

case at New York University in Abu Dhabi, Duke University-Kunshan in China, and the University of Nottingham in Malaysia, among others. All three have persisted despite opposition, but have required significant communication from leadership regarding how the campus fits into the university's strategic plan.

While some IBCs are wholly owned by the home campus, the majority receive some sort of support, whether financial, logistical, or infrastructural, from the host country. An arrangement frequent in certain countries—especially those with education hubs—entails partnership with the host government in which the local or national government subsidizes the cost of the local campus for at least some period of time. In turn, the government has the right to rescind its support at any time. The Incheon Global Campus in Korea follows this model, and has so far attracted four foreign institutions to open branches. The NYU Abu Dhabi campus construction and operational costs were entirely covered by the Abu Dhabi government. Likewise, the city of Kunshan provided the land and building for the physical campus of Duke Kunshan University.

Another characteristic of international branch campuses is that they are clearly identifiable as belonging to the home institution by their name. While much TNE exists through franchising and creation of entirely new institutions (i.e. Torrens University Australia, operated by the for-profit American provider Laureate), nearly all branch campuses retain the name of the home institution in their own name. For example, all campuses of the *Ecole supérieure des arts et techniques de la mode* (ESMOD) contain the name “ESMOD,” though the rest of the name is tailored to fit the local context. Likewise, Penang Medical College displays its affiliation with the Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland—its parent institution—in its logo.

CONCLUSION

By narrowing the definition of what is, and is not, an international branch campus, a picture of the full landscape of TNE emerges. From this, we see a broad vista of the international branch campuses in existence, which reveals a wide range of international activity, ownership models, name representation, and size and scope of academic offering, all under the umbrella of the IBC definition. An updated look at these campuses will be revealed in the upcoming IBC report, to be released by the Observatory and C-BERT at SUNY Albany in November 2016. ■

Transnational Education in Chinese Secondary Education

FION CHOON BOEY LIM

Fion Choon Boey Lim is educational quality coordinator at Victoria University College, Australia. E-mail: fion.lim@vu.edu.au.

Transnational education (TNE) in China has received much attention in the last decade. However, literature in this area has traditionally focused on the degree level, with increasing attention given to dual degree collaboration. There has been less attention given to the increasing transnational activities at secondary school level in China.

In China, the first three years of secondary school education are compulsory. The second part consists of three years of non-compulsory study (senior secondary). At the end of the three years, students sit for the National College Entrance Examination—the infamous *gaokao*. Parents and students are well known for their anxiety over the outcomes of this examination. However, in recent years, the increasing wealth of many middle-income parents and the liberalization of secondary school policy that permits foreign collaboration, have allowed more transnational activities at this level. A growing trend in Sino-foreign collaboration can be observed, where foreign curricula, usually western, are offered in collaboration with a Chinese public or private school, usually as a guaranteed pathway to a foreign degree. To date, there has been little research, discussion, or debate on this transnational secondary education activity. Given its growth rate, however, changes in the forms of control by the Chinese government can be expected.

GROWTH OF FOREIGN SECONDARY SCHOOL PROGRAMS

Foreign secondary school curricula are not completely new in China. The International Baccalaureate (IB) has been offered in China since 1991. While the 1990s were a boom time when modern China opened up its markets to foreign trade, foreign education, particularly at the secondary school level, has been tightly controlled and considered relatively hard to penetrate. In recent times, however, a new trend in Sino-foreign secondary school collaboration has been observed. A number of Chinese secondary schools have partnered with foreign schools to offer preuniversity programs. The Cambridge International Examination of GCE “O” and “A” levels, the Australian VCE curriculum, and a variety of other foundation programs have since flourished.

Many students who graduate from foreign secondary school programs find themselves with comparatively easy

entry to a foreign degree program, within China or abroad, which is essentially what these foreign programs are designed to prepare them for. Since 2000, the IB has been offered by more than 100 schools in China in collaboration with the IB foundation, and 72 percent of the IB diploma program graduates between 2002 and 2012 have achieved admission to one of the top 500 universities in the world. At least 50 Chinese schools have been listed on the Cambridge International Examination website offering students an alternative pathway to universities in the United Kingdom and other tertiary institutions around the world that recognized GCE results. A large number of Chinese students have also found their way to universities in the state of Victoria in Australia via the Haileybury International School in China. Haileybury is an independent school in Melbourne and one of the early movers in this area. In China, the school was set up as a private international school, offering Year 7 to VCE programs, and it claims many of its graduates have secured admission to top universities in Australia.

A growing trend in Sino-foreign collaboration can be observed, where foreign curricula, usually western, are offered in collaboration with a Chinese public or private school, usually as a guaranteed pathway to a foreign degree.

The growth of transnational activity in the secondary school sector in China can be attributed to a few factors, one of which being that gaining approval from the Chinese ministry of education to offer a foreign high school curriculum appears to be relatively easy, compared to gaining approval to offer a Sino-foreign collaborative degree. There is no quota system involved, and Pricing Bureau involvement in this area is nonexistent. In fact, approval from the provincial or municipal government is usually all it takes to start a foreign secondary school program. Growth is also further facilitated by the increasing trade links established by different governments with China.

MANAGING GROWTH AND QUALITY: PROVIDERS BEWARE

To date, it may be correct to claim that transnational activities in the Chinese secondary school sector have prospered in a commercially driven environment, where demand, pricing, and growth are all driven by competition. However, how far and how fast can the pace of growth go in this Sino-foreign collaboration on secondary school programs in China?

Most of these Sino-foreign collaborations are concentrated in Tier 1 and Tier 2 cities, which is understandable given the comparatively larger number of middle-income families in these cities. However, the affordability of foreign secondary school programs, particularly preuniversity programs, compared to local senior secondary schools is one possible deterrent to the growth. An IB diploma program offered in Shanghai could cost up to RMB 280,000 (US\$43,000) annually. Such fees are still considered high by many parents.

Growth is probably further hindered by the reluctance of parents to allow their children to give up the right to sit for the *gaokao* entrance examination. Many well-to-do parents have chosen to send their children to foreign school programs, which is less stressful, provides a better pathway to overseas universities, and, in many ways, better prepares them for foreign degree study. However, the majority of Chinese parents continue to choose a less risky approach—putting their children through a heavier study load of two curricula—one offered by the foreign provider and one by the Chinese secondary school.

OUTLOOK FOR TNE IN CHINESE SECONDARY EDUCATION

History suggests that where education is concerned, rapid growth without robust oversight of quality is a recipe for disaster. Singapore, Malaysia, Hong Kong, and China have tightened their assessment and approval processes for transnational degrees and private education providers at different periods of time, particularly when growth outpaced quality control. The argument that universities have well developed quality assurance mechanisms has not been successful in convincing quality assurance agencies, nor proven effective in preventing delivery of dubious quality programs as reported in these countries. It is thus not unreasonable to predict that the rapid growth of foreign curriculum in secondary school is likely to reach a turning point in the not too distant future, with the introduction of tighter quality assurance systems by the Chinese government. At that point, one would question what the likely impact on transnational education in China will be: will it trigger a further downward shift of transnational activities in the “supply-chain,” with the growth shifting to primary schools and then further to preschools? ■
