major players charged with developing policy for quality university offshore programmes, particularly in relation to providing quality learning and teaching.

The principles address three main areas: ‘welfare’, ‘curriculum’ and ‘pedagogy’. Furthermore, they are directed at policy makers, administrators, teachers travelling from Australia and locally-based tutors.
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Summary of Project Stage 2:
Applying quality principles to Australian university transnational teaching and learning

Outcomes
A major outcome of Project Stage 1 was the development of principles for promoting the quality of learning and teaching in Australian ‘offshore’ higher education programmes. The current project is the application of these principles to the delivery of Australian university transnational programmes. Outcomes will be:

(a) a professional development workshop on applying principles to enhance learning and teaching for academics delivering Australian university transnational education (TNE);
(b) implementation of the principles in ten Australian university transnational programmes across the range of models of delivery;
(c) a set of case studies of the applications of the quality principles by participating institutions; and
(d) sustainable, collaborative, cross-institutional networks of onshore/offshore academics aimed at ensuring and safeguarding quality in offshore programme delivery.

Aim
The project is geared to quality enhancement of learning and teaching. It is targeted at achieving change and improvement across the sector. It promotes teachers by emphasising that they are indispensable to quality formation. The project and its outcomes function to identify, disseminate and embed good individual and institutional practice in learning and teaching. The project builds reciprocal national and international dimensions by bringing to Australian university teaching and learning practice, principles that are relevant to the sector as a whole and which reflect and respect international understandings on quality formation.

The project is inclusive, oriented to systemic change and to developing the capacity of Australian universities to deliver quality education to meet their obligations and the needs of a varied range of stakeholders. It supports diversity by enlisting onshore and offshore academics in applying quality in terms of their particular contexts and individual needs. The project concentrates on developing quality through collaboration, both through method and outcomes. Its emphasis on the need for universities to take up principles encourages universities to recognise quality dictates. The project completes a major project of quality enhancement of university teaching/learning enabled by the ALTC. The project addresses the most pressing issue in transnational education, enhancing and ensuring quality in teaching and learning delivery. In bracing the quality in Australian university offshore delivery, the project will protect and foster an industry currently worth $581 million annually to the Australian economy (Australian Education International, 2011).
Internationalisation

The project directly addresses the nominated key issue of transnational higher education, targeting the critical problem of inconsistent educational quality across Australian transnational programme delivery. It applies to teaching and learning practice, across a variety of delivery modes, programmes and universities, principles which embrace and reflect intercultural and international dimensions particularly appropriate to enhancing and ensuring the quality of Australian university transnational education. For example, the principles draw on UNESCO/OECD quality guidelines on cross-border delivery to which Australia is a signatory. They reflect the experience of educators delivering Australian programmes in different educational and cultural environments in Malaysia, Singapore, China and Hong Kong. Application, the purpose of this project, will enfold these international and intercultural dimensions into teaching/learning.

Integration will be facilitated by: the inclusive, collaborative project approach; the professional workshop which will enable academics to achieve the most appropriate and effective applications for their purposes; the incorporation of principles into learning/teaching practice in ten university programmes; cases that will supply empirical evidence on applying principles; and the networks of academics that will be formed to collaborate on enhancing and ensuring quality in Australian university transnational learning and teaching.

Approach

The project will utilise an Action Learning model (Revans, 1982), in which academics involved in the delivery of Australian university transnational programmes are the focus of professional development. Action Learning provides a structural approach directed to learning in a social setting, linking learning with action through a reflective process within small cooperative learning groups (McGill & Beaty, 1995). The workshop series will target the developmental needs of academics to improve transnational teaching and learning, provide knowledge about the developed quality principles, and facilitate the development of small team Action Learning projects to manage the integration of the principles into teaching and learning situations.

Participants will be encouraged to use the principles to design and implement strategies for transnational programme delivery and to analyse and monitor the success or otherwise of these strategies over a period of time. The Action Learning model thus will be complemented by the theories of communities of practice (Lave and Wenger, 1991) and experiential learning (Kolb, 1984).

The project will adopt an interpretive action research approach, which draws on the expert knowledge of practitioners; people whose experience provides knowledge that can be applied to the solution of problems under investigations (Stringer, 2004). Action research is a form of self-reflective inquiry undertaken by participants in social situations “to improve the productivity,
rationality and justice of their own practices, as well as the understanding of those practices” (Kemmis and McTaggart, 1988: 5). Action and evaluation proceed simultaneously. Action research thus proceeds in a spiral of steps: plan, act and evaluate. The proposed action research works on the assumption that the project participants, whose professional lives are affected by the issue under study, will be engaged in all processes of investigation (Tripp, 1996).

Following the framework of Participatory Action Research (Atweh, Kemmis & Weeks, 1998), one or more cycles of investigation may be completed by each team. Participants will engage in a process of rigorous inquiry-in-action, acquiring information (collecting data) and reflecting on that information (analysing) in order to transform their new understandings about quality enhancement in transnational programme delivery (theorising). This new set of understandings will then be applied to plans for resolution of the problem (action), which in turn provides the context for testing hypotheses derived from group theorising (evaluation).

The project targets academics involved in various aspects of transnational teaching and learning across a range of models of delivery and across universities nationwide. It therefore has the capacity to facilitate wide-scale reform through dissemination of knowledge and skills knowledge by project participants within their teaching and learning communities.

References


Principles to Assist in Quality Assurance

The libraries and the case studies produced in Project Stage 1 were analysed in order to deduce sets of principles to assist Australian universities in assuring quality in the provision of transnational education.

While all of the material outlined in the ‘Database’ section of the project site (available at http://www.education.uwa.edu.au/research/framework) and also in the ‘Case Studies’ section contributed to the task, a number of key works were particularly helpful. The Tertiary Education Union produced its first guide for Australia-based staff working offshore in 1996. Building on the experiences of its members in the intervening years, the NTEU produced two guides in 2004: first, Working Offshore: Guide for Australian University Staff Working Overseas; and secondly, Excess Baggage: Australian Staff Involvement in the Delivery of Offshore Courses: Research Report and Case Study Findings.

The results of the AVCC Offshore Project Report published in June 2005, AVCC Offshore Quality Project Report: A Professional Development Framework for Academic Staff Teaching Australian Programs Offshore, prepared by the University of South Australia for the AVCC, was also helpful. The framework provides for both Australia-based academic staff and the professional development of local tutors in three stages: Induction, Early Career Orientation and Ongoing Professional Development.

In 2005, the Australian Vice-Chancellors’ Committee also published guidelines regarding the provision of education to international students, including offshore students. Their booklet entitled Provision of Education to International Students: Code of Practice and Guidelines for Australian Universities provides seven overarching statements regarding the preparation of staff for offshore teaching. They are outlined as follows:

To enable staff to carry out effectively the tasks for which they are allocated responsibility, universities should make every effort to:

i. ensure that all staff involved with international students are competent to deal with the students’ special circumstances;
ii. develop training programs, including cross-cultural programmes, appropriate to the different levels of involvement and responsibility among staff;
iii. ensure, through the relevant academic department, that for higher degree research students, adequate supervision and facilities will be available for the duration of candidature;
iv. ensure that all academic staff delivering courses to international students are appropriately qualified and competent to deliver those courses;
v. ensure that staff are well prepared for overseas assignments and visits;
vi. provide appropriate grievance procedures for staff and students on international matters; and
vii. ensure that all staff involved with international students are aware of their responsibilities under the relevant Australian laws and relevant laws of countries where the university is providing services.
What now follows is a comprehensive set of principles. These can be referred to when seeking to:

- enhance existing frameworks aimed at assuring the quality of learning and teaching in offshore Australian higher education programmes;
- inform the design of professional development programmes for key stakeholders which are aimed at maintaining their professionalism in the delivery of quality learning and teaching in university offshore education; and
- inform the activities of the major players charged with developing policy for quality university offshore programmes, particularly in relation to providing quality learning and teaching.

The principles have been organised under the three main headings which informed the conducting of the case studies, and under which the case-study reports are also organised, namely, ‘Curriculum’, ‘Pedagogy’ and ‘Welfare’.

Finally, not all of the principles apply to all types of programmes. For example, while quite a number of them apply in the case of Australian academics who fly-in and fly-out to teach in programmes outside of Australia, they are not necessarily applicable in the case of some of the other models of transnational higher education which operate. Regardless of the model with which one is engaged, one should take time to consider each principle and determine whether it applies to one’s own situation.
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# Principles that Apply to Curriculum

## Principles that Apply to Curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principles</th>
<th>KEY STAKEHOLDERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural sensitivity should always be considered in the preparation of course material, its delivery and the assessment of students’ work.</td>
<td>For policy makers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum design and delivery should be responsive to local offshore policies, practices and procedures to enhance student engagement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum packages should be comprehensive and should evince clear quality controls.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directors of Academic Programmes in Australian universities should be members of off-shore Advisory Academic Councils to ensure quality auditing of curriculum, pedagogy and assessment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme entry requirements should be the same for all students, whether located onshore or offshore.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulations relating to advanced standing, transfer of credit, student failure and withdrawal from off-shore programmes should be made clear to offshore students at the outset rather than at the point of crisis.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offshore staff should have autonomy in adapting the curriculum to suit the local context and the culturally diverse backgrounds of students. Teaching materials should reflect the cultural context of the course and provide an international dimension to the curriculum.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme delivery should be financially viable in order to sustain quality in teaching/learning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There should be clear guidelines for curriculum implementation, curriculum adaptation and curriculum renewal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units delivered both offshore and onshore should be equivalent, rather than necessarily identical to each other. Unit outlines, topics and learning outcomes should be the same, but curriculum content and pedagogical practice should be adapted to suit cultural differences.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Principles that Apply to Pedagogy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY STAKEHOLDERS</th>
<th>For policy makers</th>
<th>For administrators</th>
<th>For teachers who travel from Australia</th>
<th>For local based tutors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment in offshore programmes should be moderated and controlled by Australian university academics. Grade distribution should be a key responsibility of the Australian university so as to ensure, moderation, equity and parity of esteem.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attention should be given to the possibility of ensuring that offshore programmes are delivered through a blended medium, implemented by a small and consistent team of academics from Australia, combined with local tutors who are trained by the host university.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Before finally deciding to offer a programme offshore, the Australian university and the offshore ‘partner’ should be clear about all requirements and expectations. The absence of such clarity has the potential to generate serious mistrust within a very short period of time after the programme has commenced.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication protocols should be established in advance of programme delivery.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continual use of web-based learning, including for the provision of resources for learning, could enhance ongoing connections between academic staff and students.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coordinators of programmes should consider establishing a Joint Academic Board (consisting of Australian and offshore executives, teaching staff from the host university, tutors and student representatives from the offshore country) to ensure the existence of quality audits, transparent communication and a strong ongoing relationship between organisations.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In respect to the assessment of student work, feedback and moderation processes should be monitored for effectiveness.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Levels of English competency required to undertake courses by students whose first language is other than English, should be reviewed regularly to ensure congruency between the required level and course materials.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programme delivery should be of sufficient financial viability to sustain quality in teaching/learning.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Principles that Apply to Pedagogy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme delivery should be responsive to culturally-determined teaching/learning practices.</th>
<th>For policy makers</th>
<th>For administrators</th>
<th>For teachers from Australia</th>
<th>For local based tutors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programme design and programme evaluations should be responsive to the views of both onshore and offshore academic stakeholders.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision should be made to ensure programme delivery is underpinned by strong teaching relationships between staff in Australia and those based permanently offshore.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student achievement of learning outcomes should be the arbiter for evaluating the merit and effectiveness of curriculum delivery.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching visits and teaching exchanges should be routinely implemented.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The delivery of curriculum is best facilitated by one key contact point in each country. Directors should take responsibility for student selection, induction of staff, programme review, assessment moderation, and quality of teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The delivery of the curriculum should be implemented according to the specification documents approved by all partners, so as to avoid student dissatisfaction and lack of respect for the Australian institution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The pedagogies adopted for off-shore teaching of the curriculum should be innovative, “state of the art”, evidenced-based and linked to contemporary research in the field.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The provision of resources for students should be of a high standard, be readily available and be produced in a consistent format prior to delivery of courses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel involved in the administration, delivery and assessment of the programme in both countries should be treated equally if the programme is to be respected in the offshore context.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visits to the ‘home’ campus by offshore students should be encouraged, at least once, during their candidature.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching spaces and IT facilities in the off-shore context should be equivalent to those available in Australia so as to facilitate effective pedagogical engagement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Principles that Apply to Welfare

### Principles that Apply to Welfare Regardless of the Model of Transnational Education

#### Offshore Facilities and Resources

Before the deployment of staff offshore, universities should ensure that the provision of appropriate facilities exist for staff to undertake the work required, while at the same time providing opportunities to service pre-existing commitments at the Australian university through internet access.

Program coordinators should ensure that offshore students have access to appropriate learning resources, including computers, readings and other library services and facilities.

#### Professional Issues

Universities should have formal processes whereby:
1. the quality of offshore programs can be regularly reviewed and concerns resolved in a transparent manner; and
2. coordinators of programs should have the right to veto the appointment of locally engaged staff.

#### Staff Development

All staff, including those newly appointed and those experienced in offshore work, should be provided with professional development covering all aspects of offshore experience at least annually.

Formal comprehensive training of staff engaged to provide offshore teaching should take place before their deployment commences.

Staff appointed offshore should fulfil the expectations of the Australian university with regard to their academic qualifications, training and experience, as well as their general suitability for appointment, including English language competency.
### Principles that Apply to Welfare

All staff should be provided with an ‘offshore manual’ which addresses such matters as:

1. accommodation;
2. personal safety and any security issues;
3. vaccinations and health care concerns, including the use of Australian prescription medicines offshore;
4. passport and visa arrangements;
5. appropriate clothing;
6. local currency, including exchange rates and banking facilities;
7. shopping and restaurants;
8. transportation and communication including internet and email facilities; and
9. important contact numbers.

### Staff Consultation

Faculties/Departments should establish management committees to establish and monitor the effectiveness of offshore activities.

#### Composition

Such committees should consist of the following staff and provide for gender balance, where possible:

1. experienced and inexperienced offshore teachers;
2. administrators involved in the activity;
3. a senior academic member of the Faculty/Department as chair; and
4. coopted members as considered appropriate by the committee.

#### Purpose

The purpose of the committees should be to ensure that:

- appropriate staff are involved in all key aspects of course delivery and development;
- staff development and orientation programs are relevant, up-to-date, useful and regularly reviewed;
- mentoring takes place between newly appointed and experienced staff;
- programs are reviewed, at least annually, to determine their viability; and
- a ‘clearing house’ for issues raised by staff, both offshore and local.
### Principles that Apply to Welfare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY STAKEHOLDERS</th>
<th>For policy makers</th>
<th>For administrators</th>
<th>For teachers who travel from Australia</th>
<th>For local based tutors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities undertaken offshore should take into account existing university policy frameworks.</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff experienced in offshore work should be provided with opportunities to contribute to any new policies or the revision of existing ones as the need arises.</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities undertaken offshore must take into account the laws and customs of the country in which they are conducted.</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracts of employment relating to offshore activities should be clear and unequivocal in relation to:</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Employer;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Line Manager to whom responsible;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Legal jurisdiction of the contract;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Remuneration;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Legal recognition of programmes;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Legal documents for offshore travel;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Insurance; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Legal tender in which salary and allowances will be paid.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Classification of Offshore Work for those who fly-in and fly-out

Offshore work should always be regarded:
1. as non-standard; | ☑ | ☑ | ☑ |                        |
2. voluntary; and | | | |                        |
3. where practicable, distributed among staff who volunteer. | | | |                        |

### Reward and Recognition

Reward and recognition for participation in offshore programs should be consistent. | ☑ | ☑ | ☑ |                        |
# Principles that Apply to Welfare

### Staff undertaking offshore activities

Staff undertaking offshore activities should receive a *per diem* in addition to normal salary which adequately reflects the additional living costs associated with the location. *Per diems* should comply with the rates published by the Australian Taxation Office. Such payments should reflect the cost of meals and incidental expenses.

Where a full campus workload is maintained, in addition to undertaking offshore activities, staff members should receive additional payments.

### Non-monetary Compensation

Rewards and recognition for participation in offshore programs may also include:

1. The incorporation of such activities in academic profiles which contribute to academic assessment and promotion;
2. Weightings for offshore activities in determining workloads; and
3. Reductions in onshore activities in both pre and post offshore phases.

### Expenses

A travel policy should exist which specifies conditions relating to airline travel, accommodation, meals and incidentals.

Additional expenses on staff when required to travel overseas for the purpose of course delivery, should, as a matter of University policy, be reimbursed by the University. Such expenses may include fees for travel documents, vaccinations and formal entertainment expenses.

Staff required to travel overseas should be covered by insurance provided by the university.

### Pre-Departure

Before an offshore programme commences staff should agree to a written plan indicating:

1. the activities to be undertaken;
2. itinerary/travel plan; and
3. the expected outcomes.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY STAKEHOLDERS</th>
<th>For policy makers</th>
<th>For administrators</th>
<th>For teachers who travel from Australia</th>
<th>For local based tutors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principles that Apply to Welfare</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff undertaking offshore activities should receive a <em>per diem</em> in addition to normal salary which adequately reflects the additional living costs associated with the location. <em>Per diems</em> should comply with the rates published by the Australian Taxation Office. Such payments should reflect the cost of meals and incidental expenses.</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where a full campus workload is maintained, in addition to undertaking offshore activities, staff members should receive additional payments.</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-monetary Compensation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards and recognition for participation in offshore programs may also include: 1. The incorporation of such activities in academic profiles which contribute to academic assessment and promotion; 2. Weightings for offshore activities in determining workloads; and 3. Reductions in onshore activities in both pre and post offshore phases.</td>
<td>● ● ● ●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A travel policy should exist which specifies conditions relating to airline travel, accommodation, meals and incidentals.</td>
<td>● ● ●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional expenses on staff when required to travel overseas for the purpose of course delivery, should, as a matter of University policy, be reimbursed by the University. Such expenses may include fees for travel documents, vaccinations and formal entertainment expenses.</td>
<td>● ● ●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff required to travel overseas should be covered by insurance provided by the university.</td>
<td>● ● ●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre-Departure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before an offshore programme commences staff should agree to a written plan indicating: 1. the activities to be undertaken; 2. itinerary/travel plan; and 3. the expected outcomes.</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Return Requirements</th>
<th>Staff returning from offshore commitments should undergo a debriefing session.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dispute Resolution</td>
<td>Grievances resulting from offshore deployment should be settled in a timely manner in accordance with university policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code of Ethics / Code of Conduct</td>
<td>Codes of Ethics / Codes of Conduct should cover both on and offshore activities, including offshore and onshore tutors, (if the latter are not already covered by a code acceptable to the University).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>Universities should provide staff participating in offshore programmes with ‘comprehensive’ personal accident insurance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Professional Issues | Staff involved in offshore work should consider the following:  
1. the curriculum of offshore courses;  
2. the mode of delivery;  
3. quality assurance procedures;  
4. processes through which concerns can be expressed and resolved;  
5. how their materials might be used in offshore programmes; and  
6. how their offshore commitments might impact upon their onshore students, their research and their colleagues. |
# Principles that Apply to Welfare

## Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>KEY STAKEHOLDERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There should be consistent treatment of staff to suit individual</td>
<td>For policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>circumstance and operational needs.</td>
<td>For administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inability to participate in offshore programmes should not affect a</td>
<td>For teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>staff member's position unless participation in such programmes is part</td>
<td>Who travel from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of an agreed job specification.</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing needs of offshore programmes should be reviewed, identified</td>
<td>For local based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and acted upon before the commencement of the academic year.</td>
<td>tutors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When determining staff participation in offshore programmes, those</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responsible should ensure that arrangements have been made to fulfil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their on-campus responsibilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where offshore activities are being undertaken in addition to maintaining</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a ‘full’ academic workload, faculties should ensure that workloads are</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reasonable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Equity

Universities should ensure that all staff have equal opportunity to participate in offshore programmes by ensuring that:

1. family friendly policies are developed that do not disadvantage staff who have familial responsibilities; and
2. adequate compensation is provided for staff who may incur additional expense related to their familial responsibilities.
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