


2-22-2017

Faculty Role In Curriculum Delivery At An International Branch Campus

Edith Pfeifer List
Illinois State University, edithplist@hotmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#), and the [Higher Education and Teaching Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

List, Edith Pfeifer, "Faculty Role In Curriculum Delivery At An International Branch Campus" (2017). *Theses and Dissertations*. 694.
<https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/etd/694>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by ISU ReD: Research and eData. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ISU ReD: Research and eData. For more information, please contact ISUREd@ilstu.edu.

FACULTY ROLE IN CURRICULUM DELIVERY AT AN INTERNATIONAL BRANCH CAMPUS

Edith Pfeifer List

154 Pages

Focusing on faculty and curriculum at International branch campuses (IBCs), this study uses a qualitative case study method to examine faculty role in and perception of curriculum delivery. Interviews and observations were conducted at a midwestern institution and it's European IBC. The areas of investigation include faculty involvement in curricular decision making, modifications for curricular delivery at the course and program level, communication between campuses, perceived differences and similarities between campuses, and professional development opportunities through the institution. The aim of this study was to gain insights into the program level curriculum and course decision-making and delivery at international branch campuses and into faculty perceptions of their role in the delivery. The data were analyzed through the framework of micropolitics (Ball, 1987; Blase, 1991) and neoliberalism. The findings from this study provides insights about learning and teaching at IBCs for administrators, faculty, and students at both home and host campuses of IBCs. The findings indicate that a high level of autonomy along with coordination and collaboration with the home campus is important in IBC curriculum delivery.

KEYWORDS: Curriculum, Faculty, International branch campuses, International higher education

FACULTY ROLE IN CURRICULUM DELIVERY AT AN INTERNATIONAL BRANCH
CAMPUS

EDITH PFEIFER LIST

A Dissertation Submitted in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Educational Administration and Foundations

ILLINOIS STATE UNIVERSITY

2017

©2017 Edith Pfeifer List

FACULTY ROLE IN CURRICULUM DELIVERY AT AN INTERNATIONAL BRANCH
CAMPUS

EDITH PFEIFER LIST

COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

Mohamed Nur-Awaleh, Chair

Lydia Kyei-Blankson

Venus Evans-Winters

Pamela Twyman Hoff

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to thank the faculty and administrators at Midwest Christian University who took the time to speak to me. Their generosity made this dissertation possible. I would also like to thank my dissertation committee, Dr. Nur-Awaleh, Dr. Kyei-Blankson, Dr. Evans-Winters, and Dr. Hoff for seeing this project through. I would also like to thank my library colleagues who encouraged me to take the time I need to complete my degree. Finally, I would like to thank my family and especially to the little guy who joined our family in the midst of this whole process. I could not have done this without your support, humor, and love in so many ways.

E. P. L.

CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	i
CONTENTS	ii
TABLES	vi
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose of the Study	7
Research Questions	8
Definition of Terms	9
Theoretical Framework	10
Significance of this Study	12
Organization of the Study	13
CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW	15
Background on IBCs	15
Establishment of IBCs	16
Funding of IBCs	17
Market for IBCs	18
Growth of IBCs since 1980s	19
Rationale for the Establishment of an IBC	20
Benefits of the Establishment of an IBC	22
Cross-Border Faculty	25
Cross-Border Curricula	32

CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY	37
Purpose of the Study	39
Research Questions	39
Case Study Approach	40
Case Study Description	40
Description of Participants	43
Qualitative Data Analysis	45
Theoretical Framework	45
Micropolitics	45
Neoliberalism	48
Limitations and Scope of the Study	50
Ensuring Reliability and Validity	50
Researcher Positionality & Reflexivity	51
Ethical Considerations	52
CHAPTER IV: FINDINGS	54
Introduction	54
United States Campus Description	55
European Campus Description	57
Coordination Between Campuses	60
Curriculum Delivery at MCU	61
Program Level and Course Level Curriculum at MCU	64
Faculty Exchange Between Campuses	66
Professional Development	68

Faculty Workload and Tenure	69
Academic Freedom and Course Materials	70
Syllabi	71
Student Populations	72
Classroom Activities	75
Curriculum Development and Improvement	77
Course Level	79
Program Level	80
Coordination and Assessment	83
Faculty Perceptions of Their Role Regarding Curriculum	85
Power Differential	85
Curricular Academic Freedom	89
Communication and Personal Connections/Faculty Exchange	89
Locale/Context	90
Good Faculty/Good Students	91
CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS	93
Summary of Findings	93
Curriculum Delivery at MCU	93
Curriculum Development and Improvement	95
Faculty Perceptions of Their Role Regarding Curriculum	96
Discussion of Findings Relating to IBC Literature	97
Demand and Motivation for an IBC	97
Benefits of the MCU European campus	99

Communication Between Campuses	99
Professional Development	101
Power Differential	101
Curriculum Development and Delivery	102
Assessment and Quality Assurance	104
Theoretical Framework Analysis	104
Micropolitics	105
Neoliberalism	116
Conclusions	122
Policy Implications of the Study	123
Implications for Future Research	125
REFERENCES	127
APPENDIX A : INTERVIEW QUESTIONS	152

TABLES

Table	Page
1. Study Participant Descriptions by Campus with Totals	43

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

For centuries, students and scholars have been crossing borders to attend higher education institutions. More recently, higher education providers have also been crossing international borders to deliver their curricula. This delivery has happened through different formats: by establishing branch campuses abroad, franchising programs to other providers, and creating dual degree programs, along with other international activities and partnerships. The focus of this dissertation is faculty perceptions of curricular delivery, specifically as it relates to course-level and program-level curricula, at an international branch campus and examining how that differs or is similar to that which occurs at the home institution. Questions of interest are: how does curriculum delivery occur at the international branch campuses (IBC)? How does the curriculum delivery compare between the IBC and the home campus? How involved are IBC faculty in curriculum development and improvement? How are decisions made regarding the curriculum and delivery? What are IBC faculty's perception of their role within the institution regarding curriculum? Since IBCs deliver higher education as a product, the faculty, who deliver the product, are an integral part of an IBC and faculty behaviors and attitudes effect student learning (Kuh, Schneider, & AAUP, 2008; Umbach & Wawrzynski, 2005). Therefore, the faculty perspective is an important part of understanding the overall delivery of cross-border higher education. This study provides insights for administrators, faculty, and students regarding teaching and learning at IBCs at both the course- and program-level.

In the literature, education provided by an institution located in a different country than the student has been described as borderless education, offshore education, cross-border education or transnational education (McBurnie & Ziguras, 2006). For this study, the term cross-border education is used for consistency. A literature review was conducted using the

EBSCOhost interface for ERIC database and EBSCOhost's Professional Development Collection database. There are four major categories of cross-border education: franchising, twinning/dual degrees, IBCs, and distance education (Croom, 2012; Knight, 2007, 2011b). Franchising involves an institution providing curriculum, materials, and the right to award a degree in another institution's name for a fee (Altbach, 2012). Twinning or dual degrees involves two different institutions that collaborate on the coursework in one or both countries and either the host institution or both institutions award the degree (Knight, 2011b). This encourages a steady flow of students back to the home campus. Distance education refers to either coursework delivered online or with another form of communication that may or may not include face-to-face support in a different country (Knight, 2011b). The focus of this study is the international branch campus (IBC) which involves a facility in a different country, called a host campus, where face-to-face teaching occurs (C-BERT, 2017). The degree is no different than those degrees awarded at the home campus and the host campus is administered and often accredited as part of the home campus.

Branch campuses are part of the internationalization of higher education resulting from globalization (Altbach & Knight, 2007; Verbik, 2006; Wilkins & Huisman, 2012). Altbach (2004) defines globalization as "the broad economic, technological, and scientific trends that directly affect higher education and are largely inevitable" (p. 5). For decades, higher education institutions in the United States have incorporated an international aspect with student mobility through study abroad programs and international students attending their schools. More recently, internationalization reflects globalization by including international perspective within curricula for example. Globalization has further defined higher education as a service or a commodity that can be imported to meet local demand or exported with a profit (Altbach & Knight, 2007). This

contrasts with the notion that education can be a national public good provided by the state to its population (Marginson, 2011). Instead a higher education credential is a commodity to be paid for by the individual to benefit the individual rather than society as a whole.

Higher education providers can export higher education as a service or a commodity because of the support and enabling of national and international trade liberalization policies such as the World Trade Organization's General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS). The providers of cross-border higher education are not just non-profit private and public institutions, but also for-profit organizations such as corporate universities, international conglomerates, and professional associations (Altbach & Knight, 2007). For example, Laureate Education, Inc. offers higher education programs to over one million students in 25 countries (Laureate Education, Inc., 2016). For corporations, higher education can be a profitable service to offer. Another example from the United Kingdom that in 2014-2015, 663,915 students were registered at or were studying for an credential of a United Kingdom higher education provider outside of the United Kingdom (HESA, 2014). For public institutions, the generated revenue from these exports may replace declining national and state funding (A. Chapman & Pyvis, 2013). For example, the Australian international higher education sector generated 19.4 billion AUD in 2015 (Australian Government Department of Education and Training, 2015). Higher education has become an important funding source for Australian higher education institutions. All but one of Australia's 39 universities have cross-border education partnerships (Healey, 2008). Cross-border higher education providers range from for-profit corporations to private non-profit institutions to public non-profit institutions.

Most studies in the literature regarding IBCs focused on the administration and early establishment of IBCs. These include studies on motivation for establishing an IBC (Beecher,

2016; Croom, 2011; Green, Eckel, Calderon, & Luu, 2007; Lane, 2011a, 2011b; Opgenorth, 2014; Sidhu & Christie, 2014; Stanfield, 2014; Walsh, 2011; Wilkins & Huisman, 2012), marketing an IBC (Opgenorth, 2014; Singh, 2012), and mission statements (Arwari, 2014; Lane, 2011d).

There have been a few studies about the experience in the classroom of students and faculty at IBCs. Ahmad (2014) did a mixed method study of student satisfaction at Malaysian IBCs that found students were largely satisfied across seven dimensions of education and non-education issues. Jordan (2011) studied student culture at the University of Nevada Las Vegas' Singapore branch campus and discovered that there was holistic student development through various elements. Fernandes, Ross, and Meraj (2013) used a survey to measure student loyalty at a British university in United Arab Emirates (UAE) and found that the quality of teaching was important to students. Wilkins and Balakrishnan (2013) surveyed students' satisfaction with IBCs in the UAE and found that students chose to study in UAE due to convenience and country-specific reasons. A few studies have involved faculty issues. Botting (2014) studied cultural aspects of a Canadian branch campus regarding faculty and student expectations. Laigo (2013) studied the influence of financial factors and a desire for change or adventure for recruiting American faculty to IBCs in Qatar's Education City. Lehn (2016) studied the factors of cultural-heritage ties, financial incentives, and professional opportunity influencing motivation of U.S. academic staff for working in the Gulf States. Jauregui (2013) studied the cross-cultural training expatriate faculty at IBCs in Qatar's Education City which was significant in faculty effectiveness. Khoury (2013) gathered data from leaders of Qatar University, a public national university and the IBCs, private non-Qatari universities in Education City. The Khoury study mentioned faculty interactions between the institutions but did not involve any direct data

gathering from faculty or students (Khoury, 2013). However, none of these studies include how curriculum is delivered in the classroom at an IBC. Both the delivery by faculty and the curriculum itself are the foundation of an IBC operation. The curriculum delivery includes but is not limited to course design, program design, course content, course materials, lectures, classroom activities, tests, projects, and assignments.

Even fewer studies involved the curricula at IBCs. Dumbre (2013) interviewed four administrators at IBCs about curriculum implementation whose home institutions were in the United States and host campuses were in the Gulf Region. The study discovered that there is a need for both global integration and adaptation to local needs. However, the study was only at the administrative level. Crosling (2011) focused on a specific institutional program to identify unique courses at IBCs in Malaysia. It was discovered that academic program specialization could increase student retention. Jauregui (2013) touched on curriculum in interviews on cross-cultural training of expatriate faculty at IBCs in Qatar's Education City. This study found that cross-cultural training increased faculty effectiveness.. Nevertheless, the lack of studies on faculty and their involvement at IBCs highlights the need for such work to be done. Knight and Liu (2017) identified this lack of research in their analysis of literature on cross-border education as well. The work of an IBC takes place in the classroom where students and faculty interact. This dissertation studied one portion of the interaction: the perceptions of faculty who deliver curricula at IBCs both at a course-level and a program-level.

In terms of locations, the majority of the IBC studies focus on the Asia-Pacific and the Gulf Regions which reflect interested in cross-border education in education hubs. Asia-Pacific IBC locations include Malaysia (Ahmad, 2014; Crosling, 2011; Lane, 2011b, 2011c; Shams & Huisman, 2012; Sidhu & Christie, 2014), Singapore (Jordan, 2011; Shams & Huisman, 2014;

Singh, 2012; Tierney & Lanford, 2014), and Hong Kong (Opgenorth, 2014). Gulf Regions locations include Qatar (Botting, 2014; Croom, 2011; Dumbre, 2013; Jauregui, 2013; Laigo, 2013; Reilly, 2008; Stanfield, 2014; Walsh, 2011) and the United Arab Emirates (Ahmad, 2014; Dumbre, 2013; Farrugia, 2013; Franklin & Alzouebi, 2014; Harding & Lammey, 2011; Lane, 2010, 2011b; Tierney & Lanford, 2014). There are a few exceptions where IBCs in other areas have been studied. They include Bischof's (2014) discussion of European IBCs, Montoto's (2013) study of cross-border education in Panama including an IBC, and Mock's (2005) discussion of IBCs and American universities in Japan during the 1980s and 1990s. Overall, there is a deficit of information about IBCs in Europe although IBCs have been established in this region since the 1950s there.

The case study is of curriculum delivery at Midwest Christian University (MCU) at their home campus in the United States and their European branch campus. The study participants includes faculty and administrators at both campuses. MCU was founded as a Christian institution over 150 years ago in a major U.S. Midwestern city. The institution offers undergraduate, masters, doctorates and certificates in a variety of fields with an emphasis on research. The study sample size was a total of 16 individuals, seven from the host campus and nine from the home campus. In order to narrow the focus, two major programs, Program A and Program B, were preselected in consultation with the host campus senior administrator regarding the number of faculty and engagement with the home campus. The case study began with semi-structured interviews followed by classroom observations as allowed. The semi-structured interviews with faculty are the foundation of the study. The host campus faculty and administrators were interviewed and observed in the classroom at the European campus during two weeks in March 2016. The home campus faculty and administrators were interviewed during

April, May, and October 2016. The home campus classroom observations took place during October 2016.

Interviews, observations, and documents were gathered and analyzed through the lenses of micropolitics and neoliberalism regarding organizational influences on faculty delivery of course-level curriculum at an IBC. Rather than just focus on formal structures or authority, micropolitics examines vertical and horizontal influences on change within educational institutions. While Ball (1987) uses the concepts of control, conflict, goal diversity, ideology, and political activity to analyze the influences within educational organizations, Blase (1991) examines those influences using the concepts of power, goals, cooperative and conflictive actions and processes, along with macro- and micropolitical factors. Along with neoliberalism, this framework allows for the examination at a faculty level of the influences on curriculum delivery on a micro-level, a macro-level, through processes, and including individual influences.

While this study can add to a larger conversation about cross-border higher education, it is limited in scope. The study provides insight regarding faculty and curriculum at IBCs, but it is not generalizable because its nature as a case study of a single an institution with two campuses, the home campus and the host campus. This study provides a basis for a larger study or further study of faculty and curriculum at IBCs.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to examine the involvement and perceptions of IBC faculty regarding development and delivery of curriculum and the factors influencing the delivery of curriculum at an IBC. The curriculum and its delivery are foundational to the overall success of an IBC, since degrees are awarded based on students' learning through degree requirements. The study took as its focus the development and curriculum delivery at the home campus of the same

degree programs. Through this qualitative study, faculty perceptions articulated through interviews and classroom observations were analyzed and coded into themes to describe the factors and influences on curriculum delivery at an IBC explaining the differences and similarities of curriculum delivery at the home campus and the host campus. This analysis benefits administrators, faculty, students and policy makers who seek to understand how to improve IBC's effectiveness regarding curriculum development, delivery and assessment. While this study has a small sample size, the information gleaned provides information for further study of the topic.

Research Questions

This study involves faculty at international branch campuses and their role regarding curriculum at these campuses. The discussion surrounding IBCs usually lacks insight into the teaching and learning that takes place. This study furthers the conversation regarding faculty teaching and curriculum delivery at an IBC. Specific areas of the study included the following: How does curriculum delivery occur at an international branch campus? How does the delivery compare with that which occurs at the home campus? How involved are faculty - at international branch campuses and the home campus - in curriculum development and improvement? How are decisions made regarding the curriculum and its delivery and what is the role of faculty in the process? What are faculty perceptions of their role regarding curriculum within the institution? What factors influence their perceptions? The following are the three research questions guiding this study:

R1: How does curriculum delivery occur at an international branch campus? How does the delivery compare with that which occurs at the home campus? If it does differ, what are the differences and why do they occur?

R2: How involved are faculty -- at international branch campuses and the home campus -
- in curriculum development and improvement? How are decisions made regarding the
curriculum and delivery and what are faculty's role in the process?

R3: What are faculty perceptions of their role regarding curriculum within the institution?
What factors influence their perceptions?

Definition of Terms

International Branch Campus (IBC) – also known as a host campus of an institution whose home campus is based in another country. There is no single definition for IBCs, so for this document the Cross-Border Education Research Team definition is used. “An entity that is owned, at least in part, by a foreign education provider; operated in the name of the foreign education provider; engages in at least some face-to-face teaching; and provides access to an entire academic program that leads to a credential awarded by the foreign education provider.” (C-BERT, 2017). IBCs are also called satellite campuses, offshore campuses, offspring campuses, or foreign outposts in the literature.

Cross-border higher education – higher education or tertiary programs delivered in a different country than where the program originated. It is also known as transnational, offshore, or borderless higher education.

Curriculum – a program of study which is comprised of specific courses to fulfill requirements of a program of study for a credential/degree. While curriculum may include both curricular and co-curricular activities at an educational institution, for this study only academic course work and program level data are examined. This study is not an exploration of curriculum itself or program evaluation of curriculum.

Curriculum delivery – curriculum is delivered on a course-level and a program-level by faculty members. This includes but is not limited to faculty and student interactions such as classroom activities, teaching methods, field trips, and assignments. Administrative and faculty documentation/communication of curriculum delivery includes but is not limited to documents such as syllabi, university bulletins, program webpages and program brochures.

Faculty – individuals responsible for developing, delivering, and creating curricular material within a higher education setting. These individuals are responsible for the vitality and feasibility of the curriculum for the institution. They are also known as instructors, teaching staff, instructional staff, or academic staff depending on the region. These individuals may or may not have faculty rank.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework used for this study is micropolitics and neoliberalism. These two theories examine the influences and factors within the institution. This framework provides insight into faculty perceptions and analysis of the perceptions as to what influences these perspectives. Micropolitics focuses on the individual and the influences on their actions, not just the hierarchical structures or administrative decisions. Neoliberalism focuses on the macro-level issues of commodification of higher education and market influences on higher education.

Neoliberalism as a political economic theory relates to education as a service with minimized state interference. Harvey (2007) states that neoliberalism “proposes that human well-being can best be advanced by liberating individual entrepreneurial freedoms and skills within an institutional framework characterized by strong private property rights, free markets, and free trade” (p. 2). International branch campuses exhibit facets of neoliberalism through the market approach to providing higher education in other countries. Using the neoliberal lens, IBCs are

providing a commodity - a credential - shaped by market forces. The privatization of higher education is the direct result of liberalization of education. Giroux (2002) writes that

As society is defined through the culture and values of neoliberalism, the relationship between a critical education, public morality, and civic responsibility as conditions for creating thoughtful and engaged citizens are sacrificed all too willingly to the interest of financial capital and the logic of profit-making (p. 427).

While IBCs increase access to higher education within the host country market forces have resulted in inequities in terms of curriculum offerings, treating students as consumers and focusing on profitability and corporate branding of the home institution instead of learning.

Early works on micropolitics in education include Ball's (1987) *The micro-politics of the school*, Hoyle's (1982) *Micropolitics of educational organisations*, and Blase (1991) *The politics of life in schools: power, conflict and cooperation*. Blase (1991) gives the following definition of micropolitics.

Micropolitics is the use of formal and informal power by individuals and groups to achieve their goals in organizations. In large part, political actions result from perceived differences between individuals and groups, coupled with the motivation to use power to influence and/or protect. Although such actions are consciously motivated, any action, consciously or unconsciously motivated, may have political "significance" in a given situation. Both cooperative and conflictive actions and processes are part of the realm of micropolitics. Moreover, macro- and micropolitical factors frequently interact. (p. 11)

Decisions regarding curriculum delivery have many factors, according to Blase (1991) the use of micropolitics can "account for complexity, instability, and conflict in organizational settings" (p. 3). The micropolitical analysis of this study used the factors of power, interests/motivations and location to elucidate issues of individual influences and factors within the organization influencing curriculum delivery by faculty.

Micropolitics has been used to analyze educational leadership (Blase & Anderson, 1995, 1995; Brosky, 2011; Caffyn, 2010; Murphy & Curtis, 2013; Struyve, Meredith, & Gielen, 2014), teacher relationships (Brosky, 2011; Sparkes, 1987; Stake & Cisneros-Cohernour, 2004),

curricular change (Leathwood & Phillips, 2000; Muncey, Payne, & White, 1999; Sparkes, 1987) and school reform (Haag & Smith, 2002). The studies are of organizations in the United States (Blase, 1991; Blase & Björk, 2010; Haag & Smith, 2002; Muncey et al., 1999), The United Kingdom (Ball, 1987; Hoyle, 1982; Jones, Siraj-Blatchford, & Ashcroft, 2013; Leathwood & Phillips, 2000; Malen, 1995; Murphy & Curtis, 2013; Sparkes, 1987) and in Europe/Asia (Caffyn, 2010; Morley, 1999). The majority of studies are of K-12 organizations (Ball, 1987; Blase, 1991; Blase & Anderson, 1995; Brosky, 2011; Caffyn, 2010; Malen, 1995; Muncey et al., 1999; Sparkes, 1987; Struyve et al., 2014). There is a smaller number of studies regarding higher education using micropolitics (Haag & Smith, 2002; Jones et al., 2013; Leathwood & Phillips, 2000; Morley, 1999, 2000; Murphy & Curtis, 2013; Stake & Cisneros-Cohernour, 2004). While there is no precedent for using micropolitics in analysis of cross-border education, it has been used in studies of higher education, internationally, and on teacher/leadership interactions.

Micropolitical analysis focuses on influences or factors on individuals within an education organization. Some of these factors include control, political activity, interests, conflict, goal diversity, and power (Ball, 1987). Ball (1987) considered data as the “views, experiences, meanings and interpretations of the social actors involved” (p. 26). In addition, location and local context are considered in Caffyn (2010) and Muncey, Payne and White (1999) as external or macro influences on the education organization. Location and the locale/context were considered as a part of the micropolitical analysis of this study.

Significance of this Study

Altbach wrote that “establishing a real branch campus that provides an education the same as at the home institution is not an initially easy task, and it is much more difficult as time goes on” (2010, p. 3). Altbach (2012) also questioned whether higher education “product” can be

the same at a franchised degree program as at the home institution. This study seeks to provide evidence as to whether faculty perceive that they are delivering the same “product” - the curriculum in this study - at the host campus as the home campus. Since IBCs deliver higher education as a product, the faculty, who deliver the product, are an integral part of an IBC. Additionally, the curriculum is part of the equation of educational equity between the campuses. The degree granted at the IBC is considered the same as one granted at the home campus. However, there may be different courses required for a major program or general education requirements at the IBC due to localization.

While there have been some studies regarding faculty at cross-border institutions, only a few focus on faculty perceptions at the host campus. This study fills a gap in research on specifically IBCs, and more broadly, the factors influencing faculty curriculum delivery in cross-border locations. The faculty perspective is important since faculty behaviors and attitudes effect student learning (Kuh et al., 2008; Umbach & Wawrzynski, 2005). While this study does not specifically study student learning, it should provide insight into how faculty behaviors and attitudes shape their delivery of course-level and program-level curriculum.

The data from this study provides information for stakeholders, administrators, faculty and students to understand how their curriculum is delivered and shaped at an IBC. If student learning is to be improved, this study provides data on what factors shape curriculum delivery itself. This understanding of the factors could provide a pathway for improving faculty delivery and improving the curriculum overall.

Organization of the Study

This dissertation study is organized into five chapters. The first chapter includes the introduction of the study and research questions. The second chapter is the literature review

including studies and information on IBCs, cross-border higher education, and faculty in cross-border higher education. The third chapter is the methodology of the study, including the case study and the theoretical framework of micropolitics and neoliberalism. The fourth chapter is the findings from the data collected for the study. The fifth chapter is the analysis of the data using a theoretical framework and discussion of the findings.

CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW

Background on IBCs

In 1921, one of the earliest examples in the 20th century of an international branch campus was the Paris branch campus of Parsons School of Fine and Applied Arts (Parsons The New School for Design, 2012). This was followed by a few more campuses such as Florida State University's branch in Panama in 1957 (Montoto, 2013) and John Hopkins University's branch in Italy in 1955 (Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies - SAIS, n.d.). Growth of the number of branch campuses was slow until the 1980s when there was a rush to establish international branch campuses (IBCs) in Japan during an economic boom. Though for various reasons, many IBCs in Japan closed by the 1990s (Mock, 2005). The greatest growth in the total number of IBCs since the late 1990s has been in Asia, specifically China, and the Middle East (Kosmützky & Krücken, 2014; O'Malley, 2016). As of 2016, China has the most IBCs with 33 in operation followed by the United Arab Emirates with 31, followed by Singapore and Malaysia with 12 and Qatar with 11 (C-BERT, 2017; O'Malley, 2016).

There are approximately 247 IBCs currently in operation around the world, according to Cross-Border Education Research Team (C-BERT, 2017). While the majority of the home institutions are based in United Kingdom, United States, and Australia, postsecondary educational institutions from India and China are currently establishing IBCs (Wilkins & Huisman, 2012). The older IBCs are located in Europe while newer IBCs are located in Southeast Asia and the Middle East (Croom, 2011). Groupings of IBCs in educational hubs exist in Qatar, United Arab Emirates, Singapore, Hong Kong, and Malaysia (Aziz & Abdullah, 2014; Fox & Shamisi, 2014; Ibnouf, Dou, & Knight, 2014; Knight, 2014c; Knight & Morshidi, 2011;

Mok & Bodycott, 2014). Education hubs are subsidized by local government to encourage IBC establishment (Knight, 2014a).

In the literature, IBCs are also called satellite campuses, offshore campuses, offspring campuses, or foreign outposts. For this study, the definition of an IBC from The Cross-Border Education Research Team (C-BERT) at SUNY Albany is used. An IBC is “an entity that is owned, at least in part, by a foreign education provider; operated in the name of the foreign education provider; engages in at least some face-to-face teaching; and provides access to an entire academic program that leads to a credential awarded by the foreign education provider” (C-BERT, 2017, para. 1).

Establishment of IBCs

There are several motivating factors for establishing an IBC. For most institutions, it is seen as a form of revenue generation for the home institution (Croom, 2011, 2012; Gibb, 2012; Humfrey, 2013; Knight, 2007, 2011a, 2011b, Lane, 2011a, 2011c; Sakamoto & Chapman, 2011; Wilkins & Huisman, 2012). Some institutions perceive an IBC as increasing the global branding of an institution (Knight, 2014b) and with increasing an institution’s reputation and prestige (Croom, 2012; Egron-Polak, 2013; Knight, 2007, 2014b). Also, for some institutions, part of their mission is to be more international which an IBC can symbolize (Croom, 2012). However, none of these factors from the home institution perspective included a desire to meet the higher education needs of the host country. Establishing an IBC should factor in whether there is a demand for the programs for sufficient enrollment. IBCs usually meet an increased demand for higher education not met by local educational institutions (Larsen, Vincent-Lancrin, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, & Centre for Educational Research and Innovation, 2004; Wilkins & Balakrishnan, 2012). While not part of the rationale for

establishing an IBC, often the IBC becomes a “de facto cultural embassy” in regards to economic and political relations (Knight, 2007). This is especially the case if the IBC is a United States, Australian or British institution (Lane, 2011a).

The rationale for establishing an IBC affects the implementation and administration of the host campus. The local context of a host campus is another consideration. For example, the host country regulations affects both the home campus and the host campus (Lane, 2011a). Cultural tensions between the home campus and the host campus range from arranging meetings with time zone differences to a lack of understanding local customs or expectations regarding various issues (Lane, 2011a). In addition, the host campus facility may want to incorporate local customs such as having separate areas for men and women in dining halls if needed, wearing appropriate attire or demonstrating appropriate behavior on religious holidays (Lane, 2011a). Tensions from cultural differences can result in misunderstandings and complications for both the home campus and the host campus. Establishing an IBC entails an awareness of both home campus interests and local cultural customs in order to provide an equitable educational experience for the students. Franklin and Alzouebi (2014) found that UAE IBCs should take into consideration how to respect Islamic values, but government priorities for education should be taken into consideration as well. From a home campus perspective, Wilkins and Huisman (2012) found the perception that establishing an IBC takes away funding and focus from the home campus.

Funding of IBCs

IBCs are often reliant on student tuition for operating funds and receive assistance in the form of either financial support or infrastructure from local governmental entities. Self-funding means that the IBC is subject to market mechanisms (Farrugia, 2013; Lane, 2011a). For example,

Australia has claimed an 8 to 10 percent profit on its cross-border operations (Fielden, 2013). Although Fielden (2013) questioned how the profit is calculated, ensuring a profit margin means that operations must meet a local demand along with running an efficient operation. In McNamara et al. (2013), 13 of 25 study countries offered financial incentives such as providing facilities or low to no taxes to encourage establishment of cross-border education in their countries. Lane and Kinser (2013) found that the most common facilities model was wholly owned facilities followed by the government owning the campus, private investors, renting (in Europe or Dubai), or academic partners who host the campus (in Asia and Middle East). These incentives make establishing an IBC more attractive especially if startup costs are lower or infrastructure expenditures are reduced over time.

Market for IBCs

The market for IBCs is established because of a need to increase local educational capacity (Croom, 2011; Egron-Polak, 2013; Knight, 2007; Sakamoto & Chapman, 2011). IBCs are easier to establish than a new public institution and often governments are reluctant to expand local higher education due to financial considerations (Lien, 2008). However, the market demand for higher education is not the only consideration when establishing an IBC. For example, India's complex regulations make it difficult for IBCs although there is a high demand for education (Wilkins & Huisman, 2012). Wilkins and Huisman (2012) also noted that, at the time, there were only 6 international branch campuses in Africa though there is significant demand for higher education. In most countries, IBCs can be in direct competition against local providers, public or private (Lane, 2011a). This puts local providers possibly at a disadvantage from IBC competition.

Growth of IBCs since 1980s

During the 1980s, United States higher education institutions rushed to establish IBCs in Japan during an economic boom (Mock, 2005). Chambers and Cummings (1990) surveyed 100 cases of United States institutions who had either considered, negotiated, or established an IBC in Japan during the 1980s. Chambers and Cummings (1990) found a climate of opportunism among the institutions which was influenced by an information gap, a regulatory gap, and an opportunity for financial gain at the expense of others. Ohmori (2004) estimates that 40 IBCs were left by the early 1990s. In 2014, there are only three IBCs in Japan (C-BERT, 2017). Mock (2005) writes that the financial and social/academic expectations on both sides of the partnerships were responsible for the boom. The expectations of profitability and sustainability were unreasonable and the partnerships lacked a shared understanding and goals. Mock (2005) also provided a theory that there was a deliberate intention to invite United States institutions to meet the needs of a temporary boom of Japanese youth. When the boom was over, the United States institutions would fail and the Japanese higher education system would be untouched. While this theory is difficult to prove, it does provide a cautionary tale about profit motives and entering into educational partnerships.

After the majority of the IBCs in Japan had closed, the global number of IBCs was approximately 50 by the end of the 1990s (Lane, 2011a). This has grown to approximately 247 IBCs currently in operation around the world (C-BERT, 2017).

Increasingly, IBCs are found in educational hubs (Knight, 2011a). Educational hubs have several IBCs within a geographic area and usually offer financial or regulatory incentives to establish an IBC in the hub. Knight (2011a) defines an educational hub as “a concerted and planned effort by a country (or zone, city) to build a critical mass of education/knowledge actors

and strengthen its efforts to exert more influence in the new marketplace of education” (p. 225). Countries with active education hubs are Qatar, United Arab Emirates, Singapore, Hong Kong and Malaysia (Kinser & Lane, 2010; Knight, 2014c; Lane & Kinser, 2011). Other countries such as Bahrain, Sri Lanka, Botswana, Mauritius, and South Korea have declared their intentions to have an educational hub, but they have yet to fully develop them (Knight, 2011a, 2014a). Knight (2014a) categorizes the different types of hubs into student, knowledge/innovation, and talent hubs. Each category has different motivational forces behind them as illustrated in the following examples (Knight, 2014c). A talent hub, such as in Qatar, seeks to attract students and scholars to stay in the country and increase the country’s knowledge economy. A knowledge/innovation hub, such as in Singapore, seeks to attract educational institutions and researchers to the country to increase the knowledge economy. The student hub, such as in Hong Kong, seeks to attract regional students to attend hub institutions. These hubs and the incentives to establish them are a force behind the growth in IBCs.

Rationale for the Establishment of an IBC

While some local or national governments provide incentives for establishing IBCs in an educational hub, there are other motivating factors for the home institutions. For most institutions, an IBC is seen as a form of revenue generation for the home institution (Croom, 2011, 2012; Gibb, 2012; Humfrey, 2013; Knight, 2007, 2011b; Lane, 2011a; Sakamoto & Chapman, 2011; Wilkins & Huisman, 2012). In a time of declining national and state funding internationally, IBCs may provide an opportunity to diversifying funding sources. For some institutions, an IBC is seen as increasing their global brand (Knight, 2014b), reputation or prestige (Croom, 2012; Egron-Polak, 2013; Knight, 2007, 2014b). For other institutions, an IBC fulfills part of their mission is to be more international (Croom, 2012). For example, according to

the president of New York University, NYU is creating a “global network university” (Wildavsky, 2010, p. 44) which increases their brand and the international nature of their programs.

All IBCs are meeting either an increased demand for higher education or an unmet demand (Larsen et al., 2004; Wilkins & Balakrishnan, 2012). The demand defines the market for the IBCs and their programs (Croom, 2011; Egron-Polak, 2013; Knight, 2007; Sakamoto & Chapman, 2011). Often governments are reluctant to fund the expansion of local higher education and IBCs are more efficient to establish than a local institution (Lien, 2008). IBCs are highly market driven and cannot be successful without meeting a demand. Business and information technology programs are often offered in cross-border education because of the high market demand and low cost of delivery (Pimpa, 2009; Ziguras & McBurnie, 2011).

In most countries, IBCs are in direct competition against local public or private providers (Lane, 2011a). This puts local providers possibly at a disadvantage from IBC competition. Khoury (2013) found that there was a perception in Qatar that the IBCs were considered for elite students while Qatar University, the federal institution, was for average or above-average students. This competition also exists between IBCs in the case of educational hubs. However, the market demand for higher education is not the only consideration when establishing an IBC. Governmental regulations have to be considered as well. While there is a high demand for education in India, India’s complex regulations on both state and national levels make it difficult to establish IBCs (Wilkins & Huisman, 2012). This has resulted in many “twinning” programs by offering a curriculum with an Indian partner instead of an independent campus (Wildavsky, 2010). In Africa, while there is a significant unmet demand, currently there are only fifteen IBCs (C-BERT, 2017). The lack of IBC profitability in Africa is a factor in the low number of IBCs.

Monash University's South Africa campus was signed over to a private entity in 2013 after the Australian University had a net loss of 60.5 million Australian dollars between 2001 and 2013 (Victorian Auditor-General's Office, 2014). Carnegie Mellon's Rwandan campus could be considered an aid initiative, however the Rwandan government has committed to contribute \$95 million US dollars over a 10-year period to attract the IBC (Wilhelm, 2011).

For the host country, IBCs can meet the local need for skilled workers. Students may stay locally rather than going abroad for an education and end up staying abroad (Croom, 2011; Knight, 2011b, 2014b). IBCs can help avoid brain drain (Lien, 2008). However, some students may see a foreign credential as an easier path to emigration rather than a reason to stay locally. An example of building local knowledge economy is the educational hub, Dubai International Academic City. The local government offers IBCs tax-free operations, repatriation of profits, and foreigner ownership to IBCs (Croom, 2011). However, IBC facilities are rented at a high cost (Owens & Lane, 2014). Another example, The British University in Dubai, in a recent press release was recognized as a "learning affiliate" of the Energy Institute, a professional entity for the energy industry (Dubai International Academic City, 2014). This relationship increases the resources and professional networking in the region for their sustainable energy program.

Benefits of the Establishment of an IBC

The market for IBCs is defined by a demand to increase local educational capacity for various reasons (Croom, 2011; Egron-Polak, 2013; Knight, 2007; Sakamoto & Chapman, 2011). IBCs are faster to establish than a local institution and often governments are reluctant to expand local higher education due to financial considerations (Lien, 2008). The IBC comes with an established reputation and developed curriculum to meet the demand.

An IBC is an opportunity to earn an international degree for students who cannot either afford to study abroad or choose not to for various reasons. The lower cost of an IBC versus studying abroad is attractive to those who can afford one but not the other (McNamara & Knight, 2014). Some students chose an IBC because they want to remain close to family, and some have religious, gender or political reasons for not living overseas (Humfrey, 2013; Wilkins & Balakrishnan, 2012). In some societies, women would not travel abroad to attend a foreign university; therefore an IBC is a welcome option to attain a foreign degree (Wilkins & Balakrishnan, 2012). For example, females are the majority of students at The University of Calgary-Qatar (Lemke-Westcott & Johnson, 2013).

Studying abroad is one cause of brain drain for developing countries (Lien, 2008). Not only are the students leaving and staying abroad, but their families are paying an educational institution abroad rather than spending the money in their home country (McBurnie & Ziguras, 2001). By having students attend a local IBC, the newly credentialed workers will be more inclined to stay locally rather than staying abroad (Croom, 2011; Knight, 2011b, 2014b). Farrugia and Lane (2013) noted that meeting local industry needs was listed in the mission statements of some IBCs, and local industry was listed as a stakeholder. For example, University of Nevada-Las Vegas (UNLV) Singapore took a unique approach with their hospitality program by requiring students to complete an internship in the field and 1,000 work hours working on committees and hosting conferences (Jordan, 2011). UNLV has since discontinued the program with its Singapore partner, who will now open as a university on its own (Formoso, 2013).

While not part of the rationale for establishing an IBC, often the IBC becomes a “de facto cultural embassy” in regards to economic and political relations (Knight, 2007). This is especially the case if the IBC is from the United States, Australia or the United Kingdom (Lane,

2011a). This form of outreach furthers the understanding between both communities. For example, the Houston Community College cross-border partnership with Saigon Tech was touted by a Vietnamese official as helping normalize relations between the two countries (Spangler & Tyler, 2011).

The establishment of an IBC also benefits the home campus. Khoury (2013) found that since faculty from the home campus are teaching in a different environment, their teaching improves as they learn how students learn. When the faculty taught again at the home campus, they felt they were better teachers. Another benefit of IBCs are the local collaborations. IBCs in Qatar have local initiatives and research partnerships in Education City that allow the institutions to collaborate in Qatari society (Khoury, 2013). For example, there is an alternative energy research program based in Texas A&M's labs working to reduce Qatar's dependence on natural gas (Lindsey, 2011).

Curriculum and credentials that promote future employment are part of the attraction of IBCs. Although IBCs increase access to foreign education, they do not specifically reduce the brain drain issue for a country. Whether a student attains a degree from an IBC within the country or they attend abroad, the credential increases the student's mobility and their ability to gain employment globally (Sidhu & Christie, 2014). The attainment of an IBC credential is a commodity which can facilitate global mobility. To counteract this process, educational partnerships with local industries or labor markets could increase the likelihood that students will remain locally if desirable employment is available.

There is a perception that a "western" education is superior to local higher educational institutions (Cremonini, Epping, Westerheijden, & Vogelsang, 2012; Knight, 2014b). The perception is a proxy for quality. Egron-Polak (2013) and Knight (2007, 2014b) mentioned the

concern about degree mills or poor quality providers in cross-border education, which quality assurance through licensing or regulatory measures would hopefully eliminate (Altbach & Knight, 2007). While IBCs benefit from the branding of a “western” education, they also need to comply with local quality assurance measures.

While quality varies, an IBC can never completely recreate the experience at the home institution. IBCs are a different experience than at the home campus and may be a diminished experience (Boyle, McDonnell, Mitchell, & Nicholas, 2012; Farrugia, 2013). IBCs have different cultural contexts, student populations, and faculty which all contribute to a different environment. For example, the policies, processes, or procedures which are effective on the home campus may not work on the host campus (Kinser & Lane, 2013). Not only is the physical and social experience different, the skill sets of incoming students are different. For example, in the Gulf States region, secondary education may be Indian, Emirati, American or British, each which develops a different skill set (Farrugia, 2013). This results in challenges in the classroom for faculty who may expect a specific set of skills.

Cross-Border Faculty

In cross-border higher education, curriculum is usually developed and exported to another country for delivery either by local faculty or home campus staff as “fly-in” faculty. The majority of the literature regarding cross-border faculty focuses on delivery of cross-border education to Asia-Pacific region. Some of the literature was studies on delivery to Middle Eastern countries (D. Chapman, Austin, Farah, Wilson, & Ridge, 2014; Jauregui, 2013; Lazen, 2016; McNamara et al., 2013; K. Smith, 2009). “Fly-in/fly-out” or “flying faculty” are faculty who fly to the host campus for a short period of intensive teaching to deliver content for a course (Aiello & Clarke, 2010; Jais, 2012; Seah & Edwards, 2006; K. Smith, 2013, 2014). The course is

then supported locally by a teaching team of tutors or distance education methods for the duration of the course. Another arrangement is faculty employed at the partner facility. In some instances, the local faculty may be from the home institution (Altbach, 2011). Otherwise, faculty are hired specifically to teach at the partner facility. Since the curricula to be delivered were developed at the home campus, the faculty may or may not need the same credentials as those on the home campus. The availability of faculty is also affected by visa requirements in the host country, which some countries such as Qatar assist with to encourage IBCs (McNamara et al., 2013).

A portion of IBC faculty are expatriates. Their motivations for teaching at an IBC vary. Laigo (2013) found that in a small study of American faculty at Qatar IBCs, motivational factors included attractive financial incentives, seeking new adventures, and those seeking a change. D. Chapman, Austin, Farah, Wilson, and Ridge (2014) found that at federal and state universities in the United Arab Emirates, expatriate faculty were motivated to seek new adventures, be near family in the region, move away from an unpleasant situation, or to live an ethnically diverse location. In most instances, the hiring at an IBC is usually controlled or approved from the home campus (Shams & Huisman, 2014).

One model of curriculum delivery method at IBCs is having home campus faculty “fly-in” to the host campus to deliver condensed lectures over the period of a few days. For the rest of the term, local tutors deliver the rest of the curriculum. This teaching model, called “flying faculty” or “fly-in/fly-out” model is used where IBCs are within several hours flight time of the home campus. The model includes a home campus, a faculty member who flies in for a day or several days of intensive teaching followed by instruction and support from a local staff member. These degree programs are usually franchise or twinning programs (McNamara et al., 2013). For

example, Australian faculty can fly to the Asia Pacific campuses and teach a day of classes for a course (Dunn & Wallace, 2004). United Kingdom faculty also fly to Middle Eastern host campuses as well (K. Smith, 2014). However, Dunn and Wallace (2004) found that students preferred Australian faculty over tutors who deliver the majority of the curriculum. Because home campus faculty may be reluctant to relocate, the “fly-in” model allows faculty to remain at the home campus while delivering curriculum in another country (Shams & Huisman, 2014). Smith (2014) reported that faculty found this model to be physically demanding, increased their workload, lacked faculty development/support, and institutions looked for financial benefits rather than providing enriching experiences. Gribble and Ziguras (2003) study respondents also commented on the physical demanding nature and increased workload at the expense of research and publishing. Aiello and Clarke (2010) found that the “fly-in” faculty were positive about their experience however effective support of the faculty and effective learning strategies needed to be considered.

Faculty who live nearby and teach at a host campus may be from home campus or home campus faculty may participate in the selection of individuals who deliver the curriculum (Hughes, 2011). Altbach (2011) stated that having home campus faculty teach at the IBC is crucial emulating the experience and culture of the home campus. Pyvis (2008) found that faculty at a Mauritian partner institution were not familiar with the teaching methods and expectations of “English-speaking” institutions (p. 232-233), although they were required to be fluent in both English and French. English may be the faculty members’ second or third language which may affect the delivery of the curriculum (Dobos, 2011). In addition to language issues, in the United Arab Emirates, non-Emeriti faculty usually only have three-year residency visas

which can discourage commitment to the institution and personal development (D. Chapman et al., 2014; L. Smith, 2009).

Some cross-border faculty have had misunderstandings about their responsibilities, workload, and pedagogy at cross-border education institutions (D. Chapman & Sakamoto, 2011; McNamara et al., 2013; National Tertiary Education Union Policy & Research Unit, 2004). Chapman and Pyvis (2013) found in their study that the Malaysian host campus faculty felt inferior in terms of pay and support from the university while Australian home campus faculty felt that host campus was an additional workload that was in competition to their home campus work since it was not acknowledged with additional funds or release time. Dobos (2011; 2013) also found that a Malaysian host campus faculty workload was an issue due to a heavy teaching load with the addition of administrative duties.

Two major themes in the literature regarding cross-border faculty are the need for communication between institutions and professional development. Dunn and Wallace (2008) concluded that “effective communication holds the key to success in transnational education” (p. 252). The delivery of curricula by a remote staff requires communication between the home institution staff and the delivering staff regarding the course materials to be delivered (A. Chapman & Pyvis, 2013; Dobos et al., 2013; O’Mahony, 2014). The communication between campuses varied in terms of timeliness, intercultural understanding, and effectiveness (Clay & Minett-Smith, 2012; Dobos, 2011; Heffernan & Poole, 2005; Lazen, 2016). A. Chapman and Pyvis (2013) found that strong bonds were formed between an Australian home campus and a Malaysian branch campus faculty who addressed major issues with telephone communications while ordinary communications were handled by email. Communication beyond just emails between the host and home campus faculty fostered greater trust and confidence between both

home campus and host campus personnel (A. Chapman & Pyvis, 2013; Heffernan & Poole, 2005; Keevers et al., 2014). However, Dobos et al. (2013) found in a case study that host campus faculty would prefer to talk with home campus staff, however very few had access to phones to call the home campus.

Email was the dominant form of communication which was occasionally problematic at times due to cultural differences and language usage (Dobos et al., 2013; Spencer-Oatey, 2013). In a Sino-British partnership, “cultural mediators” became necessary to interpret the meaning of emails due to background and cultural differences (Spencer-Oatey, 2013). Timeliness regarding email responses is an issue for both campus faculty (Clay & Minett-Smith, 2012; Heffernan & Poole, 2005). From a United Kingdom home campus perspective, Clay and Minett-Smith (2012) found that transparency regarding decision-making was also important to foster trust and understanding between the two campuses. This trust developed over time with personnel who remained with the institution.

Respondents in Dobos’ (2013) study stated that some issues are only solved with face-to-face communication. Both campuses’ faculties appreciated faculty visits although cost, time, and availability were often cited as barriers to travel (A. Chapman & Pyvis, 2013). Heffernan and Poole (2005) proposes that the benefits to visits between the campuses outweigh the costs, especially in an Asian context. Dobos (2011) found while the number of Australian home campus faculty visits to the host campus had been reduced, the recent increase in the Malaysian campus faculty visits to the home campus had been a positive development.

Professional development ranges from pre-departure orientation to ongoing development and from informal to formal activities. Gribble and Ziguras (2003) and Gopal (2011) discuss pre-departure orientation and proposed that on-going, actual experience may be more effective. Allen

(2014) and Bovill, Jordan, and Watters (2014) found that the cultural context of the faculty development and student learning styles were important to understand the classroom expectations and in measuring the effectiveness of the programs. Jauregui (2013) found that in Qatar IBCs informal information sharing was common among faculty, however a more formal approach to faculty development regarding faculty-student interactions could be a more effective approach to advance cross-cultural competencies. Spencer-Oatey (2013) advocated for teaching teams across campuses. This is reinforced by Keevers et al. (2014) who suggested building faculty development on the everyday work of the faculty who had been successful for respondents.

A. Chapman and Pyvis (2013) found that while the home university had developed a learning program about internationalization of the curriculum, the host campus faculty felt the program was intended for home campus faculty. The host campus faculty in this case study desired more informal learning and course-specific orientation opportunities. In Hicks and Jarrett's (2008) study of a Malaysian and Australian partnership, faculty development originated with an asynchronous approach that developed into joint research projects on student-learning as equal partners. Gribble and Ziguras (2003) found in their study that the experience of teaching was more valuable to faculty than any formal pre-departure training. The respondents in Gribble and Ziguras' (2003) study were confident in dealing with cultural diversity and saw little difference teaching abroad or at home because of their experience teaching international students. They did however agree that "lecturers also need to develop an understanding of the cultural, political, legal and economic contexts of each country in which they are teaching" (p. 210). Referring to Australian cross-border campuses, Leask, Hicks, Kohler, and King (2005) describe "offshore [cross-border] teaching is as much an intercultural encounter as it is an

educational encounter. Off-shore [cross-border] teaching occurs in a dynamic intercultural space where meaning must be negotiated, interaction is effortful and the results are often not as either participant expects” (p. 33). Crosling (2012) notes that new faculty orientation becomes a foundation for a common understanding between the different campuses’ faculty members. Such a foundation assists in assessment and communicating learning outcomes.

While student learning styles should be considered, faculty teaching styles also affect student learning. In the delivery of an Australian business degree in China, the teaching staff had to work to teach to a “western” method of student learning styles (Pyvis, 2011). For example, the exam methods were not familiar to the students. Rather than adjusting the methods to reflect how learning takes place in China, the students were required to adjust to the Australian methods. Heffernan, Morrison, Basu, and Sweeney (2010) advocated for administrators and educators to understand the cultural differences to effectively deliver cross-border curricula. Dobos (2011) found that for some faculty, the Australian institution’s approach varied greatly from some faculty’s prior experience in terms of student-centered approach and different unit content. For example, Dunn and Wallace (2004) highlight the difference in learning styles between the East Asian beginning with the known information and a “western” approach beginning with an exploration of the unknown. The cultural difference can make group work difficult for those uncomfortable with the “western” approach. In Hamza (2010), female academics in the Gulf Region modified their teaching as their cross-cultural awareness increased. This resulted in engaging students with different learning styles than what they may have experienced prior to higher education. In another approach, Chinese academic staff from an Australian university program were trained at the home campus to encourage similar approaches to delivering the curriculum (Pyvis, 2011).

The power differential between the home campus and host campus has been described as one like a “parent-child” relationship (Clay & Minett-Smith, 2012; Dobos, 2011; Dobos et al., 2013; Edwards, Crosling, & Lim, 2014). The host campus faculty lacks the equity with their home campus counterparts regarding curriculum, grading, orientation, and faculty development. In relation to power inequalities, Keevers et al. (2014) found that there was a perceived higher value of formal qualifications which host campus faculty often lacked although they had more experience in cross-border education programs. Dobos (2013) reported that lack of long-term contracts, job security, and occasionally high turnover rates of faculty at the host campus made developing relationships difficult for both groups .

Cross-Border Curricula

The curriculum delivered at the IBC usually has been developed at the home campus that has a different cultural perspective. While a curriculum can have home country references removed, the result may confuse students by being too “universal” and lack context and practicality (Ziguras, 2008). Altbach (2004) describes the MBA degree program with its structured curriculum as fundamentally American because it was designed as preparation for work in the United States business sector. Also, classroom activities, such as group work, need careful consideration when there is a mixed culture group (Leask, 2008). Dobos (2011) found that a flexible approach is happening in some programs, but it is not possible for others.

While IBCs expand higher education options in a country, the curriculum is often driven by market demands, such as offering business degrees rather than degrees designed to meet local needs, such as health care programs (McNamara et al., 2013). In order to attract those who can pay for the education, most programs are professionally oriented such as business or engineering, and lower demand programs such as humanities are established after enrollment quotas are met

(Lane, 2011a). Knight (2007, 2011b, 2014b) contends that the professionally oriented programs are a form of cultural hegemony rather than internationalization of higher education. One model to address this issue of inequity is the inclusion of curricula that are locally relevant. For example, none of the IBCs in the United Arab Emirates offer a degree in Islamic art history although design classes are taught (Fox & Shamisi, 2014). Bolton and Nie (2010) noted that the expectations of various stakeholders ranging from students, parents, industry and the local government assign different values to a business education over time. In other countries, such as in Qatar, some topics were deemed too controversial at the branch campus and were avoided by the faculty (Prowse & Goddard, 2010).

Because the curriculum offered comes from the home campus and is taught in another context, the curriculum may have the same outcomes but the responses may be different. Whittaker (2008) found that students' reflective writing assignments in Zambia did not produce the similar results as the same assignments in the United Kingdom. The context of poverty and disease were avoided unintentionally in the assignment although they were a significant part of the future teachers' experience. Tange (2008) found that students may not participate in a discussion for various reasons ranging from difficulty or lack of confidence in speaking English to different expectations when discussion should take place as part of learning. These cultural norms change the academic experience. Chapman and Pyvis (2013) found in their study of a Malaysian branch campus that since both the home campus and host campus supported modifications to curriculum to the local context, the course materials were modified for student backgrounds and local environment in negotiation with both faculty groups. The negotiation included contributions to developing the curriculum as well. Later, the curricular modifications were incorporated into the overall curriculum taught at the home and host campuses. Dunn and

Wallace (2004) reported that when faculty returned to the home campus, they would make changes to their teaching upon their return. In a wider context, Dobos (2011) found at a Malaysian host campus that the high number of international students limited the extent to which the curriculum could be localized. In Hamza (2010), female academics incorporated their Gulf Region classroom experiences into their American classrooms.

One method of addressing cultural issues is through national regulations. In Malaysia, in an effort to address cultural concerns about non-Malaysian education, IBCs are required by law to teach courses in Malaysian Studies, Islamic studies for Muslim students, and moral education for non-Muslim students (McBurnie & Ziguras, 2001). Malaysian citizens are required to pass the classes in order to graduate. These courses are an attempt to address the “western” nature of the IBC experience and to localize the experience. A Malaysian branch campus of a large Australian university decided to expand the local curriculum to include courses that took advantage of the local expertise and environs (Crosling, 2011). Courses included Islamic economic development, Asian business strategy, and tropical biology. The courses were intended to increase local ownership and engagement of faculty and students (Crosling, 2011). This independence increased the local academic freedom at the IBC, which previously may have been unavailable (Edwards et al., 2014). L. Smith (2009) found that when a UAE branch campus became an autonomous university due to accreditation, it allowed the branch campus to become more independent and faculty felt more respected.

Dobos (2011) found that host campus faculty would not receive curriculum materials in a timely manner and would have to create their own. While faculty appreciated creating their own materials, there was uncertainty if the materials would be equivalent to the home campus delivery. In Shams and Huisman’s (2014) study of IBCs in Singapore and Malaysia, course

materials were usually only modified by local faculty in terms of case studies and providing a region focus. However, Shams and Huisman (2014) note that the curricular core, delivery, and assessments are tightly controlled by the home campus overall.

Assessment and quality assurance within a cross-border context are used to ensure comparability with the home institution program. The issue of equivalency is highly important in cross-border higher education. Whether the faculty come from the home campus (K. Smith, 2014) or have been hired specifically to teach at an IBC, there are tensions regarding the equivalency of the outcomes of the courses. Dobos (2013) notes that at the home campus, both local Malaysian quality assurance regulations and those of the home campus' Australian quality assurance regulations effect the host campus. Shams and Huisman (2014) found that the dual audit for a Malaysian campus were not difficult except for the large amount of paperwork involved.

According to the literature, grading of student work was another faculty issue. For example, Keever et al. (2014) reported tensions between issues of equivalency and the need to fit the local context. As another example, in Dobos' (2011) study, the grading takes place at the home campus. This results in disenfranchisement of the host campus faculty, who are responsible for teaching the material, but not delivering the final student grades. Further disenfranchisement of host campus faculty occurs when adjustments to grades happen after the course is complete (Wallace et al., 2011).

IBCs have increased in the last few decades for different rationale and benefits for the locale of the host campus and the home institution. This study focused on the faculty and curriculum delivery in a cross-border context. The next chapter discusses the methodology of the case study approach, data analysis, theoretical framework, limitations and scope of the study,

reliability and validity, research positionality and reflexivity, and ethical considerations of the study.

CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

This study utilizes the single case approach to elicit faculty perceptions of curriculum delivery at IBCs. A single case approach was selected due to the uniqueness of IBCs regarding both the host and home campus along with the context of their geographical locations. The case was selected based on the criteria of a branch campus in Europe with a home campus in the United States. According to C-BERT (2017), the two largest exporters of branch campuses are the United States and the United Kingdom. The criteria of a campus in Europe was selected due to the scarcity of studies done in the European region along with the mature nature of European IBCs. Typically, IBCs in Europe have been operating for several decades. The administrative and academic issues reflect a longer operations rather than issues of initial development such as with an IBC in the United Arab Emirates and Asia Pacific which have been operating for only a decade or so. Two institutions that met the criteria of a European host campus and United States home campus were invited by the author to participate in the study. One declined to participate for unstated reasons while the second was interested in participating. The study IBC was located in a major European city.

The qualitative approach was selected because it allows for greater understanding of the individuals working with and at the IBC (Maxwell, 2005). Because IBCs are a global phenomenon, the case study approach moves beyond describing IBCs on a macro-level to giving voice to the individual faculty members at an IBC and their roles on a more micro-level. Using purposeful sampling, the data were collected directly from individual faculty members and several administrators on both the host and home campuses. This provides a greater understanding about their roles within their specific context. Semi-structured interviews, along with observations, both in the classroom and on campus, were collected within the context of the

IBC and the home campus. This context is important to allow both the interviewees and the researcher to engage within the case under study. Document analysis further supported the data gathering as needed. Documents included institutional documents (i.e. accreditation reports, strategic planning reports, organizational charts, etc.), policy and procedure statements, and minutes of various faculty committees. This additional information provided a greater understanding of the decision making process and further information on faculty matters.

The single case study approach enabled the study of a particular institution and examination of curriculum delivery which is not well illustrated in IBC literature. In the case of curriculum delivery, perceptions may vary by institution and campus location. In this case, the data compared curriculum delivery within a single institution at two locations. This focus was on two programs' curriculum and the different and similar perceptions of individuals between the host campus and the home campus. Because there are only a few higher education institutions with a European IBC, the selection of the single-case study was limited and dependent on an institution's willingness to participate in the study. As Stake (1995) writes, "the real business of case study is particularization, not generalization" (p. 8). The selection of the single case study is to learn about faculty perceptions at a single IBC, but not to make large generalizations about IBCs around the globe. The single case study "obtains descriptions and interpretations of others" (Stake, 1995, p. 64).

The sampling process for faculty delivering curriculum was based on the individuals within two selected programs, Program A and Program B, and their willingness to participate. The programs were selected with consultation of the European campus' senior administrator based on faculty size and collaboration with the home campus. The selection process extended to the same two selected programs at the home campus in the United States. However, the faculty

contacted at the U.S. campus were selected based on having taught undergraduate courses in the program to ensure a parallel curricular experience. Those who volunteered or accepted the invitation for an interview or classroom observation were part of the sample.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is the examination of curriculum delivery, at the program-level and course-level, by faculty and the factors influencing the delivery of curriculum at an IBC. The study takes into account the curriculum delivery at the home campus of the same two programs. Through this qualitative study, faculty perceptions through interviews and classroom observations are analyzed to elucidate factors and influences on curriculum delivery at an IBC. These may be explained through differences and similarities between data collected at the home campus and the host campus. This analysis benefits stakeholders, administrators, faculty and students who seek to understand how to improve IBC's effectiveness regarding curriculum development, delivery and assessment. While this study has a small sample size, the information gleaned provides information for further study of the topic.

Research Questions

This study involved faculty at an international branch campus and its home campus regarding their roles in curriculum delivery. This study focuses on the faculty perceptions of curriculum delivery, since higher education is about student learning, which is about the interaction between faculty and students. The following are the three research questions guiding this study:

R1: How does curriculum delivery occur at an international branch campus? How does the delivery compare with that which occurs at the home campus? If it does differ, what are the differences and why do they occur?

R2: How involved are faculty — at international branch campuses and the home campus — in curriculum development and improvement? How are decisions made regarding the curriculum and delivery and what are faculty’s role in the process?

R3: What are faculty perceptions of their role regarding curriculum within the institution? What factors influence their perceptions?

Case Study Approach

The study uses the case study approach to examine a single institution and its home campus and host campus. Stake (1995) states that “case study is the study of the particularity and complexity of a single case, coming to understand its activity within important circumstances” (p. xi). Since IBCs have numerous variables, a single case study allowed for a depth of analysis within a single context. This study is a within-case study providing depth to the understanding of faculty delivering curriculum at the program- and course-level at an IBC.

The study site was selected as a typical case study. According to Gerring (2008), “the typical case exemplifies what is considered to be a typical set of values, given some general understanding of a phenomenon” (p. 649). The selection of a U.S. home campus reflects the U.S. as the largest exporter of IBCs according to C-BERT (2017). The host campus was selected from the list of C-BERT branch campuses which met their definition of an IBC.

Case Study Description

This single case study is of curriculum delivery at Midwest Christian University (MCU). The study participants includes faculty at both its U.S. campus and its European branch campus. This study site was selected due to the mature nature of the European campus, with decades of operational experience, which adds to the understanding of IBCs’ operations.

MCU was founded as a Christian institution over 150 years ago. The institution offers undergraduate, masters, doctorates and certificates in a variety of fields with an emphasis on research. The main campus is located in an urban area of the midwestern United States. The majority of MCU students attend its main campus; however some of its professional schools are located on their own campuses within the same urban area.

While MCU offers degrees from bachelors to doctorates at its U.S. campus, the European campus offers a bachelor's degree and a few masters' degrees in select programs. MCU is accredited by a U.S. accrediting agency. Additionally, the European campus is accredited by the country's higher education agency. The European campus of MCU has evolved over the decades of its operation. The European campus initially collaborated with local higher education institutions to offer classes for MCU study abroad students. It then began offering courses to local students in addition to their study abroad students. It then evolved into a feeder school, where students could take the first two years of courses at the campus and then finish their degree at the home campus. In the 1990s, the European campus began offering entire undergraduate degrees. The campus now offers a few masters degrees as well.

The European campus student body is comprised of students who are seeking a degree solely at the European campus, short-term study abroad students from the U.S. campus, and study abroad students from a few other U.S. institutions. MCU and other U.S. students can attend the European campus for one or two semesters. MCU students do not need to transfer the courses while non-MCU students need to transfer the courses from MCU to their own institution. Student registration takes place in the same student information system, irrespective of the MCU campus. This enables students to study abroad and continue completing major requirements or courses while abroad. The ease with which students can study at the European campus furthers the

attraction of the European campus to MCU. It is considered a benefit to the institution since it encourages students to study abroad who may not be able to otherwise due to their required major course work. The European campus is part of the international identity of MCU. The study abroad students and the degree-seeking students' experiences are enriched by the diversity of students and their experiences and outside of the classroom.

After an initial discussion with the senior European campus administrator, I selected two social science programs, Program A and Program B, for the study. At the time of the study, Program A and Program B were the second and third most popular majors at the European campus after Business Administration¹. The selection of only two programs provided comparison data along with an appropriate sample size for this study. Both programs had active faculty exchange programs, with U.S. campus faculty teaching at the European campus almost every year. The programs also communicated regularly with their counterparts at the U.S. campus.

The European campus programs had fewer faculty than at the U.S. campus due to the number and type of degrees offered. At the European campus, Program A had four full-time faculty and Program B had three full-time faculty. Both programs had several instructors who only taught a single class each term; however none of them participated in the study². Program A's and B's faculty at the main campus each numbered more than fifteen full-time faculty. Interviewed faculty at the U.S. campus were academically ranked and several participants were tenured. In contrast, the European campus faculty did not have rank nor have opportunities for tenure, which is the norm for higher education faculty in the country. European campus faculty

¹ Faculty from the Business Administration program on the U.S. campus were contacted by the author but no one responded to the invitation for participation.

² Although two part-time European campus faculty did respond to the request for an interview, neither one could schedule a time to meet while the author was at the European campus.

are subject to the country's national labor laws which ascribe a certain level of benefits and job security. The Faculty Handbook for MCU specifically states that the European campus faculty are not governed by the Faculty Handbook because they are subject to the country's law and policies. Additionally, according to the Faculty Handbook, the European campus faculty have a separate employment contract than the U.S. campus faculty.

Description of Participants

Administrators and faculty from both campuses participated in this study for a total of 16 participants, eight men and eight women. Table One outlines the description of the participants.

Table 1

Study Participant Descriptions by Campus with Totals

Descriptor	Total Number of Participants	European Campus Participants	U.S. Campus Participants
Faculty	12	5	7
Administrator	4	2	2
Male	8	4	4
Female	8	3	5
Program A ^a	6	2	4
Program B	7	3	4
Taught at other MCU campus	6	0	6
Classroom observations	5	3	2
Employed at MCU <5 years	5	4	1
Employed at MCU 5-9 years	5	1	4
Employed at MCU >10 years	6	2	4

^aOne administrator taught in Program A.

Regarding their employment at MCU, four participants had only worked for the institution for three years or less. Five participants had worked between five and 10 years for the institution. Six participants had worked for more than 10 years for MCU. Four U.S. campus faculty were tenured. All participants had doctoral degrees. Six faculty participants from the U.S. campus had taught courses at the European campus. All of the U.S. faculty participants had received their

doctorates from U.S. institutions. All of the European campus faculty participants except the administrators and a single faculty member had doctorates from European institutions.

The faculty who chose to participate were interviewed and some were also observed in the classroom. Two Program A faculty, Pete and Xavier, participated in the study at the European campus. Four Program A faculty, Mary, Maddie, Maxie and Pamela, participated in the study at the U.S. campus. The Program A chair at the European campus did not participate, however, the U.S. campus program chair, Maddie, did. The Program B chair at the European campus, Margaret, participated while the U.S. campus chair declined. Three Program B faculty, Anton, Petra, and Margaret, participated at the European campus. Three Program B faculty, Logan, Christopher, and Mandy, participated at the U.S. campus.

A total of five classroom observations were conducted. Three classroom observations were conducted at the European campus, one in Program A with Anton and two in Program B; one with Pete and one with Xavier. Two Program A classroom observations were conducted at the U.S. campus with Logan and Mandy. Program B faculty at the U.S. campus did not feel it would be appropriate to have an observer in their classes. All of the observations were of faculty who had been interviewed for the study.

Two administrators were interviewed at each campus. The participants at the European campus were the senior administrator, John, and the academic administrator, Alice. The participants at the U.S. campus were two academic affairs administrators, Charles and Robert. Both were familiar with the European campus and personnel. While I am referring to them as administrators, both of the U.S. campus administrators are ranked faculty and taught one course per year for the institution. Charles taught in Program A.

Qualitative Data Analysis

The data was coded upon completion of transcriptions of the interviews, classroom observations, and field notes. The qualitative analysis software, NVivo 11, was used to code and assist the analysis of the data. I noted trends and items of analysis while in the field and recorded them in field notes (Patton, 2002). The coding was based on trends or patterns identified in the data or based on the research questions (Yin, 2014). Two cycles of coding were completed. The first cycle was attribute coding and the second was values coding. Values coding included looking for values, attitudes and beliefs in the data (Saldaña, 2016).

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework for this study is neoliberalism and micropolitics. These two theories examine the influences and factors within the institution. This framework provides not just faculty perceptions, but analysis of the perceptions as to what influences these perspectives. On a macro-level, neoliberalism elucidates the issues regarding factors, such as market liberalization, market-driven decision making, and profit. Micropolitics focuses on the micro-level, the individual and the influences on their actions, not just the hierarchical structures or administrative decisions.

Micropolitics

Micropolitics was selected as part of the theoretical framework to analyze and identify the political struggles at an IBC regarding faculty and curriculum delivery. By analyzing these struggles through the lens of micropolitics, a type of organizational politics, the factors influencing curriculum delivery are articulated from within the institution rather than just on macro-level.

Educational institutions are often bureaucratic. In this case study, IBCs have their own bureaucracies and have the additional complexity of the home campus. As Ferguson (1984) writes,

Modern bureaucracies are sufficiently large so as to prohibit face-to-face relations among most of their members. They aim at arranging individuals and tasks so as to secure continuity and stability and to remove ambiguity in relations among participants, but are nonetheless usually beset by a variety of internal conflicts. In fact, bureaucracies are political arenas in which struggles for power, status, personal values and/or survival are endemic (p. 7).

The analysis of curriculum delivery with micropolitics focuses on the issues of power and its effect on curriculum delivery at an IBC.

Micropolitics, also known as micro-politics, grew out of organizational and political theory of the 20th century (Blase, 1991). Bacharach and Lawler (1980) connect politics and organizations in their title book, *Power and politics in the organization*.

Bacharach and Lawler (1980) write that:

An understanding of organisational politics requires an analysis of power, coalitions and bargaining. The power relationship is the context for political action and encompasses the most basic issues underlying organisational politics. As the primary mechanism through which individuals and subgroups acquire, maintain, and use power, coalitions crystallise and bring to the foreground the conflicting interests of organisational subgroups. Through bargaining, distinct coalitions attempt to achieve their political objectives and protect themselves from encroachments by opposing coalitions. Power, coalitions, and bargaining, therefore, constitute the three basic themes in our theoretical treatise on organizational politics (p. x).

Additionally, Bacharach and Lawler write that “organizational life is dominated by political interactions: politics in organizations involve the tactical use of power to retain or obtain control of real or symbolic resources” (1980, p. 1). While Bacharach and Lawler were interested in “discover[ing] under what conditions interest groups will form coalitions and how coalitions relate to each other politically” (1980, p. 9), micropolitics takes into account a variety of additional factors related to individuals actions within a situation.

One of the first works on micropolitics from a politics of education perspective was Iannaccone (1975). Iannaccone (1975) differentiated macro level politics of education of federal, state, and local from the micro level politics within the educational building or organization of interest groups and decision-making. Other major works on micropolitics in education include the Ball's (1987) *The Micro-Politics of the School*, Hoyle's (1982) *Micropolitics of Educational Organisations*, and Blase's (1991) work, *The Politics of Life in Schools: Power, Conflict and Cooperation*. Blase (1991) gives the following definition of micropolitics.

Micropolitics is the use of formal and informal power by individuals and groups to achieve their goals in organizations. In large part, political actions result from perceived differences between individuals and groups, coupled with the motivation to use power to influence and/or protect. Although such actions are consciously motivated, any action, consciously or unconsciously motivated, may have political "significance" in a given situation. Both cooperative and conflictive actions and processes are part of the realm of micropolitics. Moreover, macro- and micropolitical factors frequently interact. (p. 11)

Decisions regarding curriculum delivery have many factors. The use of micropolitics can "account for complexity, instability, and conflict in organizational settings" according to Blase (1991, p. 3). Additionally, the use of power, especially in IBCs, has multiple factors including the macro-level factor of location which is significant. For this study, the factors of power, interests/motivations and location were used for the micropolitical analysis based on the data collected along with themes in the data.

Micropolitics has been used to analyze educational leadership (Blase & Anderson, 1995, 1995; Brosky, 2011; Caffyn, 2010; Murphy & Curtis, 2013; Struyve et al., 2014), teacher relationships (Brosky, 2011; Sparkes, 1987; Stake & Cisneros-Cohernour, 2004), curricular change (Leathwood & Phillips, 2000; Muncey et al., 1999; Sparkes, 1987) and school reform (Haag & Smith, 2002). The studies are of organizations in the United States (Blase, 1991; Blase & Björk, 2010; Haag & Smith, 2002; Muncey et al., 1999), The United Kingdom (Ball, 1987;

Hoyle, 1982; Jones et al., 2013; Leathwood & Phillips, 2000; Malen, 1995; Murphy & Curtis, 2013; Sparkes, 1987) and from Europe/Asia (Caffyn, 2010; Morley, 1999). The majority of studies are of K-12 organizations (Ball, 1987; Blase, 1991; Blase & Anderson, 1995; Brosky, 2011; Caffyn, 2010; Malen, 1995; Muncey et al., 1999; Sparkes, 1987; Struyve et al., 2014). There are a smaller number of studies regarding higher education using micropolitics (Haag & Smith, 2002; Jones et al., 2013; Leathwood & Phillips, 2000; Milliken, 2001; Morley, 1999, 2000; Murphy & Curtis, 2013). While there is no precedence for using micropolitics in analysis of cross-border education, there is prior use in higher education, internationally, and on teacher/leadership interactions.

Micropolitical analysis focuses on influences or factors on individuals within an education organization. Some of these factors include control, political activity, interests, conflict, goal diversity, and power (Ball, 1987). Ball (1987) considered data as the “views, experiences, meanings and interpretations of the social actors involved” (p. 26). In addition, location, history and local context were used as variables in Caffyn (2008, 2010) and Muncey, Payne and White (1999) as external or macro influences on the education organization.

Neoliberalism

For the macro level analysis, neoliberalism was selected. Harvey (2007) writes that, neoliberalism “proposes that human well-being can best be advanced by liberating individual entrepreneurial freedoms and skills within an institutional framework characterized by strong private property rights, free markets, and free trade” (p. 2). The economic principles of neoliberalism began with Friedrich August von Hayek and the 1947 founding of the Mont Pelerin Society who were dedicated to studying market-oriented economic systems (Steger & Roy, 2010). Their work countered the Keynesian ideas of the time which supported

governmental spending to improve market conditions. Neoliberalism gained footing in the late 1970s and early 1980s with the work of Milton Friedman as it was implemented in various United States and British public policies (Harvey, 2007).

There are different forms that neoliberalism takes around the globe which have many similar features (Peck, 2004). While some authors, like Klein (2007) and Chomsky (1999) focus on the political and economic aspects of neoliberalism, others like Darder (2012), Giroux (2014) and Olssen and Peters (2005) focus on the impact of neoliberalism on educational policy as economic policies shift. Others focus on the effects of neoliberalism on specific regions such as Southeast Asia (Do & Pham, 2014), United Kingdom (Harris, 2005) and Australia (Marginson, 1997). Olssen and Peters (2005) describes changes in the academic realm due to neoliberalism:

Under the neoliberal period there has been a shift from ‘bureaucratic-professional’ forms of accountability to ‘consumer-managerial’ accountability models. Under consumer-managerial forms of accountability, academics must demonstrate their utility to society by placing themselves in an open market and accordingly competing for students who provide the bulk of core funding through tuition fees. (p.328)

International higher education has evolved as markets are liberalized with international and national policies enabling the exportation of higher education (Marginson, 1997). This neoliberal approach has resulted in policies such as the World Trade Organization’s General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) which have supported and enabled higher education providers to export higher education as a service or a commodity (McBurnie & Ziguras, 2006). However, local and national policies may or may not encourage the entrance of foreign providers depending on their interests and markets coupled with the legislation, interests, and markets of the home country (McBurnie & Ziguras, 2001).

Specifically studied here are IBCs who award a higher education credential, a commodity, which is shaped by market forces in another country. The marketization and

privatization of higher education is the direct result of liberalization of education globally. Olssen and Peters (2005) note that “neoliberalism is a politically imposed discourse, which is to say that it constitutes the hegemonic discourse of western nation states” (p. 314). While IBCs can increase access to higher education within the host country, market forces have resulted in inequities in terms of curriculum offerings, treating students as consumers and focusing on profitability instead of learning, and on corporate branding of the home institution.

Limitations and Scope of the Study

The study provides insights into the faculty experience at IBCs. By the selection of a single case study, the findings are limited. However, while the study sample is small, it provides a context for future study of faculty at IBCs. The issues and themes examined here could also be used in support of such a study. In addition, the location of both the home campus and the host campus are limiting factors to the scope of the study. The context of a United States private higher educational institution and a European campus is different than an Australian public higher educational institution with a South African campus. Also, the selected programs limits the scope of the findings. The perceptions of faculty within a business administration program may be different than the social science programs selected for this study.

Ensuring Reliability and Validity

To ensure reliability and validity, Stake (1995) suggests the use of data triangulation. In this case study, the data are observation notes, interviews, and document analysis which support the observations/reports of findings under different circumstances, or member checking, where participants review documentation for accuracy and palatability. In terms of member checking, Stake (1995) notes that members often do not respond to requests for checking material. Three

participants requested copies of the data collected. Only one participant responded with a correction of a name in the report.

According to George and Bennett (2005), the criteria for variables created during analysis should be articulated for inter-coder reliability. The codes created during the analysis process included descriptions as necessary to ensure greater reliability.

Maxwell (2005) identifies two broad types of threats to validity: researcher bias and reactivity, which is addressed in the positionality section. Several strategies that can be used in this case study include triangulation as mentioned above, comparison between the groups (either on the host campus and/or the home campus), respondent checking, verbatim transcripts of interviews, and examination of the data for discrepancies.

Researcher Positionality & Reflexivity

As a researcher, I have several experiences which inform my perspective. First, I have worked in private, faith-based, non-profit higher education for over fifteen years. This experience in some respects matches the study institution's home campus which is also a private, faith-based, non-profit higher education institution. My work experience is as a librarian who works with undergraduates. The case study is of two programs at an undergraduate level, which is similar to my own experience. My experience has informed my understanding of faculty issues and concerns. As a ranked faculty member, I am a member of several faculty committees, which informs my understanding of faculty issues regarding undergraduate education at a private, non-profit institution. My faculty committee assignments include the Faculty Handbook Committee and the College Curriculum Committee. While I am a ranked faculty member, I have not taught term-long courses, since librarians do not teach term-long courses at my institution. While I do

not have direct experience with Midwest Christian University, I have experienced similar contexts. I also do not have personal experience with IBCs.

Ethical Considerations

Ethical considerations regarding this study include participant anonymity and confidentiality. Marshall and Rossman (2011) suggest that the relationship between the participant and the researcher should be “benign, nonmanipulative, and mutually beneficial” (p. 142). Patton (2002) encourages full disclosure of the research being conducted in order avoid negative repercussions on the study. Request for participation was sent via email to the selected individuals. The text of the email was approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB)³ of Illinois State University and included a description of the study along with contact information for additional questions. Also, a consent form was presented and the participants were asked to sign the form prior to beginning the interview.

While the observer/interviewer presence and questions may alter the circumstances, the process and responses should be documented in order to be as nonmanipulative as possible (Marshall & Rossman, 2011). I wrote observational notes for each interview, classroom observation, and campus observation. The interview questions asked were based on the interview protocol approved by the IRB. Other considerations include respecting cultural norms and not pressuring participants to sign consent forms (Creswell, 2009). The interview transcripts should represent the interviewees as respectful as possible (Marshall & Rossman, 2011). The interviews took place in the individual’s office space or nearby. Some participants had the door open while others kept it closed. My presence for a classroom observation was announced to the students

³ IRB approval for the study was received from Illinois State University and a waiver of jurisdiction was given from Midwest Christian University since their employees would not act as agents conducting the study.

prior to the observation in two cases while other participants introduced me at the beginning of the class session.

CHAPTER IV: FINDINGS

Introduction

This is a single case study of an IBC and its home campus regarding its curriculum delivery at both a program- and course-level. It examines the development and delivery by faculty and the factors influencing the delivery of curriculum at an IBC. The study took into account the curriculum delivery and development and at the home campus of the same undergraduate programs. Through this qualitative study, faculty perceptions articulated through interviews and observed in the classroom this data were then analyzed to describe the factors and influences on curriculum delivery at an IBC.

The following are the three research questions guiding this study:

R1: How does curriculum delivery occur at an international branch campus? How does the delivery compare with that which occurs at the home campus? If it does differ, what are the differences and why do they occur?

R2: How involved are faculty - at international branch campuses and the home campus - in curriculum development and improvement? How are decisions made regarding the curriculum and delivery and what are faculty's role in the process?

R3: What are faculty perceptions of their role regarding curriculum within the institution? What factors influence their perceptions?

The differences and similarities between data collected at the home campus and the host campus are elucidated through the coded data and themes. The themes are grouped by research question. For the first research question on curriculum delivery, the themes are program-level and course-level curriculum, faculty exchange between campuses, coordination and assessment, professional development, faculty workload and tenure, academic freedom and course materials, syllabi,

student populations, and classroom activities. For the second research question, the two themes are course-level and program-level curriculum development and improvement. For the third research question on faculty perceptions of their role, the themes are power differentials, curricular academic freedom, communication and personal connections/faculty exchange, locale/context, and good faculty/good students.

United States Campus Description

The main campus of MCU covers multiple city blocks in a midwestern city in the United States. Additionally, within the city limits are several campuses for some of the university's professional schools. Most of the main campus buildings were three to four stories tall. The north side of campus was bordered by a major roadway. On the opposite side of the roadway were ten-story high apartment buildings and large buildings that housed several non-profit organizations. The campus was walkable, but it took almost ten minutes to walk from the southwest corner of campus, from a covered visitor's parking lot, to Program A's building on northeast corner. Outside of the core of the campus, there was construction activity of new university buildings and renovations of nearby commercial buildings. A new multi-story residence hall, which had just opened in the fall of 2016 along the edge of the campus core, had classrooms on the ground floor where one of the classroom observations took place. In between the university buildings were green spaces, walkways, and small courtyards with sculptures donated in honor of individuals. Some green spaces had public hammocks and others had small tables with seating for four with open umbrellas over them. The landscaping was well kept and the green spaces were neat and tidy. Campus-wide, students with backpacks were walking between buildings during my visits. Most students were casually dressed in jeans or yoga pants with a t-shirt or sweatshirt. Individuals were walking alone and in groups of two to three people between

buildings. Depending on the time of day and weather, students were seen sitting on benches or at seating areas outside. While the majority of foot traffic appeared to be students, non-students, perhaps faculty or staff, also walked briskly around the campus. Occasionally, food service workers or maintenance staff would also walk by or drive by in a golf cart. During each of my campus visits, I saw at least one tour group of prospective students and their family members touring the campus. They carried informational folders with them and usually a student tour guide led the group by walking backwards as he or she talked to the group.

The campus is anchored at the corner of two major roadways by the university chapel, which is over 100 years old. Each roadway had four lanes of traffic, two in each direction, and crosswalks to access the campus core. Behind the chapel was the library, administrative buildings, classroom and program buildings. Some buildings were over 100 years old while others appeared to be built more recently. The library was a mid-20th century, multi-story building. On the first floor of the library there was a café, multimedia center with dozens of computers, an archive, and multiple seating areas for individual and group study. While of the interior walls were made of solid white marble, the exterior walls were large glass windows. The library was one of the buildings along a pedestrian thoroughfare through the center of the campus. At the midpoint of the pathway, there is a clock tower and fountain with benches where small groups gather. Most academic buildings appeared to house two to three programs in each building along with classrooms and other academic services.

Each of the U.S. campus faculty members interviewed occupied their own office. Program A faculty members had individual offices on the first floor of a two-story building shared with one other program. Program B faculty members were spread out in individual offices around the top floor of a three-story building that it occupied with one or two other programs.

European Campus Description

The MCU European campus was located in a major European city in a fairly quiet and mostly residential neighborhood. Trees and bushes rose above the stone and wrought iron fencing around each property's perimeter. Sidewalks along wider roads were lined by continuous six-foot high walls of stucco with an occasional gate for a driveway or a doorway. Cars passed by at regular intervals but the traffic was never heavy. The streets were fairly clean and on one occasion I happened upon two city employees cleaning the street and sidewalk. Occasionally, an individual or couple would walk by on the sidewalk. Children playing could be heard from a nearby children's center.

The campus's neighborhood was comprised of residences, several multistory buildings, apartment buildings, small medical clinics, and other businesses. Nearby public transportation consisted of two underground stops and several bus stops within a ten-minute walk of the campus. Within a five minute walk from campus was a small commercial area with cafes, a small supermarket and other shops. People of all ages were entering and exiting the shops. The café's sidewalk tables had individuals enjoying a coffee and pastries. The campus itself consisted of three buildings, Halls I, II, and III. They were located on three different blocks and were built in different decades. In between the campus buildings, there were homes behind three-foot stone walls topped with wrought iron fencing. Additionally, within a several block radius of the campus, there were: a United States university center, a private local university, departments of a public university, and several medical facilities along with national services offices. The MCU European campus buildings were identified by MCU signage on the buildings, over the entryways, and along the exterior fences. The signs had the institutional logo, institution's name, and the building name. During breaks between classes, groups of students and an occasional

faculty member gathered along the sidewalks speaking in several different languages as they talked animatedly. As I walked through the entryway to Hall III between groups of students, some who were smoking, you could hear music from an open window of a second floor classroom.

The four-storied main building, Hall III, housed some administrative offices, an auditorium, the library, a cafe, reception area, classrooms, and some faculty offices. The first-floor cafe seating area and reception area opened out to a glassed-in patio with long tables and low seating areas throughout the space. Outside of the patio, small tables and chairs lined an adjacent courtyard with high, vine-covered walls. During lunch time, the entire area was filled with students at every table. Most students spoke in American English and worked on their laptops open in front of them. Many wore jeans and t-shirts or sweatshirts. I saw a few faculty or staff sit in the space as well, speaking in the official language of the country while drinking coffee. A stairwell to the upper floors looked out over the courtyard and the adjacent buildings. On either side of the stairwell were elevators to the upper floors. The library had an entire floor with a large study room on one side of the staircase and on the other side had library offices and bookcases full of books. Other floors had several classrooms and clusters of offices. Overall, the spaces were well-lit and each room appeared to have an exterior window or two. All of the study participants had offices on the top floor of Hall III.

Hall I and Hall II were smaller buildings each on a separate block along the wider road. In between the halls were a few residential buildings. Halls I and II had been used by the institution for over twenty years. It took just a few minutes to walk from building to building on the sidewalks. Hall I was two stories tall with red brick exterior with white stucco in between the windows on the second floor. There was a paved courtyard along the south and east sides of the

building, lined with small plantings and benches along the edge. A small tile sign on the building wall said “Entrance” in the country’s official language with an arrow pointing to the right. The entrance was through two tall wooden, white doors at the top of several wide concrete steps to the right. The doors opened into a brightly-lit entryway with a red-tiled floor. The building’s narrow, white corridors reflected the sunlight streaming in from the exterior windows. The backside of Hall I had an exterior encased metal staircase overlooking another paved courtyard with seating. On the warmer days, students would gather and sit on the small tables around the courtyard. The hallways were fairly small with the doorways close to each other. Hall I housed some administration offices, but mostly classrooms, labs, and faculty offices.

The second building, Hall II, was one block over from Hall I. Hall II housed various student services offices, administrative offices on the lower floors, and classrooms on the upper floors. Hall II was surrounded by a short brick wall with simple iron rails between brick posts. A small tile sign with the university logo marked the building entrance up several concrete steps. The main hallway was lined with red tiles. Offices for student services, such as the chapel, student affairs and the bookstore were along the hallway. To the right of the bookstore was an exterior metal staircase that went down to the ground floor where there were three or four classrooms. On each of the ground floor classroom’s wooden doors was a neatly posted schedule of the classes in the room. A ground-floor classroom consisted of a small desk at the front of the room, chairs, and a whiteboard on an interior wall. About fifteen padded armchairs were lined up in two rows at the back of the room. The space was compact. One exterior window at the back of the room lit the room with natural light. The classroom was small by American standards with the chairs touching each other and just about two to three feet between the front row and the desk at the front of the room. On the third floor of the adjacent wing of the building was a classroom

that accommodated about 35 students. The classroom was the largest classroom I saw during my visit, with narrow tables in six rows facing the front of the room. The door to the room was along the courtyard side of the building and was accessible from an exterior walkway and a small entryway between the rooms. The room had two double windows on each side of the room. At the front of the room was a large whiteboard and an analog clock to the right of the whiteboard.

The faculty and administrators interviewed at the European campus occupied small offices on the top floor of Hall III. The three full-time members of Program A were all housed in a single office with four desks, while the faculty members in Program B were in two different offices with two desks each. Both programs along with two administrators and several other program offices occupied the west side of the top floor of Hall III.

Coordination Between Campuses

While MCU's European campus is part of and administered by the U.S. campus, there are specific operational differences between the two campuses. MCU is accredited by a U.S. accrediting body as a single organization; however the European campus is actually a separate legal entity according to European law. The European faculty are governed by the local and national employment laws. The European campus is also recognized and authorized by the national government to deliver the U.S. program in the country.

The dual, but yet singular nature of MCU continues through management of curriculum and faculty governance and organization. The European campus faculty are governed by national and local labor laws, though they are teaching a U.S.-based and approved curriculum. While the curriculum is approved through the administration on the U.S. campus, it is delivered by the European faculty, who have the academic freedom to modify the courses as needed for their European context. European campus faculty can propose new courses or teach courses already

available in the university bulletin with approval from the U.S. campus. European campus faculty also provide a specific international concentration of their major which they feel is appropriate for their European context. The U.S. campus programs have several concentrations each.

Since the European campus is a separate legal entity from the U.S. campus, the European faculty do not have the same labor laws and regulations as the U.S. campus, nor do they have the same pay scale. While there is consultation with the U.S. campus faculty, faculty welfare issues are handled differently at the European campus. The European faculty have their own faculty senate. The European faculty senate has not delved into curricular issues to this point as evidenced by their faculty senate minutes. In terms of faculty workload, the workload at the European campus is three courses per semester, while the faculty workload at the U.S. campus is two courses for two semesters. Faculty on both campuses can apply for institutional professional development opportunities and outside professional development, such as conferences. Institutional workshops and services are offered and used on both campuses, but the European campus has a more limited selection due to time and location limitations. Faculty on both campuses can and do apply for professional development funding. Faculty from both campuses reported receiving funding; however their funding sources appeared to be different. European faculty and administrators communicate and collaborate with the programs on the U.S. campus but it is the U.S. campus that has the final approval.

Curriculum Delivery at MCU

The first research question of this study was about curriculum delivery at an IBC. Data regarding this question were collected through interviews, classroom observations, and analysis of documentation. Specifically,

R1: How does curriculum delivery occur at an international branch campus? How does the delivery compare with that which occurs at the home campus? If it does differ, what are the differences and why do they occur?

The majority of the data on curriculum delivery at an IBC was collected through the semi-structured interviews. Interview questions asked faculty about their teaching pedagogy, students in their classroom, classroom techniques, adaptations and changes in course materials and syllabi, classroom activities, and course outcomes. Additionally, classroom observations followed the faculty interviews. The observations confirmed and enriched the interview data about interactions regarding curriculum delivery, more specifically teaching and learning in the classroom. Documentation, such as faculty policies, syllabi, institutional program webpages, committee minutes, and university bulletins, further supported the data collected regarding curriculum delivery at an IBC and at its home campus. Several themes emerged from the coding and analysis of the data: program curriculum and course offerings, faculty exchange between campuses, professional development, faculty workload and tenure, academic freedom and course materials, student populations, and classroom activities.

Curriculum was delivered at the European campus with face-to-face instruction. Only two courses were offered at the European campus in spring 2016 with online delivery. Classes were scheduled and met in classrooms on the European campus several times a week. The European campus had slightly different semester starting and ending dates, holidays and breaks than the U.S. campus. The holidays take into account the local context. Faculty were responsible for textbook selection and follow syllabi guidelines specific to the European campus.

Curriculum was delivered at the U.S. campus with face-to-face instruction along with a few courses through online instruction. Program A had one online course spring 2016 and

Program B had three online courses spring 2016. Undergraduate classes took place in classrooms around the U.S. campus in various buildings. Faculty were responsible for textbook selection and follow syllabi guidelines outlined by their academic division.

The European campus teaches the same courses as are taught at the U.S. campus. The courses have the same numbers, university bulletin descriptions and are managed in the same student information system. If a European campus faculty member wants to teach a course not currently taught at the European campus but in the MCU bulletin, there is a “collaboration or approval” process according to John, the senior European campus administrator. The level of collaboration or approval depends on the program and how the two campus faculty work together. According to Charles, a U.S. campus administrator, “anything that they would like to do there [at the European campus], needs to be signed off by the home department here” and “home department here is the one who has the most control as I understand it.” A U.S. campus faculty member, Mandy, said the following about curriculum development and coordination between the two campuses:

[Program A] has an undergraduate degree, so we are, kind of, trying to offer the same courses. So every time they want to establish a course, it comes through a curriculum committee on this campus. So, it has to fit our core. It has to fit our degree. So in a way, you know, that kind of works in the sense that we are trying to offer the same degree. On the other hand, it deprives their faculty and their assembly of the opportunity to develop their own curriculum...But, that was the problem that kind of needed to be finessed in some way. In some way that would involve [European] faculty in direct governance, but wouldn't sever links with the programs they are affiliated with on this campus. Because the students have to be able to move back and forth.

Mandy notes that need for similarity, yet at the same time she articulates a desire for European campus faculty autonomy. The similarity is needed to ensure the same degree offerings and the ability for students to take the same courses. However, Mandy wants European faculty to have similar rights as those on the home campus.

Program Level and Course Level Curriculum at MCU

The curriculum delivery was studied on both on a program level and a course level. The two programs selected, Program A and Program B, each offer a major for an undergraduate degree at MCU. However, the specific course requirements for the programs varied slightly between the two campuses. The European campus's Program A major had an international focus or concentration to it. The European campus' Program B lacks the concentrations available at the U.S. campus. This is partially due to the smaller size of both students and program faculty than the U.S. campus along with smaller facilities. Additionally, some of faculty at the European campus feel that certain courses are needed to reflect the diversity of Europe.

Several years ago, MCU added a diversity core course requirement for all students. When the requirement was first added to the university bulletin, the course content was solely based on diversity in the United States. According to John, an administrator at the European campus, the European campus countered that teaching diversity based on a U.S. model was not appropriate for their context. Eventually, the European campus was able to have courses on the diversity in Europe designated for their core requirements. This highlights a difference between the two campuses. While they both value diversity, their core curricula reflect the context of their campuses in terms of the content of their diversity core course requirement. This points to the recognition of the effect that locale has on the curriculum, and while students are getting the same degree from either campus, the curricula was tailored to be reflective of their local experience.

In the data, there were other examples of the influence of the locale on curriculum delivery. One example was given by Anton, Alice, and Xavier, all European campus faculty, who mentioned the impact of the Paris bombings and the attack on Charlie Hebdo, had on their

students and how they discussed the topic on campus and in their classes. The second example was from Pamela, a U.S. campus faculty member, who mentioned the effect that campus protests about the uprisings in Ferguson, Missouri had on her teaching. She had spontaneous class discussions on the protests to engage the students on the issues surrounding the uprisings in Ferguson. While this is was not on the syllabus, Pamela felt it important to take the opportunity to engage students on an important topic.

It is not just the locale which influences the material and activities in the classroom; it is also student interests as well. Petra, a European campus faculty member, mentioned that some U.S. campus students in one of her classes were very interested in the Black Lives Matter movement. As a result, she changed some of the course content from social movements in the local country to include some social movements in the United States. Petra illustrated how she engages her student population and the high level of academic freedom she has in the classroom.

John, the senior administrator at the European campus, mentioned that although the course outcomes are the same, faculty will specialize the course because of their location. For example, there are academic trips that are offered along with courses. Whether it is a day trip or a longer trip, academic trips seem to be attractive to students, especially students from the U.S. These trips take advantage of the proximity to various locations to enhance learning. One course at the European campus, not part of Program A or B, was especially attractive to students and had several sections because of the associated trip to the coastal region. John said they could offer even more sections because they knew they would fill if offered. Some classes were offered based on student interest and enrollment numbers. The European campus administration were not able to predict all of the classes which would be of interest to study abroad students.

Occasionally, a general education course may be in high demand and the European campus administration will add additional sections to meet the demand.

The interest in adding new programs came from either campus. According to MCU's academic council minutes, a new Middle East minor was added specifically with recognition of contributions to the minor from the European campus. The minor listing at the U.S. campuses' webpage lists faculty for both campuses. According to Anton, a European campus faculty member, the interest in offering the minor came from the U.S. campus. Along with the portion of the student body from the Middle East, the proximity to the region and existing course offerings made offering the minor more compelling for Anton.

Faculty Exchange Between Campuses

Six of the faculty interviewed from the U.S. campus had taught a course at the European campus. However, none of the European campus faculty had taught or visited the U.S. campus. This interpersonal connection was important for understanding between the program faculty.

Program A was initially offered at the European campus after negotiations took place between the program members and administrators on the two campuses. The agreement to offer Program A included the stipulation that a faculty member from the U.S. campus would teach a course at the European campus each year. The three Program A interviewees from the U.S. campus each had experience teaching at the European campus. While the cost for having a U.S. campus faculty member teach a course may be higher than having a European faculty member teach the course content, the European faculty members interviewed felt that the exchange provided an important opportunity for greater understanding of who they are and what they do. Petra said,

For example, when there was a couple in [Program A] last summer who were here. On their return, they insisted as we agreed here that we would have Skype meetings. And

since then, we have had Skype meetings with [indistinct]. The personal does bring a big contribution...And of course because they return as big champions of [Program A] [European City] and they knew us. Being so small, they started to learn our challenges. And so they returned with an agenda of trying to help us and support us. And we found that is very useful.

While this personal contact was helpful for the understanding of the European campus issues, none of the European faculty had been to the U.S. campus yet. Margaret had plans to go when she was in the United States on other business; however, it was to be just a short visit. While the faculty exchanges helped with understanding between the two campuses, none of the interviewees mentioned any influence on their teaching, courses, or pedagogy as a result of their exchange.

Program B also has sent a U.S. campus faculty member, usually annually, to the European campus to teach a course, but this arrangement was not mentioned by interviewees as a requirement for offering the major program. The two faculty at the European campus had not been to the U.S. campus, although one had received his doctorate from a U.S. institution. Xavier had only been on the faculty for less than two years. Pete had personal reasons for not being available to teach at the U.S. campus although he said he would be interested at some point.

All of the interviewed U.S. faculty who had taught at the European campus, taught their courses in a compressed format during the summer term except for one individual, who taught a course, also in a compressed form during the regular semester. They taught classes which they taught on the U.S. campus in a face-to-face classroom setting.

Three U.S. faculty mentioned a few modifications they made while teaching at the European campus. Logan, a Program A faculty member, had to modify his methods for teaching the class to accommodate a larger number of students than expected. Christopher, a Program A faculty member, changed his classroom techniques to include more discussion than methodology

to meet the expectations of the faculty and students at the European campus. Pamela, a Program B faculty member, was able to take advantage of the urban setting at the European campus for her class there, having students do field work in the city during the class time. While her same class at the U.S. campus is in an urban setting, students could not move around as freely because of logistics and time constraints. None of the faculty mentioned that these modifications had a negative effect on their teaching or student learning.

Professional Development

While some faculty members interviewed only participated in professional development in their field of interest, others participated in institutional activities regarding teaching and learning. Most of the faculty on both campuses said that when they have time, they need to be focusing on their research as a priority.

All of the interviewees spoke highly of the offerings of the institution's center for teaching and learning whether they participated or not in the activities. The faculty were aware of the center's offerings and some had participated in their activities regarding teaching and assessment. The center's webpage had a specific site for the European campus and mentioned how they can accommodate the time difference between campuses. Additionally, faculty senate minutes mentioned institutional workshops regarding assessment of learning rubrics and internationalization of higher education that involved faculty from both campuses.

None of the interviews recalled any professional development regarding curriculum development or design at their campus. Two U.S. faculty members pointed out that they felt it would be unusual for an institution to offer workshops on curriculum development or design.

Faculty Workload and Tenure

Another difference between the two campuses is the number of classes that faculty teach per term and the lack of tenure/rank at the European campus. Faculty at the European campus teach three courses per term as a minimum while faculty at the U.S. campus teach two courses per term. For those U.S. faculty who taught at the European campus in the summer term, two mentioned that they were paid additionally to teach a course at the European campus. All of the interviewees on both campuses were full-time faculty members. Four U.S. faculty members, Mandy, Christopher, Maddie and Maxie, had tenure. Since the European campus is a separate legal entity, it does not offer tenure as on the U.S. campus. As a result, none of the full-time faculty at the European campus had tenure. The lack of tenure and rank is partially due to the national higher education system model. In it, the ranks are different and more administrative and do not correspond with the U.S. model. Though there was no tenure offered at the European campus, the national labor law did give faculty certain employment rights and guaranteed pension and health benefits.

In terms of workload, while all of the interviewed European campus faculty were full time, several part-time faculty were listed on each program's website. While they were contacted for this study, I was not able to meet with them while I was on site with the two who responded to the request for participation. Only one of the European faculty members mentioned the use of instructors who teach on a per class basis. However in a review of the minutes of the faculty senate, there was discussion of the use of part-time faculty and the impact ranks would have on them, positive and/or negative.

Academic Freedom and Course Materials

Both campuses' documents had specific statements regarding academic freedom encouraging “freedoms of thought, of discussion, and of action” within the context of a Christian institution. Several European campus members noted that the tradition of the local country is similar to the U.S. model of academic freedom.

“Once the course has been designed, then the professor is quite free to do more or less what he or she wants.” This statement by Margaret, a European campus faculty member, encapsulates the feelings of faculty on both campuses regarding academic freedom. Faculty are able to teach their courses based on their discretion. In the classroom observations on both campuses, students and faculty were engaged in discussions and presentations on topics of all types. Faculty on both campuses described their methods of teaching ranging from a lecture-style to class-long student-led discussions. Several faculty members mentioned that the course material determines how best to engage the students. Mandy, a U.S. faculty member, said:

So, in [Program A field], the courses are really are about ideas. So you don't memorize anything. So, it's not like in a science where you got to have command of a certain set of facts before you can do anything with it. So, there is no point here in memorizing anything. So, everything we do is, we read and talk about the text together. Any kind of exam or any kind of paper, it's all open book. There is no point in the memory work. So, all of the classes are basically a structured discussion.

While Mandy's class are mostly discussion, Anton, a European Program A faculty member, described his classes as a semester with two parts. The first part of the semester he mostly talks to set up the concepts and theories for the semester, and then the second part of the semester is student oral presentations that apply and engage the students. The classroom observation of Logan, a U.S. Program A faculty member, was of a lecture with PowerPoint presentation. However throughout the entire class period, both Logan and students asked questions and interacted about the material covered during that class period.

Syllabi

While faculty on both campuses had specific statements, program outcomes, and information to include on their syllabi, the rest of the syllabus was determined by the faculty member. Additionally, none of the faculty members mentioned any restrictions or requirements regarding their courses beyond the course description except Maxie, a U.S. campus faculty member, whose core, entry level course had specific textbooks determined by the program and assignments required for assessment of student learning.

When asked about how she manages different students in her classes, Mary, a U.S. campus faculty member, said that when her class has a larger portion of international students, she modifies how class materials are presented, but not her syllabus:

I don't make changes to the way the syllabus is planned. But the way that materials are presented is different. I spend a lot less time lecturing and a lot more time making material available through our Blackboard site...all of the slides and information. It is always available there. Whereas I might normally assume that saying it in class is going to be sufficient that would not be the case. A lot of times, it seems in this particular class what I say doesn't necessarily always kind of stick, I guess. They, it seems like there are a number of students who are much more comfortable being able to go look it up.

Maxie, a U.S. faculty member, said the following regarding her approach to meeting the needs of her students regarding the course content and the syllabus.

I try to seduce them. How can I say this? At the beginning, I try to show them rather than tell them. Try to persuade them implicitly through examples of the need to learn how to do what I want them to do as opposed to telling them. I don't change the assignments because I believe that a syllabus is a contract, but I do change the way I present the material.

Margaret, a European faculty member, said something similar: "I don't really adapt the materials. I try to ask the students that they adapt to the material."

While some faculty had made adjustments based on student interests, the syllabi still are a contract with the students. If there were differences in the students' needs, the faculty seemed

to meet the students' needs in other ways than altering the syllabus. This was similar for interviewed faculty on both campuses.

Student Populations

Since the types of classroom activities and expectations needed to meet the needs of students may vary, faculty at both campuses were asked if and how they adapt their courses to their student population. IBC literature mentioned that students at IBCs come from a variety of educational systems and backgrounds.

The students at the European campus were a combination of students from MCU's U.S. campus, other U.S. institutions and students only attending MCU's European campus. Faculty were aware of the benefits and issues the student diversity presents in the classroom. One faculty member described her teaching as "teaching to the United Nations" in terms of the different nationalities in the classroom. Petra, a European campus faculty member, felt the students' experiences and multiple language abilities added to the value and the level of her classes. Xavier, a European campus faculty member, specifically takes an international approach to teaching because of the different experiences of students. He conducts his class to develop "more intercultural communication and less conflict communication" among the students. He found that he needed to develop classroom management techniques to avoid the classroom becoming "a little bit conflicted" due to the different backgrounds in the classroom. Petra, a European Program A faculty member, spoke a bit more at length about the diversity and the impact on the classroom and the student learning.

I guess in terms of abilities, our [degree-seeking] students are a very mixed group. And also in terms of their language acquisition, their level of English, but so in that sense, some of the classes can be quite challenging. Because you have different educational backgrounds, different cultural backgrounds, levels of language acquisition. But, I think you can also draw a lot of strength from that, especially [Program A] classes, right? Because they are so diverse. The conversations are fantastic and they are learning so

much from each other, not just about diversity in general but they are learning different perspectives on the topic from within their own cultures and in their own educational backgrounds. Which I think is a great plus, that's something that comes up always in evaluations that they think this is unheard of.

The diversity of students at the European branch affects the classroom and how teachers communicate and interact with students. The faculty seem to embrace the diversity and explicitly design their classes to meet their students' learning needs.

The European campus degree-seeking student population was recruited from the international school market. Additionally, other prospective student groups include Europeans who want to stay close to home, but want to have an American-style education or fill a gap year before going to the United States. There are also Americans who want to have an American-style education but be far away from home. Other categories of prospective student groups include expatriate children, military children, and others who have been mobile, according to John, the senior European campus administrator. In terms of qualifications, some students have an International Baccalaureate (IB) diploma. When the European campus was only a feeder school for MCU, students would stay for two years of coursework at the European campus, and then attend the U.S. campus for the remainder of their coursework. However, the European campus now offers degrees without having to attend the U.S. campus. This evolution of the MCU European branch has broadened its appeal to prospective students.

Since the programs are delivered in English, students must demonstrate a level of proficiency in English. Prospective students have a number of different ways to do this including achieving a specific level on a TOEFL score. Those students who do not achieve that level are able to enroll in an English as a Second Language (ESL) program to achieve the needed level of proficiency. Overall, the ESL program is a small portion of the student population at the European campus.

Two of the U.S. faculty, who taught at the European campus more than three years ago, remarked on the lack of English proficiency among the students as an issue. Those who taught more recently did not mention the lack of English proficiency as an issue while teaching at the European campus, but rather mentioned issues regarding class size and the diversity of students' backgrounds. Three faculty members, one from the U.S. campus and two from the European campus, specifically mentioned that students from the Middle East have difficulties in the classes due to a lack of English proficiency.

Perhaps a larger issue for the European campus is the differences between the students from the U.S. and the degree-seeking students. One European faculty member said that U.S. students come for the “European photo-op”, but that they are great students. Petra noted that U.S. students aren't used to “discussions and interactive classes. So, it takes a little bit of work at the beginning to get them to open up and to be perceptive to other ways of learning.” Xavier stated that

Usually [U.S.] students are very well prepared, I would say. Sometimes, we need to keep in mind that they only come for one semester. So, they travel a lot. Sometimes, they miss a few classes or their mindset is more in a “party-mood” than academic mood. But generally, they have a very high level and they engage in class very positively. Usually out of 20 students, maybe there is always one who is more problematic.

This issue of faculty meeting the needs of shorter-term students was not present at the U.S. campus. While some U.S. campus faculty members spoke of the number of international students in their class, there was not the dynamic of short-term students versus degree-seeking students in their classes. The difference in student populations does change the learning environment in order to meet student learning needs.

The European campus faculty did mention the differences in students' educational backgrounds as contributing to diversity in the classroom. Students come with different skillsets

and expectations because of their experience in various educational systems, such as British, American or other. Anton, a European faculty member, noted that the writing styles were different in terms of their structure. Logan, a U.S. faculty member, noted that when he taught at the European campus, he could not assume a general level of understanding of a certain topic. While the European campus student population had a great diversity of students in terms of their backgrounds, cultural experiences, and educations, the European faculty were aware of the issues. They would make sure students were included and their differences acknowledged, ensuring a successful classroom experience.

Classroom Activities

In the classroom, faculty on both campuses used discussion, group work, lecture, and visual media. Students were an active part of the class session during classroom observations. On both campuses, faculty had student-led discussions and student presentations. None of the faculty members on either campus relied on lecture alone, but it was just a part of their overall teaching. In the classroom observations, students were encouraged to ask questions and to participate in the classroom on both campuses. One European campus faculty member noted the difference between the local national public university system which is largely based on lectures and at MCU where the classes are smaller and the teaching is more student-centered.

Program A faculty on both campuses focused on the need for students to discuss the subject matter. Christopher, a U.S. campus faculty member said the following about his teaching in the classroom:

.. it is a normal approach to lecture/discussion...I try to get students to think critically about the subject matter which we feel in the department overall is the most important thing to teach. Because many of the facts, of course, they will forget but it's best to teach people how to look at something and then critique it.

In a Program A classroom observation with Anton on the European campus, two students gave presentations on topics and then led a discussion about the material before the faculty member commented and engaged with the class on the overall topics. In a Program A observation with Mandy at the U.S. campus, two students were assigned the role discussants for the class period on the readings. While Mandy assisted the discussion and ensured most students participated, the majority of the class period was spent hearing from students about their ideas and analysis of the readings for the day. Program A participants mentioned a focus on writing with the exception of one faculty member on the European campus. Anton only had presentations and exams while all the other five faculty members interviewed in Program A required written assignments outside of class. Logan noted that “We [Program A faculty] have made an effort in our department the last few years to change this [lack of writing assignments]. And encourage faculty to have writing assignments: critical thinking, evaluating critical perspectives on different things.”

Program B emphasized discussion and student participation in the classroom. In the two classroom observations at the European campus, the faculty members Xavier and Pete had short introductions at the beginning of the class. Then the students had to apply the presented material to a topic and work in groups for the rest of the class period. Maddie, a U.S. campus faculty member, also emphasized group discussion in the class session:

We have fishbowl activities where there’s a group in the center and we have observation and then kind of analysis of the interaction and how we make sense of that. I have them do reflections where they connect the material to experiences outside of class.

The European campus faculty in Program B all assigned papers according to their syllabi.

However, Maxie was the only U.S. campus Program B faculty member that explicitly discussed writing during the interview. She said that “I am trying to get them to emphasize content and research. I have them do a lot of writing. I never give them multiple-guess exams. I make...I try

to make them responsible for what they say.“ Writing appeared to an important part of the other courses. This could not be confirmed for Program B on the U.S. campus, since the syllabi were not accessible and the topic was not discussed specifically in other Program B faculty interviews.

During the classroom observations on both campuses, students were the focus of the sessions. Petra, a European campus faculty member noted that MCU was offering an English-language based liberal arts education in a European context which attracts students along with a diverse faculty and diverse student population. The European context influences the type of programs, local academic opportunities and courses at the European campus, but at its core is an American liberal arts curriculum. The classes are smaller in size than local public institutions. The largest number of students enrolled in a course either mentioned in an interview or observed was around 25 students at the European campus. At the U.S. campus, the largest number of students enrolled in a course that was mentioned or observed was 35 students.

Curriculum Development and Improvement

The second research question is about curriculum development and improvement with the program and across the campuses. Specifically,

R2: How involved are faculty — at international branch campuses and the home campus — in curriculum development and improvement? How are decisions made regarding the curriculum and delivery and what are faculty’s role in the process?

Faculty and administrators clarified that final approvals for new curriculum, whether at the program level or course level, go through the U.S. campus bureaucracy. Approvals progress upward from the program-level to the college level and then to an upper administrative level. While either campus faculty can change their syllabus or how they teach in the classroom, changes in course descriptions, new course offerings and new program offerings must be

approved by the U.S. campus program chairs, faculty committees and upper level administrators. Documentation from the last two years of the MCU academic affairs committee showed that several programs and minors specific to the European campus were added and approved by the U.S. campus administration during the time period. Documentation from the last two years of curriculum committee meetings for the college of Program A and Program B shows that both programs are adding courses, changing course prerequisites, and making program changes. The curriculum committee documentation however, did not note whether the European campus was effected or not, unlike the academic affairs committee. The lack of communication regarding course changes and program-level changes to the European campus faculty was mentioned as an issue by participants from both campuses.

U.S. campus faculty members know that the European campus should be part of the discussion when considering curricular changes. However, the communication is not systematic and was reported as not timely as in the examples below. European campus faculty and administrators reported using video conferencing to attend cross-campus committees and institution-wide meetings. Video conferencing seemed more productive; however it seems to only happen once a term on a program level. Email was more often mentioned as the primary form of communication method regarding curriculum. However, some European campus faculty mentioned that emails were not answered quickly by U.S. campus faculty. Program A faculty from both campuses mentioned that having a U.S. campus faculty member teach at the European campus each summer was helpful for building personal relationships and awareness of the European campus issues. While there was little coordination on a course level, there was coordination regarding assessment and improving student learning. Although a program level

assessment was fairly new, there was coordination between campuses and a European campus program faculty member on the program assessment committee.

Course Level

At the course level, there are two ways new courses can be offered at the European campus. The first and easiest to add a course to the European campus schedule is if there is an existing course already offered in the university bulletin. If there is an existing course, a discussion takes place between the two campus's program chairs, and upon agreement, the existing course can be added to the European campus's offerings. Since the U.S. campus already has a significant amount of courses listed in the university bulletin, adding courses to the European campus offerings can be negotiated at just the program level which is more efficient. The second way is to add a "new to the institution" course. For the European campus, new courses go through the European program chair and then on through the program chair at the U.S. campus before moving through the U.S. campus curriculum approval process. Two European faculty members reported that they had added new courses to the university bulletin. Both courses were based on their content specialties and were approved after submission to their program chairs, which moved them on to the U.S. campus for the rest of the needed approvals.

If a course changes, for example in terms of the number of credit hours per the request of the U.S. campus program, the European campus follows suit when they are notified or find out about the changes. However, changes regarding courses were not always communicated in a timely manner. Petra, a Program A European campus faculty member, had an experience where she found out the U.S. campus had added a lab session to a course a few weeks before she was to begin teaching the course. She had to change her syllabus quickly to reflect the change at the U.S. campus. Maddie, the U.S. campus Program B chair, noted that when the program redid the

program curriculum, they changed the prerequisites for some courses. However, it wasn't until the changes were implemented in the system she realized that the changes effected the European campus as well. Maddie said that

It's hard to tell where there is independence [on the European campus] and part of this is about the process of the university. Part of it is, there needs to be some degree of independence because we are in very different contexts and situations. And there has to be flexibility for meeting the needs of students in these different contexts and situations. But, also collaboration at the same time and so...I don't know how this system works. And I don't know if I'm about to do something that has negative consequences that I need to figure out how to avoid. It gets confusing. So part of it is the system and part of it is the distance. Part of it is different needs.

The dichotomy between independence and "sameness" is a thread through several faculty members' answers. Maddie points out several factors in this quote that make this dichotomy difficult to navigate: the system, the distance, and the different needs between the two campuses.

Program Level

Adding a major to the European campus offerings requires collaboration and approvals from the existing program on the U.S. campus. John, the senior administrator at the European campus, said that,

The faculty have a lot of say in it. It's not about finances. The bottom line is that if the departments in U.S. think it is a good idea. And our faculty think it is a good idea. We can offer it.

It was alluded to that the changes in program offerings mostly come from the European campus wanting to expand their offerings as the market allows. However, Anton, a faculty member in Program A, was asked by a new U.S. program to coordinate a minor at the European campus. The U.S. campus faculty member in charge of the minor visited the European campus and discussed the minor with students and faculty. The minor was new to both campuses and involved an international component which may have made sense in order to take advantage of the European campus offerings and location. Additionally, the webpage for the minor was the

only program documentation that listed both U.S. campus faculty and European campus faculty. By contrast, Program A and Program B program webpages do not cross list any faculty on the program webpages.

In terms of program offerings, both Program A and Program B on the European campus have different major requirements than at the U.S. campus. The U.S. campus offers multiple concentrations of Program A and Program B. The European campus programs each reflect a single major concentration offered at the U.S. campus. The European campus programs have a specific international focus in terms of required courses that the U.S. campus concentrations do not appear to have. Also, major offerings are fewer due to the smaller faculty size with only several full-time faculty at the European campus. In contrast, there were over 15 faculty members at the U.S. campus in each program. However, they also teach in their graduate programs, which the European campus did not have.

Program A's major requirements at the European campus requires two more credit hours plus two additional courses outside of the major than the U.S. campus concentration with a similar name. The current requirements were established after the previous Program A chair left a few years ago. Since the program faculty were all fairly new, they thought revising the requirements and sequencing the courses could be changed and would benefit the students' learning. Petra, a European campus faculty member, said that

...in terms of changing the program, we have quite a bit of autonomy there. Of course, we are following, and that was part of the agreement to set up the B.A. here, we are following more or less the same curriculum. But in the way we put together the program we have quite a lot of autonomy.

The purpose of changing was to make the program more sequential. Additionally, based on data from an assessment of only European campus degree-seeking students, Program A made some

modifications to improve the program for their students. There may have been more done administratively to approve the changes than Petra's statement of the events.

Program B at the European campus has an additional core course and a smaller selection of courses within themed groups than those offered at the U.S. campus. Pete, a European faculty member, said that

They [U.S. campus program] got rid of one class, [class name]. And they teach [topic] across courses and we still have [topic class]. We teach it here and we don't necessarily see a reason not to keep it. Right? And we've talked about that and they seem ok with it. There's no, I mean, "no, they have to get rid of it"...we have to be exactly the same. So, in that sense, there's some flexibility. Their relationship between both campuses, I would describe it as an ambiguous relationship. And it's a type of ambiguity that you can't really solve. You can't resolve it.

The ambiguous nature that Pete mentions relates to the overall relationship between the two campuses at a specific program level. This ambiguous nature was reflected in Maddie's previous quote about course level curricular changes. Because the degree from MCU is considered the same regardless of the campus where it is earned, there is a clash between sameness and uniqueness based on campus identity. Pamela, a U.S. campus Program B faculty member, said that

we always try to communicate with them [European faculty] about classes and we...it's interesting because I think like, every department on campus is different in how they see their connection with the [European] campus. I think our department has always seen that there is a strong connection. Some will just have separate curriculums, but sees it as a really strong connection. I think [European campus] sees it as a one-to-one. Everything we are doing here, they have to do there. I think we don't always see it in that exact same way. So that, sometimes we will make decisions and no one says like, "wait, how will this effect [European campus]?" And then we make decisions and we let them know and they say "this is going to affect us!" And we're like, it doesn't have to. It's not a rule. We don't have to be the same exact curriculum. And so when we made some of these changes, like, we added the [course topic 1] for example. We had all of these changes and we added [course topic 2] you know and all these like [course topic 3] and all these other classes. And the [course topic 1] and we put it in our core, they were like "what a minute, this isn't, like, we have to do this class now and I don't know if we can do this class." We spent a lot of time talking with them. 'Cause we had different technology, computer labs, and access and faculty with particular skills, but now anyway, they do teach the class.

And it is in their curriculum. But, I think it is often that relationship where we make changes without the expectation that they are going...we see them as having some independence and they see us as maybe...being like whatever we do they should be doing.

The dichotomy between the same degree yet having specific different major requirements and courses has resulted in what Pete referred to as an ambiguous relationship. While the campuses are autonomous in terms of how courses are taught, the program outcomes are aligned although the European campus currently has additional outcomes. This is evidenced by additional rows in the program-wide assessment rubrics for the European campus. The rubric outcomes recognize both the differences and the similarities between the two programs.

Regarding curricular change implementation and communication about it, there are varying degrees of inclusion. Several faculty from both campuses mentioned that over the last few years, there has been greater communication and inclusion of the European campus. As senior administrators at MCU have changed, there have been more in person visits to the European campus by administrators. U.S. faculty had been travelling to teach at the European campus for some time, but the visiting of U.S. campus senior administrators was new for the institution. One of the European campus administrators regularly visits the U.S. campus, but none of the European faculty had been to the U.S. campus yet. One had plans to visit two months after I was there.

Coordination and Assessment

How the courses are delivered in terms of teaching and student learning is left up to the individual faculty members on both campuses. Some faculty directly attributed this to academic freedom. There was also a high level of trust by the U.S. campus members who mentioned implicit trust in the European campus faculty in their ability to teach and their understanding of the field. When asked if there was coordination between the two campuses regarding course

content or delivery, the majority of the European faculty mentioned occasional to no contact. The exception was Pete, who said,

So really there's not that much coordination in terms of...in terms of the courses. We do meet with them. Ah, lately we've had meetings about assessment and program outcomes. So, we have them all aligned. But in terms of course materials, ah, we use different materials. For example, in one of my classes that I taught for the first time, I got in contact with... [Maddie at the U.S. campus], who is the current chair of the department. And she shared her syllabus with me and the book she was using and I ended up using the book she was using. Mainly, because I found it interesting, useful. But that's the level of coordination, that's the highest I guess because not because we need to do it together and do the same thing. But because I need help in that sense.

While this was the only example of specific course-level coordination, program level coordination was mentioned several times in regard to overall program assessment. Part of the annual program assessment plan form filled out by the U.S. campus faculty members requires explanation of how assessment efforts are coordinated with the European campus on courses and/or with the program. Additionally, there is a European campus faculty member on each program's assessment committee. This was a fairly new assessment process for the institution. Program A's European campus assessment committee member felt this process was positive and felt included in the department. Program B's assessment committee member was hopeful that the result of the committee work would be more integration of the department. This sense of collaboration or assessment however was not reported by the entire European campus faculty interviewed. European campus faculty reported submitting artifacts for assessment; however they did not discuss the evaluation of them. This level of assessment was corroborated in recent accreditation documents. The documents stated that the European campus has done some of their own assessment for improvement, but the program level assessment with inclusion of both campuses is in the process of being implemented.

The program level assessment is based on a common rubric for each program. The outcomes are the same for each program on both campuses. Additionally, Program A's assessment rubric has two additional rows specific to the European campus relating to "local, regional, and global issues". Program B planned to add a "dimension" to their rubric to address the European campuses' "international nature of their program". These additions to their program rubrics reflect how the major requirements vary slightly between the two campuses due to the differences in locale, context, and market.

Faculty Perceptions of Their Role Regarding Curriculum

The final research question is about the faculty and their perceptions about curriculum at MCU. The final research question is:

R3: What are faculty perceptions of their role regarding curriculum within the institution?

What factors influence their perceptions?

Faculty's perceptions of their role regarding the curriculum is influenced by several factors: the power differential between the campuses, academic freedom, communication and personal connections/faculty exchange, the locale/context of the campus, faculty quality, and student needs. These factors result in different curricular concerns of the faculty. This is expressed at the course level, the program level, and consideration for different student populations.

Power Differential

Nine of the sixteen participants remarked about a power differential between the two campuses. While there was a high level of confidence in the European faculty and their programs, the final decision-making rested with the U.S. campus program. Also, whenever the U.S. campus changes their degree program, the European campus felt they had to operate the

similar or identical way in many instances. Mary, a U.S. campus Program B faculty member, expressed her thoughts about the differences between the two campuses this way:

So, it feels like there are times where we are being asked to paddle the same canoe. We're like...so not the same canoe. So...not really quite sure how...these things are supposed to go...together. I've never been to the [European] campus. I don't know anything more about it than anyone else. I mean and so I sort of feel like that's their thing and we are doing our thing. And so it sort of seems like there are times we are together and times where we are not.

While the faculty meet the same hiring requirements and teach the same courses, there are perceptible differences between the two campuses. Maddie, the U.S. campus Program B chair put it this way:

I think there is a desire to connect and collaborate and talk and share information. And so that helps. I do find that I have to watch myself. So, we are the [U.S.] campus and they are the [European] campus but it is easy to fall into language that positions us as "the campus" and them as the "[European] Campus"...And I find myself doing that sometimes and I have to stop and think about that and reflect on, kind of, backtracking from that. There's this sort of position of power that it creates, that I think might be present in the system, but it doesn't have to be the only way which our relationships are framed. That language choice can make a difference, I think.

Maddie is conscious of the differences between the two campuses and does not want to only describe their relationship only as "us" and "them". However, she knows that may be part of the system. She would like to give the other campus equal consideration, but she is often focused on her day-to-day, immediate issues at the U.S. campus. None of the faculty seemed to relish a power difference or superiority; rather it was just something that was present.

Charles, a U.S. campus administrator, noted the perspective that European campus is sometimes treated as a "bureau of tourism" where the European campus faculty are obliged to accommodate U.S. campus faculty. Additionally, the European campus faculty's salaries are lower, they have fewer benefits, and have a larger teaching load in comparison to the U.S. campus faculty. Charles sensed in conversations with some European campus faculty that they

felt like “second-class citizens”. This statement was corroborated by Alice, who used the same phrase to describe the relationship between the two campuses. She followed with a statement that it had gotten better, especially now that her U.S. campus program chair is more inclusive. This would then allow for more collaboration in terms of offering a program exclusively at the European campus. Because the U.S. campus held the final decision-making authority, this created an environment where the European campus programs had limited autonomy. The European campus faculty were always subject to the decisions of the U.S. campus.

While this power differential appeared to be inherent in the relationship between the two campuses rather than deliberate. Another example of different treatment of the European campus was the issue of the difference in salaries and benefits between the two campuses. This issue was raised by the European faculty when MCU’s president visited the European campus faculty senate. He made it clear that the campuses should not be comparable but rather comparable to their local markets. The faculty members on both campuses have the same qualifications, but they are treated differently because they work in different markets.

Throughout the interviews, the participants used different adjectives to describe the two campuses. Usually the campuses were referred to by the city’s name. The European campus’s brand includes the city name, and much of the documentation refers to the city name. However, the U.S. campus was called by the state name, city name, or more specifically the main campus’s name, depending on who was saying it. Both campuses used the city name. However, three European campus faculty used the state name while three U.S. campus faculty used the main campus’ name. The usage of different terms reflects the speaker’s context and concept of the location. A European campus administrator made the point that the U.S. campus was not the

“home campus”. I was not sure if this was to highlight united nature of the institution or the autonomy of the European campus.

In terms of the changes in the curriculum, the European campus was not always aware of changes in a timely manner. Petra, a Program A faculty member, generously states that:

I think it is just lack of habit of practice in them considering us as being part of the same program. Of course, they know we are here. But, it is an afterthought sometimes and it is not a criticism of anyone in particular. It's just the whole operation, I guess, for a long time we were told after decision, after fact, what we needed to do. Whereas now I think we are moving into a new...I'm absolutely convinced that with all of the changes that are going on there and here as well. We are moving in a new era of genuine collaboration as of this year.

Perhaps the highest goal is collaboration between the programs with an acknowledgement of their individuality and unique strengths. Pete, a European Program B faculty member, felt included in current program activities. He said,

We are not just being told “this is what you have to do”. But we also have a say in the process of deciding what to do. So that's one of the biggest changes that has happened in, that's pretty recent. So that's the strongest development that I see.

We have had a very positive experience so far as we are working on student learning outcomes and student learning template for the program together with them. They sent us a draft; we've added [European campus] specific learning outcomes. We are negotiating with them. We are collecting our artifacts together. So, it's the most positive experience, I have had in terms of collaborating and deciding together how we move forward. We feel that we are indeed part of the department. But, guess historically it hasn't necessarily been the case. So yes, communication and lack of some personal connection, was perhaps an issue. But also, this...actual reality that most departments sometimes forgot that we are here. But, yeah, as the assessment is the big preoccupation at the moment and is the buzzword for the next few years.

It is difficult to work on curricular issues if one feels forgotten or left out. Most of the faculty in each program felt that they were communicating more now than before, but that there still is room for improvement.

Curricular Academic Freedom

Academic freedom is clearly outlined in documentation from both campuses. The European campus has an academic freedom statement that is based on the U.S. model of academic freedom. The policy includes a statement that the specific material for a course is not determined for the European campus faculty as long as it is appropriate for the course objectives, course description, or course syllabus. The U.S. campus faculty are assured their academic freedom per their faculty handbook.

Neither campus faculty noted major curricular issues regarding academic freedom. Faculty from the European campus stated that they have freedom to discuss controversial issues in the classroom and to choose the content necessary for the courses. This extends to proposing courses as well.

Communication and Personal Connections/Faculty Exchange

Communication and personal relationships between the programs makes a difference when faculty are changing or proposing new curriculum. Petra, a European Program A faculty member, noted that

We are always consulting [U.S. campus] when we are innovating anything in our program. In the past, I don't think they have consulted us. They didn't see us as instrumental in deciding what they should deliver there. But, I think that's changing and again, I think that is a big part of improving communication, improving personal relations...The personal does bring a big contribution.

Petra's statement illustrates the need for communication with and understanding of the needs of the European campus faculty. She felt the relationship between the two campuses was improving but there was a need for understanding of and communication with the European campus faculty by the U.S. program faculty.

Several faculty members noted a perception that the relationship between the two campuses had improved in recent years. In the last two years, the president and the chief academic officer had both visited the campus which had not happened before. On a faculty level, annually there are U.S. faculty on the European campus. As Petra noted, the more the U.S. faculty are familiar with the European campus, the better the communication and collaboration is. The most collaborative example was when Pete contacted a U.S. campus faculty member when he was developing the syllabus for a course. He found it helpful, but no other interviewee mentioned collaboration on a course level.

Both campus's interviewees mentioned the recent work on assessment as an opportunity for collaboration. For example, the institutional assessment plan template requires programs to address how they are coordinating with the European campus. Additionally, program assessment rubrics were mentioned by faculty on both campuses. The European campus faculty were even able to add lines to the rubric for their program and desired outcomes. This enables the programs to assess the same program outcomes but also meet the needs of the European campus programs. Faculty on both campuses mentioned their involvement in collecting assessment artifacts. However, since the assessment process is fairly new to the European campus, there was not enough information about how the assessment data and process will inform curricular decisions moving forward. That said, both European campus assessment committee members seemed very pleased with the work that was being done and the collaboration that was happening.

Locale/Context

European campus faculty were clear that their curriculum is appropriate for what is expected in Europe. Their programs are based an international perspective and what is expected regarding their discipline in Europe. Xavier, a European campus Program A faculty member said

that, “we also included something specific about an international perspective which maybe they don’t need it in [U.S. campus]. But, for the [European] campus, it is necessary. Intercultural perspective and intercultural communication and international knowledge.” These expectations are reflected in the program requirements being slightly different at the European campus versus the U.S. campus. This is not a negative, but rather is an indicator of how European faculty perceive the courses and program they teach in. This is also intended to meet the needs and market expectations of degree-seeking students at the European campus.

For both their classes and their programs, both campuses make use of the locale and opportunities, whether events, conferences or guest speakers. These enrichment opportunities are part of the uniqueness of each campus and its offerings for students. Several U.S. faculty mentioned local U.S. current events and how they had brought the topic into the classroom discussions. European campus faculty mentioned both regional and international issues and how they brought them into classroom and campus discussions as well.

Good Faculty/Good Students

Overall, the faculty appreciated their colleagues on the other campus. The U.S. campus faculty thought well of qualifications of the faculty on the European campus using adjectives such as “good”, “fantastic”, “excellent”, and “extremely good”. Pete, a European campus faculty member said,

But I think it [MCU] is a great institution and I think that we get a lot good, good students and a lot of good faculty. And for they are bad students as well, that’s unavoidable. But, I’ve had extremely positive experiences with my students to the extent that I’ve worked...close to publishing a paper with an undergraduate student which was finished last semester. And students...there are lots of them who are very engaged and who are really hard working and that makes for very rewarding experiences in the classroom. As a whole, academically speaking I see [MCU] as a great institution here in [country] and in Europe.

While overall faculty felt the student population was capable, there were a few exceptions to this on each campus. Two U.S. faculty felt the European students were less prepared, but their initial experience with teaching at the European campus was more than a decade ago.

CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS

This chapter includes discussion and analysis of the finding presented in chapter four. After a summary of findings, analysis is given through a discussion of findings as they relate to IBC literature, an analysis through the theoretical framework of micropolitics and neoliberalism, and conclusions regarding this. The conclusion of the chapter includes policy implications of the study and implications for future research.

Summary of Findings

Curriculum Delivery at MCU

In terms of curriculum delivery, the courses are taught in a face-to-face format in a classroom. The faculty on both campuses reported and were observed engaging students in activities such as lecture, discussions, and group activities. While the formats and outcomes of the courses were similar, the faculty members designed their courses to meet the student learning needs and to achieve the student learning outcomes as appropriate for their student populations and locale. The faculty engaged students in classes ranging in size from twenty to thirty-five students. At the European campus, the classes taught by visiting U.S. campus faculty were taught in a compressed format, usually during the summer term. They reported the classes delivered in a similar fashion to their U.S. campus classes. The faculty exchange served to not only enrich the offerings at the European campus, but also it fostered greater understanding across the campuses and increased communication between faculty due to the interpersonal connections.

On a program level, major requirements were scaled and focused differently on each campus. The difference in programs were based on several factors. On the European campus, there were fewer faculty and expectation of a degree from a European institution was one with an international focus. The U.S. campus had significantly more faculty, who also taught at the

graduate level. Because of the variety of faculty, they could offer multiple concentrations of their major. In the case of Program B, the facilities at the U.S. campus lent themselves to more diverse course offerings as well.

Faculty at both campuses had a similar level of academic freedom regarding curriculum delivery, syllabi, and course materials. Faculty were able to design their course curriculum as they saw fit. While the academic division and campus prescribed parts of the syllabus, the rest of the syllabus was the purview of the faculty member. Faculty could also alter the course content as needed for either the student interest or to further student learning.

In terms of curriculum delivery or curriculum development and improvement, faculty at both campuses were engaged in various different levels of assessment and professional development. There was coordination between the two campuses regarding undergraduate curriculum assessment. A European campus faculty member from each program participated in their program's assessment committee and these faculty members reported participating in program assessment. This included adding lines to program assessment rubric to take into account the European campus's international focus. Faculty from both campuses took advantage of the institution's center for teaching and learning offerings, although many cited their research as a priority over inside professional development. Faculty also participated in outside professional development such as conferences and other activities. These were supported financially by the institution as well.

The major difference between faculty at each campus was the faculty workload expectations, academic rank, and tenure or lack thereof. The U.S. campus, as a research institution had a two course per semester workload expectation of faculty while the European campus faculty were expected to teach three courses per semester. The U.S. campus faculty also

have academic rank and have tenure opportunities. While the European campus was considered more as a teaching institution and faculty research was also a priority for the faculty, their workload was different. Also, the European campus faculty did not have faculty rank or tenure, but did have employment security through national labor and employment laws. This difference was attributed to the European context and different national higher education system. Both campuses had a faculty senate, but they were separate organizations. Faculty governance was different each campus regarding faculty welfare and organization. Although it is not confirmed in the data collected, I assume that there was also a difference in salaries in which the home campus faculty are paid more annually.

Curriculum Development and Improvement

Curriculum development and improvement occurred at course level, program level, and a campus level. Faculty were involved in the process of curriculum changes and development of new courses along with changes in the program. While faculty at the European campus had a smaller offering of courses and a specific concentration for their major, they were able to modify and require a sequencing of courses for Program A and the grouping of core courses for Program B. Faculty on both campuses were able to modify their own course content as needed whether for the design of the course, syllabus, the choice of textbooks, or classroom activities. The major requirements were shaped by the location, expectations of the European campus faculty and students, and expertise of the European campus faculty. European campus faculty were also able to ask U.S. campus program chairs to offer additional courses listed in the MCU bulletin upon approval. Two European campus faculty each had proposed a new course which required them to seek approvals from their program chair who in turn sent it on to the U.S. campus program chair. It then moved through the U.S. campus bureaucracy for approval. Faculty on each campus was

involved in curriculum development and improvement, however it was the U.S. campus who had the final authority on many aspects of the curriculum development and improvement.

On a program level, each campus faculty made curriculum changes to their program. However, it was the U.S. campus which is the final authority regarding semester hours, course descriptions, and approving new courses and programs. While a new Middle East minor was developed in consultation with European campus faculty and administration, the final approval came from the academic council on the U.S. campus. However, when the U.S. campus altered prerequisites, semester hours, or designated core courses, this affect the European campus programs and how they offered courses since the European campus followed the U.S. campus. European campus faculty reported finding out about the changes rather than being informed of them on a timely basis. The European campus faculty were involved in the curriculum development and improvement through high levels of collaboration within their own campus department and lower levels of collaboration and communication between campuses. The U.S. campus faculty were involved in curriculum development and improvement as well which may or may not affected the European campus program depending on the decision made.

Faculty Perceptions of Their Role Regarding Curriculum

Several factors affected faculty's perceptions of their role regarding the curriculum; a noticeable power differential, curricular academic freedom, communication and personal connections, the locale/context, and different student populations. The findings indicate that a high level of autonomy along with coordination and collaboration with the home campus is important in IBC curriculum delivery. The coordination and collaboration varied but communication and personal connections, usually development through faculty exchange were important. This activity increased the level of trust and understanding between the campuses'

program faculty. Although there was a level of trust between the program faculty, there still was a power differential that influenced curriculum development and improvement, especially at the European campus. The authority of the U.S. campus and the decisions they made without consultation or communicated after the fact with the European campus was an issue for European campus faculty. European campus faculty had a more international focus regarding the nature of the curriculum and their student population. While this was a factor regarding curriculum development and improvement, the curricular academic freedom enabled European campus faculty to shape the curriculum to meet the international nature of their campus and their student population.

Discussion of Findings Relating to IBC Literature

Some of the findings of this study align with IBC and cross-border higher education literature while other findings did not. In terms of alignment, the findings align regarding the topics of the demand and motivation for an IBC, types of communication between campuses, facility ownership, trust between campuses, program offerings, and a power differential. The study findings did not align with the literature in terms of competition with local higher education institutions, the status of the faculty, professional development, curriculum development and delivery, and assessment and quality assurance. The differences in findings may be due to such variables as the longevity of MCU campus operations or its location in Europe which is more culturally similar than most of the studies of IBCs in the Middle East or Asia Pacific regions.

Demand and Motivation for an IBC

The motivation for establishing MCU's European campus was initially based on the interest of MCU to have a study abroad location for their U.S. campus and later, to meet the

demand for individuals who want an American-style higher education experience in Europe. The evolution of MCU as an IBC is different than the findings of Croom (2011) regarding Japanese IBCs and educational hubs in Dubai and Qatar and Knight (2011b, 2014b) where local governments are interested in expanding their higher education system with IBCs. MCU's European campus appeared to be established without governmental incentives according to available documentation.

MCU's European campus however was seen as a revenue generating entity which is in line with the literature of Croom (2011, 2012), Gibb (2012), Humfrey (2013), Knight (2007, 2011b), Lane (2011b, 2011b), Sakamoto and Chapman (2011), and Wilkins and Huisman (2012). The MCU European campus is also part of the internationalization of the MCU brand which is also in line with the literature of Croom (2012), Egron-Polak (2013), and Knight (2007, 2014b). The European campus was promoted along with other activities as internationalizing MCU.

MCU's European campus was not however in competition with nor put local higher education providers at a disadvantage unlike the findings of Lane (2011b) regarding IBCs which were a part of educational hubs in Malaysia and Dubai. Because MCU's European campus had less than 1000 students and was located in a city with several large public universities, it was not in direct competition to local higher education. The local public universities enroll thousands of students by comparison. Additionally, MCU's student population was both study abroad and degree-seeking students of which, the degree-seeking students were just a portion of the overall enrollment and tuition income for the campus.

Benefits of the MCU European campus

MCU's Program A and Program B curriculum was delivered by faculty who had the same credentials as faculty at the MCU home campus. While a portion of the cross-border literature focused on "flying faculty" as a method of curriculum delivery at cross-border higher education institutions (Aiello & Clarke, 2010; Dunn & Wallace, 2004; Shams & Huisman, 2014; K. Smith, 2014), the faculty at MCU's European campus were full-time employees who lived locally and were long-time residents of Europe. Since the study location was in Europe and the majority of the literature regarding cross-border faculty is regarding Asia-Pacific (Aiello & Clarke, 2010; Dobos, 2011; Dunn & Wallace, 2004; K. Smith, 2014) and the Middle East (D. Chapman et al., 2014; Jauregui, 2013; Lazen, 2016; McNamara et al., 2013; L. Smith, 2009), the faculty population may or may not be reflective of IBCs in the European region.

The facilities of the MCU European campus were owned by MCU which was in line with Lane and Kinser's (2013) findings regarding the majority of IBCs owning their own facilities. MCU even had renovated Hall III within the last five years. The facilities were attractive and fit the location of the campus.

Communication Between Campuses

Communication between the home institution staff and the delivering staff about the curriculum was a major theme in the literature (A. Chapman & Pyvis, 2013; Dobos et al., 2013; O'Mahony, 2014). While much of the cross-border literature discussed curriculum delivery as identical delivery at all locations, MCU's European campus did not require identical delivery. The need for communication for MCU was mostly about changes in the curriculum and student achievement of program outcomes. The literature regarding communication between campuses discussed issues of timeliness, intercultural understanding, and effectiveness (Clay & Minett-

Smith, 2012; Dobos, 2011; Heffernan & Poole, 2005; Lazen, 2016). For MCU's European campus, communication took place through emails, in-person visits, video conference meetings, and phone calls. As in the literature, email was the primary method of communication among program faculty. The secondary method was video conferencing for meetings. These meetings took place more frequently for administrators than for the faculty. Administrators had weekly and monthly meetings while faculty met only a few times a semester with other campus program members at most. The lack of timeliness of responding to emails was mentioned by a MCU faculty member as an issue. None of the faculty mentioned issues regarding intercultural understanding or effectiveness. This may be a result of both campuses having similar cultural backgrounds.

While there was a level of trust and professional respect between faculty and administrators between the two campuses, communication and cross-campus initiatives furthered a sense of hopefulness about collaboration and inclusion among the faculty members. The administrators interviewed met regularly via video conference and the senior administrator of the European campus travelled several times a year to the U.S. campus. The importance of trust/respect among the cross campus faculty members was also found in the literature of A. Chapman and Pyvis (2013), Heffernan and Poole (2005), and Keevers et al (2014).

The issues about communication were more about how and when to communicate within the program effectively about changes. The level of autonomy at the course level at MCU was higher than represented in the cross-border literature about curriculum delivery. As a result, the issues were on the program level rather than on the course level. The understanding of the IBC was enhanced by U.S. campus faculty members taught at or administrators visited the European

campus. This increased level of understanding however did not show evidence of improvement regarding curriculum delivery or improvement.

Professional Development

Professional development was another major theme in the cross-border literature. Some of the literature focused on pre-departure development (Crosling, 2012; Gopal, 2011; Gribble & Zигuras, 2003) and some focused on on-site professional development (A. Chapman & Pyvis, 2013; Jauregui, 2013; Keevers et al., 2014; Spencer-Oatey, 2013). When MCU European campus faculty were asked about professional development offered at MCU, very few actively participated in these activities. Of those interviewed, there was an awareness of the offerings and the quality of the offerings but faculty did not have a lot of time to participate in them. Some of the faculty members wanted to work on their research or had other service obligations that took precedence. Some of the literature also focused on specific intercultural professional development (Gribble & Zигuras, 2003; Hamza, 2010; Leask et al., 2005). While European campus faculty were aware of the intercultural issues in their classrooms, there was no mention of specific intercultural professional development during the interviews. There was an internationalization of the curriculum professional development activity mentioned in documentation, but this issue did not come up in the discussion of professional development. All but one of the MCU European faculty had studied and taught in another or several other countries prior to working at MCU. Their prior experiences and backgrounds may have lowered the interest in intercultural professional development.

Power Differential

A power differential between campuses was evident at MCU. This was in alignment with the literature of Clay and Minett-Smith (2012), Dobos (2011), Dobos et al. (2013), and Edwards

et al. (2014). There was a higher level of respect for the faculty at the MCU European campus than was evident in Dobos et al. (2013) which was in the Asia-Pacific region. Irrespective of the global region, the difference between a host campus and home campus is one that is difficult to navigate for some. For MCU faculty, they were respectful and supportive of their colleagues at the other campus, however, as long as the U.S. campus has the final approval and authorization of the curriculum, the home campus held the place of a higher authority. The difference between the reputation as a research institution at the U.S. campus and the reputation of the European campus as a teaching institution, along with the differences in workload and opportunities, the IBC faculty will always be different and never an equal partner.

Curriculum Development and Delivery

The curriculum at MCU's European campus is based on market demand for the programs along with approval from the U.S. campus programs to offer them. Since the programs then adjust their offerings based on their ability to offer courses and the expectations of a degree offered in Europe, this is different than much of the cross-border literature about the subject. MCU offers a business program along with traditional humanities, social science and professionally-oriented programs. This model is more inclusive than programs discussed in Lane (2011a), Fox and Shamisi (2014), and Prowse and Goddard (2010). While Lane (2011a) was broad in scope, Fox and Shamisi (2014) and Prowse and Goddard (2010) were focused only on the Middle Eastern region. Because MCU is in Europe and also has study abroad students, this alters the market and possibility of campus offerings. MCU's European campus appears to have diversity of course offerings and programs that may not be offered at some other IBCs. The curricula offered at the European campus also reflect the location and culture of the campus locally, nationally and regionally within Europe. This includes the academic trips, courses

specific to regional topics, and programs that reflect the international nature of the European region. This was evidenced also by the program assessment rubrics that included additional material to reflect the international nature of the European campus program offerings within Program A and Program B.

Some literature focused on the lack of autonomy which resulted in intercultural issues with the curriculum (Shams & Huisman, 2014; Tange, 2008; Whittaker, 2008). Other literature highlighted addressing localization of the curriculum by teaching courses of local interest (Crosling, 2011; McBurnie & Ziguras, 2001). MCU's European campus curricular offerings and delivery seem to have more autonomy for an IBC than what is presented in the literature. This may be due to the maturity of the IBC or its development as a study abroad location or other factors. The delivery of Program A and Program B at MCU's European campus takes into account the diversity of the student population and the students' learning styles. Based on the classroom observations and the faculty interviews on both campuses, the delivery is grounded in the disciplines but the faculty-student interactions take into account the student needs and interests. The faculty autonomy at the course level is present on both campuses and allows for curriculum delivery to be based on creating a positive learning environment for their location and student population.

The intercultural nature of the faculty-student interactions at MCU's European campus did not appear to be a barrier to learning. For the MCU European campus faculty, the student population diversity in regards to backgrounds and cultures was something to be embraced and contributed to the identity of the campus. The student diversity was also taken into account regarding classroom activities and student learning. MCU is different than the studies done at IBCs in the Middle East (Bakken, 2013; Botting, 2014; Prowse & Goddard, 2010; Rostron,

2009) and Asia-Pacific (Dobos, 2011; Dunn & Wallace, 2004; Hicks & Jarrett, 2008; Hoare, 2013) which had more significant intercultural issues for faculty and students. This may be due to the European context and expectations of student and faculty at the IBC.

Assessment and Quality Assurance

Assessment and quality assurance in cross-border education (Dobos et al., 2013; Shams & Huisman, 2014) is needed to ensure consistency between different locations. MCU's European campus is accredited by both the country's national agency and by a U.S. accrediting body. It seemed that the assessment work is driven by the U.S. accrediting body since it was mentioned in several of their accreditation reports as needing improvement. MCU was actively working on assessment and improvement and it seemed to be an expectation of faculty.

Theoretical Framework Analysis

The theoretical framework for this case study is micropolitics and neoliberalism. Micropolitics analyzes the use of power, interests/motivation of individuals when they make decisions, which are political. From Ball (1987), "decision-making is not an abstract rational process which can be plotted on an organizational chart; it is a political process, it is the stuff of micro-political activity" (p. 26). In regards to faculty role in curriculum delivery, decisions regarding what type of curriculum will be delivered on a program or course level are influenced by power and the interests/motivations of individuals along with the influence of the location.

Neoliberalism was used to provide analysis on the macro level. Harvey (2007) writes that, neoliberalism "proposes that human well-being can best be advanced by liberating individual entrepreneurial freedoms and skills within an institutional framework characterized by strong private property rights, free markets, and free trade" (p. 2). In this case study,

neoliberalism influence the curriculum development and delivery at an IBC through profit-making, hiring considerations, and cost considerations.

Micropolitics

The factors of power, interests/motivation, and location are examined in this micropolitical analysis of curriculum delivery at an IBC. Blase (1991) says that

“micropolitics is about power and how people use it to influence others and to protect themselves. It is about conflict and how people compete with each other to get what they want. It is about cooperation and how people build support among themselves to achieve their ends.” (p. 1)

Blase (1991) later defines micropolitics as:

Micropolitics is the use of formal and informal power by individuals and groups to achieve their goals in organizations. In large part, political actions result from perceived differences between individuals and groups, coupled with the motivation to use power to influence and/or protect. Although such actions are consciously motivated, any action, consciously or unconsciously motivated, may have political “significance” in a given situation. Both cooperative and conflictive actions and processes are part of the realm of micropolitics. Moreover, macro- and micropolitical factors frequently interact. (p. 11)

The micropolitical analysis engages the research questions in the following two questions: 1) using power, interests/motivation and location, how do these factors influence curriculum delivery at the host campus, European campus and why there are differences between the campuses regarding the courses and the programs? 2) How does the micropolitical climate effect faculty involvement in the curriculum development and delivery process?

Power

There was a defined difference between the European campus and U.S. campus when it came to who had more power regarding curricular decision-making between the two campuses.

Ball (1987) defines power as:

Power here is conceived of as an outcome, something achieved and maintained in and through a performance, in and through joint action. Power is contested not invested. The dice may be loaded in favour of heads [of the educational institution] but circumstances

can be great equalizers, and micro-politics is a dynamic process dependent upon the skills, resources, and alliances of its participants (p. 85).

Several individuals articulated the existence of a power differential between the two campuses.

One European administrator mentioned that the European campus felt like “second-class citizens” but that it was improving. Charles, a U.S. administrator, said that he thought the European campus sometimes felt “as though they are treated as sort of an afterthought by the main campus”. This power differential was present in the approval process of which the U.S. campus had the final approval of the curriculum, the level of communication and collaboration between campuses, the different levels of autonomy, and faculty governance.

Communication

When asked about the level of faculty involvement in curriculum delivery and curriculum decisions and communication about them, Petra, an European campus faculty member, answered that:

Well, I think the message is...in the way I see it, that there was insufficient involvement in the past. But that has started to change at least in terms of [Program A], that we are beginning to consult a lot more. We are always consulting [U.S. Campus State Name] when we are innovating anything in our program. In the past, I don't think they have consulted us. They didn't see us as instrumental in deciding what they should deliver there. But, I think that's changing and again, I think that is a big part of improving communication, improving personal relations.

While European campus faculty do have academic freedom in their curriculum delivery on within the courses, the course descriptions were changed and approved by the U.S. campus programs and administration. This power differential put the European campus at a disadvantage. The European Program A chair felt that emails went unanswered while other European campus faculty did not have much communication with the U.S. campus at all. This is in contrast with the European campus administrators who attended weekly and monthly meetings via videoconference with U.S. campus administrators. Maddie, the U.S. campus program B chair,

responded with the following statement regarding the factors regarding the two campus relationship:

I think it is complex. So I would say distance plays a role in the sense that in my day-to-day life, they are not here. And so when I have many things going on and I think about the many factors. Part of it, it's about learning to think about them regularly and consistently because I don't see them and it doesn't remind me right? So, part of it's about needing a shift in how we think about our relationship to them. So, that distance doesn't mean we just don't think about them in moments when we should in terms of what we are doing in the department.

A majority of the interviewees felt there had been an improvement in the communication between the campuses in recent times. Most of the communication among the faculty was through email, while administrators who regularly attended meetings via video conferencing. For the European faculty, the infrequency in communication with the U.S. campus program faculty, put them at a disadvantage when there were curricular changes planned or implemented. The European faculty felt comfortable working with their own program faculty and making modifications locally, but there was a perceptible distance and lack of communication regarding curricular changes that came from the U.S. campus.

Autonomy

Autonomy is one expression of power in higher education. The ability to either as an individual or a group, whether as a department or as a larger group such as the entire faculty body, to determine how curriculum development and delivery took place was limited at European campus. In this case, there was a bifurcation of autonomy for European campus faculty regarding curriculum development and delivery. On one hand, they have academic freedom to teach and design their courses to their strengths and skills. On the other hand, the university bulletin with its course descriptions was written and approved, for the most part by U.S. campus faculty. When a course changes whether in content or the number of credit hours, it would be

approved by the U.S. program chair and the U.S. campus bureaucracy. However, the U.S. campus faculty could change the program curriculum without consultation of the European campus faculty. This, by design puts the European campus at a disadvantage. Depending on the relationship between the program chairs and the faculty themselves, this can be a significant issue or a non-issue for the program. Both Program A and Program B felt their relationships were improving but communication needed to improve regarding curricular changes.

There were several examples in the data of the lack of communication between the two campuses about curricular changes. One example was Petra's, a European campus faculty, having to change a course weeks before the term started because of a change at the U.S. campus. Petra said that,

...while I am quite new, my experience so far is limited as it is, we could work better. We could work a little closer. For example, they in [U.S. Campus], they changed the [specific Program A] class...from a three-credit course to a four-credit course adding a lab session. And for, we found that out very late. And so I had to create a whole new syllabus for the lab in the last few weeks before the class started. And things like this. I don't want to complain. I'm just saying that perhaps given that we are delivering the same program. Some of the decisions could be taken more jointly...in a more anticipated way. I think we are moving in that direction already. I think the relationship between the two departments or the two campuses is strengthening.

This lack of communication, whether deliberate or unintentional, put the European campus program at a disadvantage. This creates an atmosphere where the European campus has to work on figuring out how to improve communication and understanding with the program faculty at the U.S. campus so they can deliver the curriculum. A second example was Maddie's realization that programmatic changes would affect the European campus program which she had not communicated to them. Maddie, the U.S. campus Program B chair, said the following when asked to describe the relationship between the two campuses overall:

Like when we redid our curriculum, we changed the prerequisites for some of our classes, but [European campus] hadn't made the same kind core curriculum change. So, I'm like

how do we change our prerequisites without that affecting their prerequisites which was again was something until we decided we were going to do it, I never occurred to me that it would affect them. It was only in the implementation in the system did I realize. I don't know how this system works. And I don't know if I'm about to do something that has negative consequences that I need to figure out how to avoid. It gets confusing. So part of it is the system and part of it is the distance. Part of it is different needs.

While the lack of communication about the Program B core curriculum change at the U.S. campus was not intended to penalize the European campus, it did affect them. Maddie seemed to understand the consequences of her actions, but was confused about how to prevent it. She was in a position of power by the very nature of the relationship between the two campuses to make changes and yet she did not want to negatively affect the European campus, but had. This results in the European campus implementing the decisions from the U.S. campus since they are offering the same major and degree. As a result, curricular changes may just reflect the U.S. campus and may not always take into consideration the needs of the European campus.

While the European campus Program B faculty had their own structure for their major based on their students' needs and the abilities of their faculty, they had to conform to the curricular decisions that the U.S. campus makes as they affect them. The European faculty are then having to react to changes rather than being part of a discussion. This may be part of the difference in the size of faculty and student population. Each of the European programs were only three full-time faculty members compared to the over fifteen faculty members at the U.S. campus per program. While the interviewed faculty spoke highly of each other, there seemed to be a difference in the outlook regarding curricular changes. Perhaps since the European faculty offered a small international subset of the U.S. campus curriculum, they had a similar small input into curricular changes.

While curriculum changes favor the U.S. campus programs, the faculty that were interviewed had similar goals regarding teaching to engage students. This common interest

appeared to be the basis for how curriculum delivery occurs on both campuses. Several faculty on both campuses articulated their goal to teach in a student-centered way. Petra described herself as “quite a committed and enthusiastic teacher”. Pete described his “philosophy is to combine student-centered teaching and it’s based on students’ needs.” Maddie enjoyed MCU since “there is much more opportunity for kind of mentoring students and relationship building which is better with my teaching approach.” Maxie engages students by “try[ing] to persuade them implicitly through examples of the need to learn how to do what I want them to do as opposed to telling them.”

While not directly connected to curriculum delivery for all faculty, faculty on both campuses mentioned the importance of their own research. There seemed to be three different professional interests for faculty: teaching, research, and service. All of the interviewed faculty had service to the institution in terms of administrative roles or committee assignments. This seemed universal for the institution. However, it was not clear in the data how much of faculty time was required for service. For faculty members on the U.S. campus, their teaching load was usually “two-two”, two courses per term per academic year to allow for their research. For faculty members on the European campus, their teaching load was ‘three-three’, three courses per term during the academic year, which made time for research more precious. Petra said it was “a big priority” for her. Margaret said:

...people want to do research, so we want to teach less...we teach six courses per year here...We wanted to teach less...to have more possibilities, more time to do research, and you know. So, yeah, there is some tension, I think, there is a tension between the home campus and the abroad campus because of this.

John, a senior European campus administrator, described the difference between campuses as the U.S. campus is “a research university and we [European campus] are a campus of a research university that is basically here to teach undergraduates.” While this explains the difference in

expectations between the two campuses, the faculty identity at the European campus was conflicted between the need to research and the demands of teaching and service. Their identity was similar to the U.S. campus, yet it was different. They had the same qualifications, but different expectations and different opportunities even though they all worked for MCU.

However, the issues between the U.S. campus and European campus were just part of a larger issue for the institution. According to Logan, a U.S. faculty member,

I just...I think that it is a kind of hierarchical structure that the [MCU] campus, main campus, [U.S.] campus dictates what they do. We try to include them, but I think that varies across departments. Maybe even college, I don't know. In terms of the curricular stuff, it is sort of missing to an extent here that. Not just between [MCU] and [European City], but within the department or within the college, within the university. We can't agree on a university core. We can't agree on sort of a common experience for undergraduates. So, every college has their own core.

When John, a senior European campus administrator, was asked about how new programs or courses are offered, he responded, "We communicate. You know one of the...I think there is more communication between us and the schools in [U.S. City] than among the schools themselves." The U.S. campus had a great deal more administration and bureaucracy than the European campus since it was the home campus and it was a research institution with several colleges.

A variant of the power and interest that European faculty have was their ability to introduce new courses to the curriculum. Both Anton and Xavier had proposed new courses based on their expertise and the courses were approved. They were able to promote their own interests and were supported by their departments in order to that the course proposals moved forward for U.S. campus approval. However, this was not how the majority of the curriculum is developed. The majority of the curriculum in terms of courses originated at the U.S. campus. On a program level, the program had to be approved by the U.S. campus program prior to being

offered at the European campus. This came with a proviso for Program A that required a U.S. faculty member teach a course, usually with a U.S. focus on the field, each year. While the European faculty felt this was to their benefit to have the faculty exchange, this did impose a restriction on the European faculty in terms of how to develop their program's curriculum. This also came at a cost to the European campus that had to pay for the U.S. faculty member's salary, travel, and accommodations.

Faculty Governance

Since the campus is registered as a private university in the European country, there are several different layers of faculty governance for MCU's European campus. One layer is faculty representation. The European campus faculty are organized with a Faculty Senate separate from the U.S. campus Faculty Senate. Additionally, the European campus faculty have a representation council for various matters by national labor law. Another layer is the administration of the European campus itself. The European campus has a single senior administrator who is responsible for the administration of the campus. This individual participates in weekly meetings with the St. Louis campus administration via video conferencing. There is also an academic administrator for academic matter. Another layer is the coordination and organization within each academic division and academic program. In the interviews, little was said about how the European campus administration and their interactions about curriculum and curriculum delivery. The majority of the data referred to the other campus faculty and their own program chair. Anton and Xavier mentioned that the European campus administrators were part of the approval process for new courses and programs. While there was little interview data on the relationship between faculty and the administration, there was documentation from the Faculty Senate minutes that indicate a discomfort with the senior administrator and consolidation

of power in the position. The documentation indicated that some faculty wanted a separation of certain functions to eliminate conflict of interest in certain matters.

In terms of a hierarchy, the European campus programs themselves appeared to be very inclusive of other faculty members. It could be assumed that they would have to be since they share offices with each other unlike on the U.S. campus. The European campus senior administrators appeared to be involved in curriculum development and approval, but not curriculum delivery specifically. During their interviews, they spoke about coordinating, collaborating, and communicating with programs and between campuses, but not about approvals or decision-making. A more through study may reveal more about the power issues within the campus administrative structure.

Interests/Motivation

Part of the micropolitical definition, were the interests or goals of individuals who may form into interest groups. This was related to the forms and uses of power and the consequences or meaning from the uses of power for others (Blase, 1997). The interests of MCU identity/mission, motivation for working at MCU

MCU Identity and Mission

European campus and U.S. campus faculty had different perceptions about MCU. Most European campus faculty felt that MCU was not well known in the area, whether the European city itself or regionally and this was a detriment to MCU. When U.S. campus faculty were asked about the mission of MCU or their motivation for coming to MCU, four faculty mentioned the MCU's mission with its focus on service and engagement with the community as a draw to the institution. This difference in perception, while not specific to curriculum development or delivery, it does indicate a difference in their motivation and interests. This extends to the

curriculum delivery at the U.S. campus where the mission is incorporated into classes and faculty research. The European campus faculty mentioned publishing in local news outlets and focusing on their international research when they have time.

Motivation

While some of the faculty were attracted to MCU as an institution, many of them mentioned either the fact that they were offered a job or that there was a financial or personal incentive for moving to the area was the reason why they were at MCU. Some mentioned the attraction to how the institution had small classes and the interest in student learning.

While Program A European campus faculty interviewed were fairly new to working at MCU, they had been there long enough to know that the curriculum needed updating and they were able to change the sequencing of the major since they were all new. At the U.S. campus, the program change took longer since the faculty turnover was slower. Logan said that

When I first got here, we hadn't done any curricular development in decades. There were classes on the books that hadn't been offered in years and years and years. There were classes on the books that just didn't meet the expectation of what a [Program A] degree in 2011 looked like. So, we've actually improved the degree. In a lot of this, we've had turnover in the department where older faculty retired, replaced by younger faculty. Younger faculty kind of come up with "here's how we did things when I was in college in 2005" as opposed to 1965. So, it's more of a...as the turnover in the department happens, the curriculum changes come up and those sort of natural outlets.

This difference in the rate of curricular change is a difference in the politics of having a large faculty of over 15 and a smaller group of three faculty. The decision making process was accelerated at the European campus because of their size and common interests and goals. The decision making process was much slower at the U.S. campus because of their size, seniority of faculty, and faculty experience as characterized by Logan. The European campus faculty in Program A were motivated to address an issue they had observed and were able to implement a change more quickly.

Location

The different location of the campuses affected the curriculum development and delivery. The interests and motivations of the faculty at each campus were influenced by the location. At the European campus, there was only a single concentration for each major of Program A and Program B. The concentration was based on an international experience and component to the curriculum. The faculty specifically even asked for program rubrics to include an extra row for an international component to reflect their program.

The faculty also had to take into consideration the student population when delivering the curriculum. The diversity of the student population was specifically addressed by the faculty at the European campus and the diversity of the student population was anticipated. The U.S. campus faculty mentioned international students, but on the whole, their student population appeared to be more homogenous and the curriculum based on U.S. centric topics. The students' opportunities included travel to other countries during the term while at the European campus, while U.S. students did not appear to have the same opportunities for curricular enrichment.

The faculty were also more homogenous in terms of their educational experiences at the U.S. campus than at the European campus. The majority of the faculty at the European campus did not have a U.S. degree. The faculty also spoke at least two, if not more languages at the European campus. This extends to the students at the European campus as well. Petra noted that;

It is just so easy that they, the students are so well travelled and well informed in a very personal and immediate way. And they will be able to do research in multiple languages. I think that really adds to the value and the level of the class.

During a classroom observation at the European campus, students reflected on their own experience and cultures they are familiar with as part of the discussion. During a classroom observation at the U.S. campus, students asked questions based on their experience within the

U.S. which was appropriate for the topic of the day. While there was student diversity in both classroom observations, the interactions between the faculty and students appeared more culturally diverse at the European campus than the U.S. campus. While the content of the courses taught at the campuses may be similar, the curriculum delivery reflects the interests of the students and faculty of the campus. This drives the choices made on how the curriculum is delivered and what the expectations of classroom interactions are.

Neoliberalism

In the era of a knowledge economy, higher education has become a commodity rather than a public good provided by the state for all individuals. In the case of higher education in a knowledge economy, the higher education credential can be an individual good or “student good” (Marginson, 1997). This is in contrast with “knowledge goods” are goods created as knowledge or intellectual property (Marginson, 1997). In regards to IBCs overall, the access and attainment of the higher education credential is dependent on one’s ability to pay the tuition and fees in addition to meeting the admission requirements. Specifically for MCU, their tuition and fees are higher than the national university system whose fees are a fraction of what MCU European campus charges. Additionally, one does not need to take the national university exam to be admitted to MCU European campus. However, one will have to pay the tuition and fees which are higher than public institutions. This highlights the different nature of a private university and its student population who can pay for something different at a higher rate.

At MCU, the European campus was initially a study abroad option for their own students in Europe. The European campus evolved from being exclusively a study abroad location to having local students attend classes to becoming a feeder school offering the first two years of courses to offering entire degrees at the MCU European campus. As a feeder school and later as

a branch campus, student population appears to be those who can afford a private education, whether students are U.S. or a non-U.S. citizen. This elite form of higher education is in contrast to the low-cost, public higher education options available for students enrolled in public European institutions. According to MCU documentation, one of the factors to offer entire degree programs at the European campus was that some students were not attending the U.S. campus upon completion of their first two years at the European campus. Reasons given in the documentation for not continuing at the U.S. campus included costs, preference for staying in Europe and U.S. visa regulations. By offering entire degrees at the European campus, the retention of students increased. Remaining viable in the European market was a consideration for developing programs in the early 2010s. In the early 2000s, according to MCU documentation, the European campus could only remain financially viable as a feeder school with the addition of the study abroad students. The documentation goes on to mention the developing niche markets for attracting European country nationals. It appears that the development of the European campus is dependent on market and economic forces and the institution positioned itself to address these issues. This is an indicator of the neoliberal forces upon the European campus in terms of its market and the reliance on revenue of non-degree seeking students to remain viable at the time. It was indicated, but not corroborated that programs would be developed based on market needs of the student population.

Their accreditation self-study mentioned that MCU's European campus was more a draw regarding its American university image rather than the institutional mission. The study interviewees identified different motivations for students. For some degree-seeking students, the MCU degree offered in Europe is an opportunity to attain a degree from a U.S. institution without having to travel to the U.S. for whatever reason. For other degree-seeking students, it is

the opportunity for learning in the liberal arts environment with smaller classes and emphasis on student learning in the American higher education model. For some degree-seeking students, it is the interest in something “different”. For study abroad students, it is an opportunity to experience a European country while continuing their MCU or American education. For some study abroad students, attending MCU’s European campus is an opportunity to travel across Europe outside of classes and with classes. According to John, a European campus administrator, depending on the enrollment of students each term, especially for the student abroad students, there are fluctuations in the demand for classes. While the introductory courses usually fill with degree-seeking students, study abroad students may want to enroll in specific classes.

From a faculty perspective, some students who study abroad at MCU’s European campus, they are not there to learn, but rather to party or come for the “photo op” as Alice referred to it. This is an attraction to some students. For Maxie, a U.S. faculty member, when asked about the relationship between the two campuses overall, she replied, “Not terribly strong. I would say the strongest link is all of our kids want to go over there. It’s a great party place.” Xavier spoke about study abroad students’ motivation in the following quote.

E: And do you feel like they are all prepared for your classes in terms of academics or...?

Xavier: Most of them.

E: Most of them?

Xavier: ...Usually [study abroad] students are very well prepared, I would say. Sometimes, we need to keep in mind that they only come for one semester. So, they travel a lot. Sometimes, they miss a few classes or their mindset is more in a “party-mood” than academic mood.

One perspective is that the European campus is attractive to students while the institution can offer courses in a different location at a lower cost for the same degree for the study abroad students. It was unclear from the data whether the MCU European campus would exist without the study abroad student income.

Profit

Two U.S. faculty mentioned that the European campus was “a cash cow”. Others referred to the European campus making money, but the U.S. campus keeping it. A U.S. administrator confirmed that the European campus is doing “quite well” financially. The European campus is not a non-profit enterprise unlike the U.S. campus. It is legally a private university in Europe. One of the effects of this status, Margaret noted that because the European campus is a private university and not a non-profit, she felt that EU grants were harder to obtain. However the nature of MCU’s European campus was liberating for Petra who had left a teaching position in another part of Europe because of the emphasis on revenue from teaching. She had found the previous employment’s required measurements demotivating and wanted to focus on her teaching and research.

Christopher, a U.S. faculty member, who taught at the European campus, reported making over 3 times the salary per class than European faculty at the time. Logan reported making \$5,000 for a six week class and Christopher reported making \$6,000 for a six week class. Logan took issue with the class which was originally had an enrollment of 12 students, but by the first day of class he had 26 students which required him to changed his teaching strategies. He was told that they would not be paying him any more for the additional students. Logan said that the U.S. campus is the one who determines the salary, not the European administration. He estimated that \$150,000 was collected by the institution in tuition charges while he made \$5,000 for the class. Inherently, the cost for sending a U.S. campus faculty member over was at a higher cost than hiring locally. The U.S. faculty reported a higher cost for the U.S. campus faculty included living and travel expenses along with a salary.

The cost of tuition at the European campus is one-third of the cost at the U.S. campus. The degree-seeking students at the European campus usually are more affluent and usually reside outside of the U.S.. Mandy, a U.S. faculty member, noted that European campus degree-seeking students cannot afford to come to the U.S. campus because of the higher tuition cost and cost of living in the U.S. even in the Midwest. The study abroad students at the branch campus do pay slightly less than at the U.S. campus, but it is still higher than the European campus degree-seeking student pay. It appears that U.S. students are charged U.S. prices and pay for their study abroad time to the U.S. campus administration.

Hiring

Chomsky (1999) wrote that “neoliberal doctrines, whatever one thinks of them, undermine education and health, increase inequality, and reduce labor’s share in income, that much is not seriously in doubt” (p. 32). This is illustrated in the considerations regarding hiring and the European campus. The amount in U.S. dollars that it costs to hire a European campus faculty is significantly less than a faculty member on the U.S. campus. When a senior administrator was asked, at a European campus Faculty senate meeting about the discrepancy between compensation and benefits between the two campuses, he stated that each campus should be compared and set based on the local market. John mentioned that new faculty in the European country may start at a low wage, but that they can teach at several institutions to equate with a full-time wage.

In terms of hiring faculty, a criticism from a Program A U.S. faculty member had been the overall growth of the program to cover many different facets of the field. He pointed to the number of classes that were canceled the previous semester due to low enrollment. While there are qualified faculty to teach a variety of courses, not all of the courses are not necessarily what

students are interested in. So while the prestige of the U.S. campus program is at a high level, the actual enrollments may not reflect students taking the breath of courses in the university bulletin or the faculty specialties.

There was a discrepancy in the data regarding the involvement of both campuses regarding hiring. Mandy, a U.S. campus faculty, felt that there was a “fair amount of coordination with hiring”. Margaret, a European campus faculty, felt that while she sent the U.S. campus prospective faculty CVs, they had not reciprocated when the U.S. campus had hired new faculty. This may indicate a lack of interest or merely an oversight in terms of coordination between the two campuses.

Case Study Issues Regarding Neoliberalism Analysis

It is difficult to discern if the profitable nature of the IBC has an effect on the local market since the combination of study abroad students and degree-seeking students creates an environment which is not comparable in the local market. The MCU European campus does not appear to be in competition with local or national public higher education institutions because the campus is small and provides a niche education, it cannot displace or replace other higher education providers.

Some contend that neoliberalism suppressing civic learning and expression. For example, Giroux (2002) stated that:

As society is defined through the culture and values of neoliberalism, the relationship between a critical education, public morality, and civic responsibility as conditions for creating thoughtful and engaged citizens are sacrificed all to willingly to the interest of financial capital and the logic of profit-making. (p. 427)

At MCU’s European campus, the programs studied and others listed in the documentation, do work to foster critical thinking and civic participation. This includes MCU’s general education program and the focus on engagement in the classroom which local public higher education does

not appear to include. However, the education at an IBC is not available widely or for those who are not able to pay the cost of attending the institution. Additionally, the mission of the university includes an element of service and engagement with the community which is counter to a neoliberal approach. While the MCU European campus appears to be profitable, part of the mission of the institution is to create citizens who are engaged in their community. This extends to the MCU European campus where students, both study abroad and degree-seeking, work with and for the local community. This even includes health sciences programs that engage with the local community and providers on both campuses.

Conclusions

Curriculum delivery at an IBC is similar on the surface to the home campus, it has marked differences. These differences reflect the locale/context of the IBC along with the differences in the student and faculty populations. The courses are delivered in face-to-face interactions on both campuses with interactive student activities. Faculty have academic freedom in the classroom and regarding what best supports student learning in their classroom. Faculty did not report having to follow a specific outline or required assignments for their courses at the IBC.

The curriculum while mostly developed at the U.S. campus had evolved to reflect the international nature of the European campus in terms of the diversity of the student population and the international faculty. The concentrations in the programs studied and the courses offered reflected the locale/context of the European campus. The faculty were involved in curriculum improvement and development on an individual and program level. Although there were issues with communication between the campuses regarding curricular changes, the IBC faculty seemed invested in their program and how best to improve it for their student population of

degree-seeking students. Faculty engaged in curricular changes on a campus level, but did not have much authority beyond their campus. There was respect of each campuses' faculty, but the hierarchical structure and bureaucracy of the much larger home campus overshadowed the IBC. The IBC is part of the institution, but it has lesser authority and is subject to decisions and changes of the larger home campus. While collaboration and communication can improve the relationship and understanding between the two campuses regarding the curriculum, the changes in administration and faculty may affect the level of trust and interest in the future.

The tensions between the larger research university home campus and the smaller international campus seem inevitable. The disparities between faculty salaries, workload, and rank created tensions for IBC faculty since host campus faculty had the same credentials as the home campus but they are working in Europe. Pete, a European campus faculty member, describe the relationship between the two campuses is “a type of ambiguity that you can't really solve” since the IBC can never be fully American and never be fully European because of it is a European campus of an U.S. university with European laws governing it. But, that “it's a type of relationship that allows for lots of things to happen.” In terms of the curriculum delivery, the international nature of the European campus allows for a different type of an American-style higher educational experience.

Policy Implications of the Study

There are three policy implications of this study regarding communication about the expectations of integration on a program level, the level of autonomy faculty have regarding the IBC curriculum, and influence of the IBC locale on the curriculum and faculty. The first two elements should be articulated and documented by the institution to ensure a level of understanding and specific actions by both campuses. This would elevate the level of trust of the

faculty on both campuses and lower the uncertainty of curriculum delivery and improvement for the host campus. The interaction between the IBC and the locale influenced the curriculum and faculty which could be articulated and promoted at the institution.

The level of autonomy of the MCU European campus faculty was important to the faculty. Although they were delivering a U.S. based degree, the major requirements were appropriate for a degree earned in Europe according to the faculty. The courses fit the expertise of the faculty and the locale/context of Europe. This created a program that reflected the faculty and location. This autonomy creates a dynamic program and engaged faculty. Ensuring this level of autonomy through policy and documentation would increase the level of trust between the campuses. These elements are key to achieving and maintain the appropriate level of autonomy within the classroom and within the design of the program major requirements for each campuses' students. This autonomy was a positive aspect of the study for the faculty participants regarding curriculum delivery.

To further the level of trust and to lower issues of uncertainty at the European campus, ensuring timely and consistent communication and collaboration about changes in the curriculum is important. The two campuses lacked a systematic method or a workflow process that would ensure prompt and effective communications about curricular changes. Having a systematic way of introducing, collaborating, and communicating about curricular changes in a timely manner would further enhance the cross-campus relationship. While the assessment plan has a single line ensuring that the European campus is considered, similar methods of introducing checks on implementation and discussion of changes is an important policy consideration. Another example of collaboration was the additional rows on the program rubric. Such changes require a stated

policy, appropriate documentation, and reporting out of the expectations and outcomes of collaboration between the campuses on a regular basis to be effective.

Communication between the campuses is also key for a successful relationship, not only about curricular changes. Faculty exchanges are part of increasing trust and understanding; however, regular meaningful conversations would increase the understanding between the two campuses. Even just regular communications between campuses would increase the level of trust across the campuses. Several faculty members mentioned an occasional video conference across programs. This is contrast with senior administrators, who attended weekly meetings cross-campus and were very familiar with each other.

The interaction between the IBC and the locale influenced the curriculum both at the course level and program level. The specialization of the curriculum was important for both the faculty and to meet the needs of the student population. Recognition and facilitation of articulating the need for and implementation of curriculum change and improvement due to locale at an IBC by the institution would further support the IBC's faculty and students. This could take the form of collaboration on specific course level or program level changes with the department and/or campuses.

Implications for Future Research

This study contributes to the understanding of curriculum delivery and faculty at IBCs, a little studied topic. The issues and themes could serve as a starting point for additional research regarding curriculum at IBCs either with a qualitative or quantitative approach. Additional research in this area, such as a longitudinal study to track the issues of curriculum delivery and development/improvement would provide a broader understanding of faculty and curriculum at an IBC and the factors influences curricular changes over time.

While this study focused on faculty perceptions, future research could include the relationship between faculty and administration or governance structures to further enrich the understanding of curriculum at an IBC. This influence was not part of this study, but the findings regarding the faculty autonomy and faculty governance highlight the need for further understanding of faculty at an IBC.

REFERENCES

- Ahmad, S. Z. (2014). Evaluating student satisfaction of quality at international branch campuses. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 1–20.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2014.925082>
- Aiello, M., & Clarke, J. (2010). “Flying faculty and the transnational teacher” - the way forward for globalized education? *Innovations in Practice*, 51.
- Allen, J. (2014). Investigating transnational collaboration of faculty development and learning: An argument for making learning culturally relevant. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 8(2). Retrieved from <http://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/ij-sotl/vol8/iss2/17>
- Altbach, P. (2004). Globalisation and the university: Myths and realities in an unequal world. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 10(1), 3–25.
- Altbach, P. (2010). Why branch campuses may be unsustainable. *International Higher Education*, (58), 2–3.
- Altbach, P. (2011). Is there a future for branch campuses? *International Higher Education*, (65).
- Altbach, P. (2012). Franchising - the McDonaldization of higher education. *International Higher Education*, (66), 7–8.
- Altbach, P., & Knight, J. (2007). The internationalization of higher education: Motivations and realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11(3–4), 290–305.
- Arwari, T. T. (2014). *International branch campuses: A multi-paradigmatic analysis of university discourse* (Doctoral dissertation). The George Washington University. Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI No. 3615515)

- Australian Government Department of Education and Training. (2015). *Export income to Australia from international education activity in 2015* (Research Snapshot). Canberra. Retrieved from <https://internationaleducation.gov.au/research/Research-Snapshots/Documents/Export%20Income%20CY2015.pdf>
- Aziz, M. I. A., & Abdullah, D. (2014). Malaysia: Becoming an education hub to serve national development. In J. Knight (Ed.), *International education hubs* (pp. 101–119). Springer Netherlands. Retrieved from http://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-94-007-7025-6_7
- Bacharach, S. B., & Lawler, E. J. (1980). *Power and politics in organizations* (1st ed). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bakken, R. (2013). *Exploring the impact on students of Western universities on foreign soil: A case study of Qatar* (Doctoral Dissertation). University of San Diego. Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI No.3575051)
- Ball, S. J. (1987). *The micro-politics of the school: Towards a theory of school organization* (1993 Reprint). London: Routledge.
- Beecher, B. K. (2016). *Internationalization through the international branch campus: Identifying opportunities and risks* (Doctoral Dissertation). George Washington University. Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI No.10142596)
- Bischof, L. (2014). Franchising, validation and branch campuses in the European Union. *International Higher Education*, (74), 16–17.
- Blase, J. (Ed.). (1991). *The politics of life in schools: Power, conflict, and cooperation*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

- Blase, J. (1997). The micropolitics of teaching. In B. J. Biddle, T. L. Good, & I. F. Goodson (Eds.), *International handbook of teachers and teaching* (pp. 939–970). Springer Netherlands. Retrieved from http://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-94-011-4942-6_23
- Blase, J., & Anderson, G. L. (1995). *The micropolitics of educational leadership: From control to empowerment*. London: Cassell.
- Blase, J., & Björk, L. (2010). The micropolitics of educational change and reform: Cracking open the black box. In A. Hargreaves, A. Lieberman, M. Fullan, & D. Hopkins (Eds.), *Second international handbook of educational change* (pp. 237–258). Springer Netherlands. Retrieved from http://link.springer.com:2048/chapter/10.1007/978-90-481-2660-6_14
- Bolton, D., & Nie, R. (2010). Creating value in transnational higher education: The role of stakeholder management. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 9(4), 701–714. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMLE.2010.56659888>
- Botting, J. (2014). *Branch campus classroom expectations: An ethnographic study of transnational faculty and students in Qatar* (Doctoral Dissertation). University of Calgary (Canada). Retrieved from University of Calgary Dissertations & Theses. (<http://theses.ucalgary.ca/handle/11023/1728>)
- Bovill, C., Jordan, L., & Watters, N. (2014). Transnational approaches to teaching and learning in higher education: Challenges and possible guiding principles. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 20(1), 12–23. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2014.945162>

- Boyle, B., McDonnell, A., Mitchell, R., & Nicholas, S. (2012). Managing knowledge in internationalizing universities through foreign assignments. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 26(3), 303–312. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09513541211213363>
- Brosky, D. (2011). Micropolitics in the school: Teacher leaders' use of political skill and influence tactics. *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, 6(1). Retrieved from http://eric.ed.gov/?q=micropolitics&ff1=dtySince_2011&id=EJ972880
- Caffyn, R. (2008). Understanding the historical context: History as an investigative lens in studying micropolitics of international schools. *International Schools Journal*, 27(2), 29–36.
- Caffyn, R. (2010). “We are in Transylvania, and Transylvania is not England”: Location as a significant factor in international school micropolitics. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 38(3), 321–340. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143209359712>
- C-BERT. (2017, January 20). C-BERT branch campus listing. Retrieved March 2, 2017, from <http://www.globalhighered.org/branchcampuses.php>
- Chambers, G. S., & Cummings, W. K. (1990). *Profiting from education: Japan-United States international educational ventures in the 1980s* (Research Report No. 20). Institute of International Education. Retrieved from <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED320488>
- Chapman, A., & Pyvis, D. (2013). *Enhancing quality in transnational higher education: Experiences of teaching and learning in Australian offshore programs*. Lanham: Lexington Books.

- Chapman, D., Austin, A., Farah, S., Wilson, E., & Ridge, N. (2014). Academic staff in the UAE: Unsettled journey. *Higher Education Policy*, 27(1), 131–151.
<https://doi.org/10.1057/hep.2013.19>
- Chapman, D., & Sakamoto, R. (2011). The future of cross-border partnerships in higher education. In *Cross-border partnerships in higher education: Strategies and issues* (pp. 265–270). New York: Routledge.
- Chomsky, N. (1999). *Profit over people: Neoliberalism and global order*. New York: Seven Stories Press.
- Clay, H., & Minett-Smith, C. (2012). Managing across borders: Empowering and supporting staff to lead global teaching teams. *International Journal of Learning*, 18(10). Retrieved from <http://ijl.cgpublisher.com/product/pub.30/prod.3344>
- Cremonini, L., Epping, E., Westerheijden, D. F., & Vogelsang, K. (2012). *Impact of quality assurance on cross-border higher education*. Enschede, Netherlands: Center for Higher Education Policy Studies. Retrieved from <http://doc.utwente.nl/84413/1/Cremonini12impact.pdf>
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design : Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Croom, P. W. (2011). Motivation and aspirations for international branch campuses. In R. Sakamoto & D. W. Chapman (Eds.), *Cross-border partnerships in higher education: Strategies and issues* (pp. 45–66). New York: Routledge.
- Croom, P. W. (2012). Internationalization and institutional strategy. *AUDEM: The International Journal of Higher Education and Democracy*, 3(1), 99–119.

- Crosling, G. (2011). Defining identity, engaging teachers and engaging students: “Education strengths” in a foreign branch campus. In *International perspectives on higher education research* (Vol. 6, pp. 245–252). Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing. Retrieved from [http://www.emeraldinsight.com/10.1108/S1479-3628\(2011\)0000006024](http://www.emeraldinsight.com/10.1108/S1479-3628(2011)0000006024)
- Crosling, G. (2012). Issues and strategies for student engagement through assessment in transnational higher education. In L. Clouder, C. Broughan, S. Jewell, & G. Steventon (Eds.), *Improving student engagement and development through assessment: Theory and practice in higher education* (pp. 196–209). New York: Routledge.
- Darder, A. (2012). Neoliberalism in the academic borderlands: An on-going struggle for equality and human rights. *Educational Studies*, 48(5), 412–426.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00131946.2012.714334>
- Do, T. T., & Pham, D. N. (2014). Academic mobility in South East Asia: Challenges and opportunities in the coming decades. *International Education*, 44(1), 28.
- Dobos, K. (2011). “Serving two masters” - academics’ perspectives on working at an offshore campus in Malaysia. *Educational Review*, 63(1), 19–35.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911003748035>
- Dobos, K., Chapman, A., & O’Donoghue, T. (2013). *Australian universities delivering educational programs in other countries: A study of off-shore higher education*. Lewiston: The Edwin Mellen Press.

- Dubai International Academic City. (2014, July 14). The British University in Dubai takes energy training and professional development to new levels through affiliation with the Global Energy Institute. Retrieved August 8, 2014, from <http://www.diacedu.com/media-center/latest-news/1-2011/697-the-british-university-in-dubai-takes-energy-training-and-professional-development-to-new-levels-through-affiliation-with-the-global-energy-institute>
- Dumbre, J. (2013). *Curriculum implementation at international branch campuses of United States higher educational institutions in the Gulf Region: A narrative study* (Doctoral dissertation). Lamar University. Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI No. 3606214)
- Dunn, L., & Wallace, M. (2004). Australian academics teaching in Singapore: Striving for cultural empathy. *Innovations in Education & Teaching International*, 41(3), 291–304. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703290420001733285>
- Dunn, L., & Wallace, M. (Eds.). (2008). *Teaching in transnational higher education: Enhancing learning for offshore international students*. New York: Routledge.
- Edwards, R., Crosling, G., & Lim, N.-C. (2014). Organizational structures for international universities: Implications for campus autonomy, academic freedom, collegiality, and conflict. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 18(2), 180–194. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315313493182>
- Egron-Polak, E. (2013). Rethinking the internationalisation of higher education: Sharing the benefits, avoiding the adverse impacts. In *Going global: Identifying trends and drivers of international education* (pp. 219–229). Bingley, U.K.: Emerald Group Publishing.

- Farrugia, C. A. (2013). *International branch campus quality in a segmented quality assurance environment* (Policy Paper No. 5). Sheikh Saud Bin Saqr Al Qasimi Foundation for Policy Research.
- Farrugia, C. A., & Lane, J. E. (2013). Legitimacy in cross-border higher education identifying stakeholders of international branch campuses. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 17(4), 414–432.
- Ferguson, K. E. (1984). *The feminist case against bureaucracy*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Fernandes, C., Ross, K., & Meraj, M. (2013). Understanding student satisfaction and loyalty in the UAE HE sector. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 27(6), 613–630. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-07-2012-0082>
- Fielden, J. (2013). Financial aspects of offshore activities. *International Higher Education*, (72), 10–12.
- Formoso, J. A. (2013, January 28). UNLV to split with Singapore education partner. *The Rebel Yell*. Retrieved from <http://www.unlvrebelyell.com/2013/01/28/unlv-to-split-with-singapore-education-partner/>
- Fox, W. H., & Shamisi, S. A. (2014). United Arab Emirates' education hub: A decade of development. In J. Knight (Ed.), *International education hubs* (pp. 63–99). Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands. Retrieved from <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-94-007-7025-6>
- Franklin, A., & Alzouebi, K. (2014). Sustainability of international branch campuses in the United Arab Emirates: A vision for the future. *The Journal of General Education*, 63(2), 121–137.

- George, A. L., & Bennett, A. (2005). *Case studies and theory development in the social sciences*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Gerring, J. (2008). Case selection for case-study analysis: Qualitative and quantitative techniques. In J. M. Box-Steffensmeier, H. E. Brady, & D. Collier (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of political methodology* (1st ed., pp. 645–684). Oxford University Press.
- Gibb, A. (2012). Exploring the synergistic potential in entrepreneurial university development: Towards the building of a strategic framework. *Annals of Innovation & Entrepreneurship*, 3(0). <https://doi.org/10.3402/aie.v3i0.16742>
- Giroux, H. A. (2002). Neoliberalism, corporate culture, and the promise of higher education: The university as a democratic public sphere. *Harvard Educational Review*, 72(4), 425–464.
- Giroux, H. A. (2014). *Neoliberalism's war on higher education*. Chicago, IL: Haymarket Books.
- Gopal, A. (2011). Internationalization of higher education: Preparing faculty to teach cross-culturally. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 23(3), 373–381.
- Green, M. F., Eckel, P., Calderon, L., & Luu, D. (2007). *Venturing abroad: Delivering U.S. degrees through overseas branch campuses and programs*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Gribble, K., & Ziguras, C. (2003). Learning to teach offshore: Pre-departure training for lecturers in transnational programs. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 22(2), 205–216. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360304115>
- Haag, S., & Smith, M. L. (2002). The possibility of reform: Micropolitics in higher education. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 10(0), 21. <https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.v10n21.2002>

- Hamza, A. (2010). International experience: An opportunity for professional development in higher education. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 14(1), 50–69.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315308329793>
- Harding, L. M., & Lammey, R. W. (2011). Operational considerations for opening a branch campus abroad. *New Directions for Higher Education*, (155), 65–78.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/he.445>
- Harris, S. (2005). Rethinking academic identities in neo-liberal times. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 10(4), 421–433. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562510500238986>
- Harvey, D. (2007). *A brief history of neoliberalism*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Healey, N. (2008). Is higher education in really “internationalising”? *Higher Education*, 55(3), 333–355.
- Heffernan, T., Morrison, M., Basu, P., & Sweeney, A. (2010). Cultural differences, learning styles and transnational education. *Journal of Higher Education Policy & Management*, 32(1), 27–39. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13600800903440535>
- Heffernan, T., & Poole, D. (2005). In search of “the vibe”: Creating effective international education partnerships. *Higher Education*, 50(2), 223–245.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-004-6352-2>
- HESA. (2014). Introduction - Students 2014/15. Retrieved November 2, 2016, from <https://www.hesa.ac.uk/data-and-analysis/publications/students-2014-15/introduction>
- Hicks, M., & Jarrett, K. (2008). Instruction, orientation and professional development. In L. Dunn & M. Wallace (Eds.), *Teaching in transnational higher education* (pp. 238–248). New York: Routledge.

- Hoare, L. (2013). Swimming in the deep end: Transnational teaching as culture learning? *Higher Education Research & Development*, 32(4), 561–574.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2012.700918>
- Hoyle, E. (1982). Micropolitics of educational organisations. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 10(2), 87–98.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/174114328201000202>
- Hughes, R. (2011). Strategies for managing and leading an academic staff in multiple countries. *New Directions for Higher Education*, (155), 19–28. <https://doi.org/10.1002/he.441>
- Humfrey, C. (2013). Transnational education: Examining and improving the student experience. In *Going global: Identifying trends and drivers of international education* (pp. 159–165). Bingley, U.K.: Emerald Group Publishing.
- Iannaccone, L. (1975). *Education policy systems: A study guide for educational administrators*. Fort Lauderdale, Fla.: National Ed. D. Program for Educational Leaders, Nova University.
- Ibnouf, A., Dou, L., & Knight, J. (2014). The evolution of Qatar as an educational hub: Moving to a knowledge-based economy. In J. Knight (Ed.), *International education hubs* (pp. 43–62). Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands. Retrieved from <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-94-007-7025-6>
- Jais, J. (2012). *Flying academics—examining short-term international teaching assignments impact on academics' career success and work-life balance* (Doctoral dissertation). RMIT University. Retrieved from RMIT Research Repository. (RMIT No. 160244)

- Jauregui, M. (2013). *Cross-cultural training of expatriate faculty teaching in international branch campuses* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Southern California. Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI No. 3609911)
- Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies - SAIS. (n.d.). SAIS Facts. Retrieved July 19, 2014, from <http://www.sais-jhu.edu/about/sais-facts>
- Jones, M., Siraj-Blatchford, J., & Ashcroft, K. (2013). Micro-politics, participation and empowerment. In *Researching into student learning and support in colleges and universities* (pp. 102–120). London: Kogan Page.
- Jordan, E. J. (2011). *Creating and maintaining a student-centered culture at an international branch campus: A case study examining the roles of faculty, staff, and students at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas Singapore campus* (Doctoral Dissertation). University of Southern California. Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI No. 3487969)
- Keevers, L., Lefoe, G., Leask, B., Sultan, F. K. P. D., Ganesharatnam, S., Loh, V., & Lim, J. S. Y. (2014). “I like the people I work with. Maybe I’ll get to meet them in person one day’: teaching and learning practice development with transnational teaching teams. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 40(3), 232–250. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02607476.2014.903024>
- Khoury, I. E. (2013). *Unbridled globalization: The transformation of higher education in Qatar* (Doctoral dissertation). The Pennsylvania State University. Retrieved from Pennsylvania State University Libraries. (No. 16375)
- Kinser, K., & Lane, J. E. (2010). Deciphering “educational hubs” strategies: Rhetoric and reality. *International Higher Education*, (59), 18–19.

- Kinser, K., & Lane, J. E. (2013). The problems with cross-border quality assurance. *International Higher Education*, (73), 18–19.
- Klein, N. (2007). *The shock doctrine: The rise of disaster capitalism*. New York: Picador.
- Knight, J. (2007). Cross-border tertiary education: An introduction. In *Cross-border tertiary education: A way towards capacity development* (p. 200). Paris: OECD.
- Knight, J. (2011a). Education hubs: a fad, a brand, an innovation? *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 15(3), 221–240. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315311398046>
- Knight, J. (2011b). Higher education crossing borders: A framework and overview of new developments and issues. In R. Sakamoto & D. W. Chapman (Eds.), *Cross-border partnerships in higher education: Strategies and issues* (pp. 16–41). New York: Routledge.
- Knight, J. (2014a). Comparative Analysis of Education Hubs. In J. Knight (Ed.), *International education hubs* (pp. 183–206). Springer Netherlands. Retrieved from http://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-94-007-7025-6_11
- Knight, J. (2014b). Is internationalisation of higher education having an identity crisis? In *The forefront of international higher education: a festschrift in honor of Philip G. Altbach* (pp. 79–91). Dordrecht: Springer. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-7085-0>
- Knight, J. (2014c). Understanding education hubs within the context of crossborder education. In J. Knight (Ed.), *International education hubs* (pp. 13–27). Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands. Retrieved from <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-94-007-7025-6>
- Knight, J., & Liu, Q. (2017). Missing but needed: Research on transnational education. *International Higher Education*, (88), 15–16.

- Knight, J., & Morshidi, S. (2011). The complexities and challenges of regional education hubs: Focus on Malaysia. *Higher Education*, 62(5), 593–606. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-011-9467-2>
- Kosmützky, A., & Krücken, G. (2014). *Macro-environmental mapping of international branch campus activities of universities worldwide* (CSHE No. 2.14). Berkeley: University of California. Retrieved from <http://cshe.berkeley.edu/publications/macro-environmental-mapping-international-branch-campus-activities-universities>
- Kuh, G. D., Schneider, C. G., & AAUP. (2008). *High-impact educational practices: What they are, who has access to them, and why they matter*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Laigo, R. H. (2013). *Recruiting faculty abroad: Examining factors that induced American faculty to work at branch campuses in Qatar's Education City* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Southern California. Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI No. 3609932)
- Lane, J. E. (2010). Private higher education in Dubai: Growing local versus importing foreign campuses. *ASHE Higher Education Report*, 36(3), 63–75.
- Lane, J. E. (2011a). Global expansion of international branch campuses: Managerial and leadership challenges. *New Directions for Higher Education*, (155), 5–17.
- Lane, J. E. (2011b). Importing private higher education: International branch campuses. *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis*, 13(4), 367–381. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13876988.2011.583106>

- Lane, J. E. (2011c). Joint ventures in cross-border higher education: International branch campuses in Malaysia. In R. Sakamoto & D. W. Chapman (Eds.), *Cross-border partnerships in higher education: strategies and issues* (pp. 67–90). New York: Routledge.
- Lane, J. E. (2011d). Public or private? Deciphering the role of international branch campuses in the Arabian Gulf. In *Intersection of the public and private in education in the GCC* (pp. 25–32). Ras Al Khaimah, UAE.
- Lane, J. E., & Kinser, K. (2011). The cross-border education policy context: Educational hubs, trade liberalization, and national sovereignty. *New Directions for Higher Education*, (155), 79–85.
- Lane, J. E., & Kinser, K. (2013). Five models of international branch campus facility ownership. *International Higher Education*, (70), 9–11.
- Larsen, K., Vincent-Lancrin, S., Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, & Centre for Educational Research and Innovation. (2004). *Internationalisation and trade in higher education: Opportunities and challenges*. Paris: OECD. Retrieved from <http://new.sourceoecd.org/9264015043>
- Laureate Education, Inc. (2016). About Laureate. Retrieved November 1, 2016, from <http://www.laureate.net/AboutLaureate>
- Lazen, M. (2016). *American branch campuses with an “Arabian accent”*: Adaptation of educational policies, programs, and practices in transnational education (Doctoral Dissertation). New York University. Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI No. 10129589)

- Leask, B. (2008). Internationalisation, globalisation and curriculum innovation. In M. Hellstén & A. Reid (Eds.), *Researching International Pedagogies* (pp. 9–26). Springer Netherlands. Retrieved from http://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-1-4020-8858-2_2
- Leask, B., Hicks, M., Kohler, M., & King, B. (2005). AVCC offshore quality project: A professional development framework for academic staff teaching Australian programs offshore. *Adelaide: University of South Australia.*
- Leathwood, C., & Phillips, D. (2000). Developing curriculum evaluation research in higher education: Process, politics and practicalities. *Higher Education, 40*(3), 313–330.
- Lehn, T. (2016). *Academic Mobility: The transnational flow of U.S. academic staff to higher education institutions in the countries of the Gulf Cooperation Council* (Doctoral Dissertation). University of Minnesota. Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI No. 10099973)
- Lemke-Westcott, T., & Johnson, B. (2013). When culture and learning styles matter: A Canadian university with Middle-Eastern students. *Journal of Research in International Education, 12*(1), 66–84. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1475240913480105>
- Lien, D. (2008). Economic analysis of transnational education. *Education Economics, 16*(2), 149–166.
- Lindsey, U. (2011). A future minus oil. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 57*(22), A23–A25.
- Malen, B. (1995). The micropolitics of education: Mapping the multiple dimensions of power relations in school politics. In J. D. Schibner & D. H. Layton (Eds.), *Study of educational politics : The 1994 commemorative yearbook of the politics of education association (1969-1994)* (pp. 147–167). London: Routledge. Retrieved from <http://site.ebrary.com/lib/alltitles/docDetail.action?docID=10057697>

- Marginson, S. (1997). *Markets in education*. St. Leonards, N.S.W: Allen & Unwin.
- Marginson, S. (2011). Higher education and public good. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 65(4), 411–433.
- Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (2011). *Designing qualitative research* (5th ed.). Los Angeles: Sage.
- Maxwell, J. A. (2005). *Qualitative research design: an interactive approach* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- McBurnie, G., & Ziguras, C. (2001). The regulation of transnational higher education in Southeast Asia: Case studies of Hong Kong, Malaysia and Australia. *Higher Education*, 42(1), 85–105.
- McBurnie, G., & Ziguras, C. (2006). *Transnational education: Issues and trends in offshore higher education*. London: Routledge.
- McNamara, J., & Knight, J. (2014). *Impacts of transnational education on host countries: Academic, cultural, economic and skills impacts and implications of programme and provider mobility*. British Council. Retrieved from <http://www.britishcouncil.org/education/ihe/knowledge-centre/internationalisation/impacts-transnational>
- McNamara, J., Knight, J., & Fernandez-Chung, R. M. (2013). *The shape of things to come 2: The evolution of transnational education*. The British Council. Retrieved from http://www.britishcouncil.org/sites/britishcouncil.uk2/files/the_shape_of_things_to_come_2.pdf

- Milliken, J. (2001). “Surfacing” the micropolitics as a potential management change frame in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education Policy & Management*, 23(1), 75–84. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13600800020047252>
- Mock, J. (2005). American universities in Japan. In J. S. Eades, R. Goodman, Y. Hada, & Ritsumeikan Ajia Taiheiyō Kenkyū Sentā (Eds.), *The “Big Bang” in Japanese higher education: The 2004 reforms and the dynamics of change* (pp. 183–198). Melbourne: Trans Pacific Press.
- Mok, K. H., & Bodycott, P. (2014). Hong Kong: The quest for regional education hub status. In J. Knight (Ed.), *International education hubs* (pp. 81–99). Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands. Retrieved from <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-94-007-7025-6>
- Montoto, L. (2013). *The public good, the market, and academic capitalism: U.S. cross-border higher education in Panama* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Georgia. Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI No. 3577946)
- Morley, L. (1999). *Organising feminisms : The micropolitics of the academy*. New York, NY, USA: Palgrave Macmillan. Retrieved from <http://site.ebrary.com/lib/alltitles/docDetail.action?docID=5001676>
- Morley, L. (2000). The micropolitics of gender in the learning society. *Higher Education in Europe*, 25(2), 229–235. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03797720050115490>
- Muncey, D. E., Payne, J., & White, N. S. (1999). Making curriculum and instructional reform happen: A case study. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 74(1), 68–110.
- Murphy, M., & Curtis, W. (2013). The micro-politics of micro-leadership: Exploring the role of programme leader in English universities. *Journal of Higher Education Policy & Management*, 35(1), 34–44. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080X.2012.727707>

- National Tertiary Education Union Policy & Research Unit. (2004). *Excess baggage: Australian staff involvement in the delivery of offshore courses : research report and case study findings, July 2004*. Melbourne: National Tertiary Education Union.
- Ohmori, F. (2004). Japan and transnational higher education. *International Higher Education*, (37), 13–15.
- Olssen, M., & Peters, M. A. (2005). Neoliberalism, higher education and the knowledge economy: From the free market to knowledge capitalism. *Journal of Education Policy*, 20(3), 313–345. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02680930500108718>
- O'Mahony, J. (2014). *Enhancing student learning and teacher development in transnational education*. York, United Kingdom: The Higher Education Academy. Retrieved from http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/news/detail/2014/learning_teaching_transnational_education_reports
- O'Malley, B. (2016, November 10). China overtakes UAE as top host of branch campuses. *University World News*, (436). Retrieved from <http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20161110144407523>
- Opgenorth, L. T. (2014). *Establishing and marketing an international branch campus: A case study of Savannah College of Art and Design Hong Kong* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Southern California. Retrieved from University of Southern California Dissertations and Theses.
- Owens, T. L., & Lane, J. E. (2014). Cross-border higher education: Global and local tensions within competition and economic development. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 2014(168), 69–82. <https://doi.org/10.1002/he.20114>

- Parsons The New School for Design. (2012). About Parsons Paris - History. Retrieved July 19, 2014, from <http://www.newschool.edu/parsons-paris/history/>
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Peck, J. (2004). Geography and public policy: Constructions of neoliberalism. *Progress in Human Geography*, 28(3), 392–405. <https://doi.org/10.1191/0309132504ph492pr>
- Pimpa, N. (2009). Learning problems in transnational business education and training: The case of the MBA in Thailand. *International Journal of Training and Development*, 13(4), 262–279.
- Prowse, J., & Goddard, J. T. (2010). Teaching across cultures: Canada and Qatar. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 40(1), 31–52.
- Pyvis, D. (2008). Transnational education in Mauritius: Quality assurance for program exporters. In L. Dunn & M. Wallace (Eds.), *Teaching in transnational education: Enhancing learning for offshore international students* (pp. 227–37). New York: Routledge.
- Pyvis, D. (2011). The need for context-sensitive measures of educational quality in transnational higher education. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 16(6), 733–744. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2011.570436>
- Reilly, B. (2008). Digital Encounters: Using Information Technology in an Overseas Branch Campus. *History Teacher*, 41(4), 531–541.
- Rostron, M. (2009). Liberal arts education in Qatar: Intercultural perspectives. *Intercultural Education*, 20(3), 219–229. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14675980903138517>

- Sakamoto, R., & Chapman, D. W. (2011). Expanding across borders: The growth of cross-border partnerships in higher education. In *Cross-border partnerships in higher education: strategies and issues* (pp. 3–15). New York: Routledge.
- Saldaña, J. (2016). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (Third edition). Los Angeles, CA: SAGE.
- Seah, W. T., & Edwards, J. (2006). Flying in, flying out: Offshore teaching in higher education. *Australian Journal of Education (ACER Press)*, 50(3), 297–311.
- Shams, F., & Huisman, J. (2012). Managing offshore branch campuses: An analytical framework for institutional strategies. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 16(2), 106–127.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315311413470>
- Shams, F., & Huisman, J. (2014). The role of institutional dual embeddedness in the strategic local adaptation of international branch campuses: Evidence from Malaysia and Singapore. *Studies in Higher Education*, 1–16.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2014.966669>
- Sidhu, R., & Christie, P. (2014). Making space for an international branch campus: Monash University Malaysia. *Asia Pacific Viewpoint*, 55(2), 182–195.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/apv.12052>
- Singh, N. (2012). *The market for branch campuses: UNLV Singapore and the role of the government in defining its market* (Doctoral Dissertation). University of Southern California. Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI No. 3542479)
- Smith, K. (2009). Transnational teaching experiences: An under-explored territory for transformative professional development. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 14(2), 111–122.

- Smith, K. (2013). Overseas flying faculty teaching as a trigger for transformative professional development. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 18(2), 127–138.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1360144X.2012.655280>
- Smith, K. (2014). Exploring flying faculty teaching experiences: Motivations, challenges and opportunities. *Studies in Higher Education*, 39(1), 117–134.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2011.646259>
- Smith, L. (2009). Sinking in the sand? Academic work in an offshore campus of an Australian university. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 28(5), 467–479.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360903154118>
- Spangler, M. S., & Tyler, A. Q., Jr. (2011). Identifying fit of mission and environment: Applying the American community college model internationally. *New Directions for Higher Education*, (155), 41–52.
- Sparkes, A. (1987). Strategic rhetoric: A constraint in changing the practice of teachers. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 8(1), 37–54.
- Spencer-Oatey, H. (2013). Maximizing the benefits of international education collaborations managing interaction processes. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 17(3), 244–261.
- Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Stake, R. E., & Cisneros-Cohernour, E. J. (2004). The quality of teaching in higher education. *Quality of Higher Education*, 1, 94–117.
- Stanfield, D. A. (2014). *International branch campuses: Motivation, strategy, and structure* (Doctoral dissertation). Boston College. Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI No. 3638305)

- Steger, M. B., & Roy, R. K. (2010). *Neoliberalism: A very short introduction*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.
- Struyve, C., Meredith, C., & Gielen, S. (2014). Who am I and where do I belong? The perception and evaluation of teacher leaders concerning teacher leadership practices and micropolitics in schools. *Journal of Educational Change*, 15(2), 203–230.
- Tange, H. (2008). International education as intercultural learning. In M. Hellstén & A. Reid (Eds.), *Researching International Pedagogies* (pp. 99–114). Springer Netherlands. Retrieved from http://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-1-4020-8858-2_7
- Tierney, W. G., & Lanford, M. (2014). An investigation of the impact of international branch campuses on organizational culture. *Higher Education*, 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-014-9845-7>
- Umbach, P. D., & Wawrzynski, M. R. (2005). Faculty do matter: The role of college faculty in student learning and engagement. *Research in Higher Education*, 46(2), 153–184.
- Verbik, L. (2006). The International Branch Campus – Models and Trends. Presented at the Going Global. Retrieved from <http://ihe.britishcouncil.org/sites/default/files/import-content/gg2-line-verbik-paper.pdf>
- Victorian Auditor-General's Office. (2014). *Universities: Results of the 2013 Audits*. Melbourne, Australia: State Government of Victoria. Retrieved from <http://www.audit.vic.gov.au/publications/20140528-University-Audits/20140528-University-Audits.pdf>
- Wallace, M., Mahmud, S., Yeo, S., Briguglio, C., Sanderson, G., Hukam-Singh, P., & Thuraingsam, T. (2011). *Moderation for fair assessment in transnational learning and teach: Final report*. Sydney, Australia: Learning and Teaching Council.

- Walsh, P. (2011). *Becoming a knowledge society: State of Qatar rationales for the importation of a North American branch campus model of higher education in Qatar* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Calgary (Canada). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI No. NR75484)
- Whittaker, G. (2008). Inside thinking/outside issues: Reflective practice in Zambia - journey of uncertainty. In L. Dunn & M. Wallace (Eds.), *Teaching in transnational higher education: Enhancing learning for offshore international students* (pp. 99–109). New York: Routledge.
- Wildavsky, B. (2010). *The great brain race: How global universities are reshaping the world*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Wilhelm, I. (2011, September 14). Carnegie Mellon U. to open campus in Rwanda, a milestone for Africa. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/article/Carnegie-Mellon-U-to-Open/128991/>
- Wilkins, S., & Balakrishnan, M. S. (2012). How well are international branch campuses serving students? *International Higher Education*, 66, 3–5.
- Wilkins, S., & Balakrishnan, M. S. (2013). Assessing student satisfaction in transnational higher education. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 27(2), 143–156.
- Wilkins, S., & Huisman, J. (2012). The international branch campus as transnational strategy in higher education. *Higher Education*, 64(5), 627–645. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-012-9516-5>
- Yin, R. K. (2014). *Case study research: design and methods* (Fifth edition). Los Angeles: SAGE.

Ziguras, C. (2008). The cultural politics of transnational education: Ideological and pedagogical issues for teaching staff. In L. Dunn & M. Wallace (Eds.), *Teaching in transnational higher education: enhancing learning for offshore international students* (pp. 44–54). New York: Routledge.

Ziguras, C., & McBurnie, G. (2011). Transnational higher education in the Asia-Pacific region: From distance education to the branch campus. In S. Marginson, S. Kaur, & E. Sawir (Eds.), *Higher education in the Asia-Pacific* (pp. 105–122). Springer Netherlands. Retrieved from http://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-94-007-1500-4_5

APPENDIX A : INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Interview Protocol - European Campus Faculty

1. Could you tell me a little about yourself and how you came into teaching and specifically working for this institution?
 - a. What brought you to MCU? What made this position desirable?
 - b. How long have you worked at MCU?
 - c. Do you have other work experiences at transnational/cross-border higher education institutions?
 - d. Tell me about your pedagogy/teaching philosophy?
2. Please describe the courses you teach at MCU?
 - a. How would you describe the students in your courses in terms of, for example, academic preparation, English language abilities, and learning needs?
 - b. What techniques do you use in the classroom to foster student learning? Lecture, Discussion Groups, etc.
 - c. How do you adapt the course material to your student population's needs each term?
 - d. Are any of the classroom activities and assignments prescribed by the U.S. campus faculty/program heads? If so, how and why are they? If not, why not?
 - e. How does your program ensure the same course outcomes are achieved in program if there are different instructors?
3. How are your courses assessed? Please describe the assessment process for your academic program.
 - a. What is your level of participation? What affects your participation?
4. Please describe your understanding of the process for curricular changes (new courses, changes in courses, program changes) at MCU?
 - a. What is your involvement in course/program modification and/or development? Can you propose changes? How are you notified if there are changes proposed at the U.S. campus?
 - b. What about your participation at the program level?
 - c. What factors affect your involvement in curricular issues?
5. What professional development opportunities do you have?
 - a. Workshops, Seminars? On curricular design or instruction techniques?
 - b. What factors affect your participation in professional development activities?
6. What makes the [European] campus unique? How does it contribute to the academic mission of MCU?
 - a. Can you give an example?
7. How would you describe the relationship between the [European] campus and the U.S. campus overall?

- a. What factors contribute to your description?
 - b. What about at the program level? What factors contribute to this description?
8. How is information communicated between the U.S. campus and [European] campus regarding curricular issues?
 - a. What forms does this communication take? Email, phone calls, video conferencing, etc.?
 - b. What do you think affects the level of communication between the campuses?
 9. Is there anything else you would like to tell me about?

Interview Protocol - United States Campus Faculty

1. Could you tell me a little about yourself and how you came into teaching and specifically working for this institution?
 - a. What brought you to MCU? What made this position desirable?
 - b. How long have you worked at MCU?
 - c. Do you have work experience at transnational/cross-border higher education institutions?
 - d. Tell me about your pedagogy/teaching philosophy?
2. Please describe the undergraduate courses you teach at MCU?
 - a. How would you describe the students in your undergraduate courses in terms of, for example, academic preparation, English language abilities, and learning needs?
 - b. What techniques do you use in the classroom to foster student learning? Lecture, Discussion Groups, etc.
 - c. How do you adapt the course material to your student population's needs each term?
 - d. Are any of the classroom activities and assignments coordinated with the [European] campus faculty/program heads? If so, how and why are they? If not, why not?
 - e. How does your program ensure the same course outcomes are achieved in program if there are different instructors?
3. How are your courses assessed? Please describe the assessment process for your academic program.
 - a. What is your level of participation? What affects your participation?
4. Please describe your understanding of the process for curricular changes (new courses, changes in courses, program changes) at MCU?
 - a. What is your involvement in course/program modification and/or development? Can you propose changes? How are you notified if there are changes proposed at the U.S. campus?
 - b. What about your participation at the program level?
 - c. What factors affect your involvement in curricular issues?
5. What professional development opportunities do you have?
 - a. Workshops, Seminars? On curricular design or instruction techniques?
 - b. What factors affect your participation in professional development activities?

- c. Do you feel valued as a MCU faculty member?
6. How would you describe the relationship between the [European] campus and the U.S. campus overall?
 - a. What factors contribute to your description?
 - b. What about at the program level? What factors contribute to this description?
 - c. What factors enhance or inhibit your participation in MCU? (Salary, benefits, etc.)
7. What are your thoughts about the MCU as an academic institution in general?
 - a. How does the [European] campus contribute to the mission/vision of MCU? (Can you give an example? What makes the [European] campus unique?)
8. How is information communicated between the U.S. campus and [European] campus regarding curricular issues?
 - a. What forms does this communication take? Email, phone calls, video conferencing, etc.?
 - b. What do you think affects the level of communication between the campuses?
9. Is there anything else you would like to tell me about?