2025 European Quality Assurance Forum

QA in times of crises – Ensuring stability, autonomy and international cooperation in higher education

Hosted by Corvinus University of Budapest, Hungary
12-14 November 2025

ISSN: 1375-3797

Author(s)

Name: Ștefania-Maria Armășelu

Position: Quality Assurance Expert

Organisation: ARACIS

Country: Romania

Short bio: Ștefania-Maria Armășelu is an expert within the Quality Assurance Department at the Romanian Agency for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ARACIS) starting with 2021, where she gives technical support to the external evaluation of the quality of educational activities carried out. Since 2022, she has been part of the "Implementation and Innovation in Quality Assurance through Peer Learning" (IMINQA) project, funded by the Erasmus+ program, the umbrella project to support the work of the Bologna thematic peer group on quality assurance (TPG C). Additionally, starting with 2023, she represents ARACIS at the General Assembly of the European Network for Accreditation of Engineering Education (ENAEE).

Name: Lien Beyls

Position: Policy Advisor

Organisation: NVAO

Country: Belgium

Short bio: Lien Beyls has been working as a policy advisor at NVAO, the accreditation organisation of the Netherlands, Flanders and Luxembourg, since June 2021. She has extensive experience in coordinating accreditation procedures at EQF level 5, 6 and 7, and in coordinating institutional reviews. She also contributed to the development of a new QA methodology and assessment framework for nursing programmes at EQF level 5. In 2023–2024, she led a system-wide analysis on curriculum development and future-proof curricula. Her focus within higher education includes domain-specific learning outcomes, (the EU directive on) professional qualifications, and developments in healthcare education. Going forward, she will also be involved in implementing NVAO's international strategy and will take part in conducting assessments under the European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes.

Name: Jennifer Osborne

Position: Manager

Organisation: QQI

Country: Ireland

Short bio: Jennifer Osborne is a Manager in the International Education Division at Quality and Qualifications Ireland (QQI), supporting the TrustEd Ireland quality mark for international learners. She has extensive experience in quality assurance, international education and learner mobility. Jennifer previously managed QQI's International Mobility & Prior Learning unit and previous to that, facilitated

QQI's external QA processes in tertiary education. She has worked with The Open University and holds credentials in refugee qualification assessment (EQPR) and Recognition of Prior Learning. In 2024, she completed the ENQA Leadership Programme, focusing on Cross-Border Quality Assurance and strengthening her international QA leadership expertise.

Name: Emilia Primeri

Position: Evaluation Expert

Organisation: ANVUR

Country: Italy

Short bio: Emilia Primeri, since 2017, is an Evaluation expert in the International Division at ANVUR, the Italian national Agency for the evaluation of Universities and Research. She has been in charge also of the accreditation and evaluation of Italian universities and their new study programmes and AFAM institutions (HEIs in the sector of music and arts). She has a deep knowledge of QA issues and higher education developments at the national and international levels. Formerly (2007 - 2017) she was a technologist at the Italian CNR where she participated and coordinated several European and national research projects, developing an expertise in evaluating policies for public research and higher education and in the analysis of the impact of joint programming at the EU level.

Paper

Title: Crossing Borders, Crossing Lines? Navigating the Ethical Minefield of CBQA

Abstract

CBQA refers to external quality assurance activities conducted by a QA agency in a country other than its own (EUA, 2017). CBQA increasingly operates within a broader changing policy landscape shaped by internationalisation, digitalisation, and the marketisation of higher education, which pose multiple challenges: failures in governance, financial and risk management, leadership conduct, and quality assurance concerns (Sánchez-Chaparro et al., 2019; Prisacariu et al, 2016).

CBQA has gained relevance due to increased demand for higher education and internationalisation and is framed within a liberal market perspective that aims to increase transparency, institutional compatibility, and mobility by allowing institutions to choose the QA body that best fits their mission.

However, CBQA also raises significant ethical concerns, particularly around justice, equity, and transparency. Instead of fostering shared responsibility and implementing clear, accessible policies, QA processes could prioritise accommodating diverse institutions and stakeholder demands. This can lead to the neglect of national contexts and priorities and does not function as tool for accountability and transparency (Trifiro, 2018, 2019; Carvalho et al., 2022; Lim et al., 2016). Knight (2002) to this respect highlights the following as the main CBQA ethical challenges: a) ensuring academic quality, b) avoiding "degree mills", c) recognizing local sensitivities and relevance in QA procedures and d) addressing commercial motivations of QA providers.

This paper argues for the importance of framing the ethical dimensions of quality assurance (QA) in cross-border contexts, particularly where cultural diversity and legal complexity may erode trust. It critiques the shift from education as a public good to a market-driven service. Drawing on survey data from a sample of European QA agencies, the paper identifies three core ethical values essential to CBQA: rootedness, empathy, and justice. It supports the idea that QA is not value-neutral, but shaped by leadership, institutional culture, policy clarity, stakeholder engagement, and resource availability.

Finally, the paper questions whether integrating internal and external QA systems within standardized international frameworks (e.g., ISO, ICE, CEN, ESG) can truly enhance global alignment in educational quality.

Introduction

Cross-border higher education (CBHE) refers to the delivery of educational programs across national borders through student, program, or institutional mobility. CBHE has gained prominence alongside the internationalisation of higher education, supported by frameworks such as the Bologna Process and the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) as well as developments with the European Degree label and existing European University alliances.

In response, CBQA has emerged as a mechanism to monitor and ensure the quality of these transnational education offerings, which include franchise arrangements, twinning programs, joint degrees, and distance learning models. Framed within a liberal market perspective, CBQA seeks to enhance transparency, institutional compatibility, and mobility by allowing institutions to choose the QA body that best aligns with their mission, while referring to a common and shared set of standards. In this context, the European Quality Assurance Registry (EQAR) plays a pivotal role by listing agencies compliant with the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG) criteria (ENQA et al., 2015; Knight, 2002; Rawazik & Carroll, 2009; Sánchez-Chaparro et al., 2019). This represents a significant step towards enhancing transparency and accountability in the area of QA in Europe (Stensaker et al., 2011). Also, frameworks such as the ESG 2015 play a crucial role in harmonising QA procedures and approaches (Sánchez Chaparro, Remaud, & Jolly, 2021, p. 285). The ESG distinguishes between two fundamental dimensions of quality assurance in higher education: *internal quality assurance (IQA)*, referring to the policies and practices developed by institutions themselves to monitor and enhance the quality of their educational offerings, and *external quality assurance (EQA)*, which involves procedures conducted by independent bodies such as quality assurance agencies or governmental authorities.

A key feature of an IQA system is its integration into university management systems, i.e. strategic management, the operationalisation of strategic goals through the development of plans and programmes, target agreements, and management control (Pablo Villalobos, Álvaro Rojas, Francisco Honorato, and Sebastián Donoso, 2017).

EQA, however, is expected to fulfil a dual function: it ensures compliance with established standards (accountability) and promotes institutional improvement (enhancement). The balance between these two functions, accountability and enhancement, varies across national contexts within the EU, although both are fundamental when designing external QA systems (Vroeijenstijn, 1995; Billing, 2004; ENQA et al., 2015). Tensions may arise between internal, improvement-oriented QA mechanisms and externally imposed approaches to quality assurance (Amaral & Rosa, 2010; Huisman & Westerheijden, 2010; Grochau et al., 2018).

This dynamic highlights the strong connection between academic integrity and quality assurance (QA), particularly regarding the ethical foundations of evaluation systems and processes. Academic integrity - grounded in honesty, fairness, responsibility and respect - serves as a fundamental pillar of trust and credibility in higher education. (ENQA, 2015 Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG); Nadalutti, E., 2020).

The integrity of a QA agency and processes refers to its ability to consistently uphold high standards of quality and ethics in its operations which means ensuring transparency in the evaluations performed (processes, criteria and decision making), being accountable towards institutions and stakeholders,

operating consistently, that is applying standards uniformly across evaluations and protecting sensitive information (confidentiality).

Benefits and risks of CBQA in HE

Beyond the push towards increasing CBQA in EHEA, its implementation remains so far uneven: for instance, as of 2023, only 22 out of 47 EHEA countries have fully open legal frameworks allowing HEIs to choose foreign agencies for mandatory reviews (IMINQA, 2023) and procedures such as the European approach are not allowed in all EU countries. Notwithstanding its diffusion, CBQA has both important benefits and risks.

One of the key advantages of cross-border quality assurance lies in its capacity to support strategic alignment between higher education institutions (HEIs) and quality assurance (QA) agencies. In contrast to nationally mandated QA bodies, cross-border frameworks often allow institutions to select an agency whose evaluative philosophy and methodological approach resonate more closely with their institutional mission, vision, and pedagogical identity. This flexibility can be particularly valuable for universities with distinctive profiles, such as research-intensive institutions, practice-oriented universities of applied sciences, or those emphasising international collaboration, as it enables them to engage in a quality assurance process that genuinely reflects and supports their strategic objectives (EQAR, 2014).

A second notable benefit is enhanced recognition, both at the institutional and individual level. Engaging in CBQA processes can bolster the credibility and visibility of an HEI in the international arena. For students and graduates, this can translate into greater academic and professional mobility, as degrees evaluated through internationally recognized procedures are more likely to be trusted by employers and academic institutions abroad. In this sense, CBQA contributes to the construction of a transnational space of higher education where qualifications are more easily understood and accepted across borders.

Moreover, CBQA serves as a powerful driver of capacity building. External reviews by international QA agencies often introduce institutions to new standards, methodologies, and benchmarking practices that may not be prevalent in their national contexts. These engagements can act as catalysts for internal reform, encouraging a culture of continuous improvement, reflective self-assessment, and evidence-based decision-making. By exposing institutions to diverse perspectives and international best practices, CBQA fosters organisational learning and supports the professional development of academic and administrative staff alike.

Lastly, CBQA has the potential to strengthen mutual trust among education systems. By adhering to shared standards, such as the ESG 2015 activities contribute to the harmonization of expectations around what constitutes a “quality” education. This, in turn, enhances transparency, reduces uncertainty, and lays the groundwork for reciprocal recognition of qualifications and assessments. In a broader policy sense, CBQA plays a role in shaping a more integrated and cooperative global education ecosystem.

Despite its many benefits, CBQA is not without significant risks. Knight (2002) in this respect, highlights as main ethical challenges of CBQA are: a) ensuring academic quality, b) avoiding “degree mills”, c) recognizing local sensitivities and relevance in QA procedures and d) addressing commercial motivations of providers in QA systems. Sánchez-Chaparro et al. (2019) highlight as in the EHEA, CBQA has been heavily encouraged by the European Commission both to encourage competition among quality assurance bodies and to foster the creation of a liberal ‘market’ logic into the QA sector to improve the overall quality of higher education (Knight, 2002; Rawazik & Carroll, 2009; Sánchez-

Chaparro et al., 2019). Nonetheless, they also recall that many countries have become importers of QA approaches and services by foreign providers (Blanco Ramírez, 2014).

A central concern is then CBQA ethical misuse, particularly the phenomenon known as "agency shopping." In the absence of stringent legal and regulatory safeguards, institutions may strategically select QA agencies perceived as more lenient or flexible, with the sole purpose of obtaining favourable evaluations. Such practices undermine the credibility of QA processes and may result in a dilution of standards. Furthermore, they threaten the core principles of accountability and integrity that QA systems are meant to uphold. So far, the risk of building a QA system based on a streamlined QA framework might occur.

Another major risk is cultural misalignment. Many QA agencies operate according to epistemological and pedagogical assumptions grounded in specific national or regional traditions. When these models are exported into different cultural or regulatory environments without adequate adaptation, they can clash with local educational values and governance structures. This may lead to superficial compliance rather than meaningful engagement, and in some cases, resistance or unintended consequences at the institutional level.

Resource intensity is also a pressing issue (Grifoll et al., 2015). CBQA processes often require significant financial, administrative, and human resource investments. These demands may be manageable for large or well-funded universities and QA agencies, but they can pose substantial burdens for smaller institutions, especially those in lower-income countries. The resulting inequality may exacerbate existing disparities in quality assurance capacity and hinder participation in international QA networks.

A further concern relates to the risk of supporting a “quality imperialism” that is the imposition of a foreign model based on epistemic exclusion. The predominance of some QA frameworks compared to other (less known and diffused) risks marginalizing alternative understandings of quality. Even where legal frameworks exist, operational hurdles persist (e.g., need to use national languages or standards) (IMINQA, 2023). As noted by Blanco Ramírez (2014), this can lead to a system in which diverse epistemologies are subordinated to globally dominant paradigms, with potentially harmful effects on academic diversity and local relevance. Nonetheless, at times, clashing with local contexts can be observed (Pyvis, 2011).

Summing up, quality assurance mechanisms risk not always being used in a constructive manner. So far, the following questions arise:

- What risks for accountability and enhancement can emerge in CBQA?
- How can QA agencies balance local specificity with global legitimacy?
- What are the key aspects to be monitored to ensure that agencies maintain ethical practice when working across borders?

These questions highlight tensions between quality assurance as regulation versus enhancement, and between standardization and contextualization.

This paper emphasises the need to frame “ethical challenges” of CBQA mechanisms and processes, focusing on three main concepts: rootedness, empathy, and justice.

Rootedness refers to the alignment of QA processes to the national contexts and institutional missions and cultural values of universities. Rather than applying a rigid, one-size-fits-all model, QA mechanisms should be sensitive to the historical, political, and educational specificities at the European and non-European level. QA should reflect the diversity of different educational contexts, while still promoting shared standards, such as the ESG 2015, and supporting institutional autonomy and differentiation across systems (e.g. between research-intensive and teaching-focused universities). This is increasingly important considering the increasingly internationalised contexts of QA activities in order to enhance trust and legitimacy of external QA processes at the local level (Westerheijden, D., 2007).

Empathy refers to the capacity of QA processes to adequately take into consideration and acknowledge the institutional challenges, constraints, and aspirations of universities operating in different educational (and political contexts), especially those in transition, underfunded regions, or affected by demographic and policy pressures (Nadalutti, E., 2020). Empathy should support mutual respect and trust between universities and quality assurance bodies, allowing meaningful dialogue in cross-border QA.

Justice in QA refers to the fair and equitable design and implementation of quality assurance processes including both procedural justice (fairness and transparency in evaluation processes) and distributive justice (equal access to quality resources and recognition across institutions and regions). To this end, transparent criteria, consistent application of standards, and inclusive stakeholder involvement are fundamental (Šedžiuvienė, N., & Tamutienė, I., 2016; European Commission 2020). Regional disparities should call for additional concern to ensure equity at the level of processes, instruments and beneficiaries.

Framing the Ethical Minefield of CBQA

This research adopts a qualitative approach, grounded in three core ethical principles - rootedness, empathy, and justice - which serve as analytical lenses to examine the dynamics of cross-border collaboration in higher education quality assurance (QA).

- ***Rootedness*** guides the analysis of how QA practices adapt to local contexts.
- ***Empathy*** directs attention to interpersonal and institutional relationships, and the quality of dialogue between partners.
- ***Justice*** enables the evaluation of fairness in decision-making processes, assessment criteria, and the distribution of resources and opportunities.

The three principles are framed as follows.

QA principles in CBQA	Ethical challenges	Ethical issues to be monitored
Rootedness	Language barriers	Fair judgment
	National cultural differences	Prejudices
	Legislative jurisdiction barriers	Fair judgment
	Knowledge contexts	Fair judgment/Prejudices
Empathy	Qualification recognition	Misalignment
	Experts selection/panel composition	Skewed representation of expertise
	Stakeholders' involvement	Skewed representation of expertise
	Decision validation	Misalignment
Justice	Agency selection bias	Marketisation
	Evaluation process	Confidentiality

QA principles in CBQA	Ethical challenges	Ethical issues to be monitored
	Evaluation outcomes	Feedback/Publicity
	Fair procedures	Trust/Reliability
	Finances and resources	Marketisation
	Follow-up	Trust/Reliability

The study employs a combination of qualitative methods.

Firstly, a **document analysis** of QA guidelines and policy papers is carried out to define a framework of main issues to be considered when addressing ethical challenges in CBQA. A **survey** titled *"Ethical Dimensions of Cross-Border Quality Assurance in Higher Education" was also* addressed to QA agencies **representatives.**

Data are analyzed using the three ethical principles as analytical categories to identify practices, tensions, and opportunities within cross-border QA processes. Triangulation of sources and methods will also be used to enhance the reliability of the findings.

This methodological framework aims to generate insights useful to support critical thinking about ethical challenges in international cooperation for quality assurance in higher education.

Results

While the global expansion of Cross-Border Quality Assurance (CBQA) offers opportunities for benchmarking and institutional growth, it also raises ethical concerns, especially when local contexts, stakeholder input, and power equity are overlooked.

A document analysis of policy reports, academic literature, and case studies identified key ethical challenges in CBQA, centered on rootedness, empathy, and justice. The findings reveal both strengths and blind spots in current practices, showing that ethical lapses often correlate with declining quality and institutional performance, posing systemic risks to accountability and improvement.

Cremonini and Epping (2012) warn of "rogue providers" and superficial compliance, linking these to justice issues like inequitable standards. Knight (2006) highlights risks from unregulated providers and "degree mills," raising concerns about fairness and consumer protection. De Wit et al. (2025) emphasize ethical gaps in digital and privatized transnational education (TNE), especially in opaque systems, where risks like foreign influence and lack of transparency disproportionately affect underserved regions, touching on justice, empathy, and rootedness.

EQAR (2017) supports adapting ESG standards to local contexts, promoting rootedness by aligning global benchmarks with national frameworks. TEQSA (2014) and IMINQA (2023) echo this, advocating for context-sensitive QA and mission-aligned evaluations. Knight (2007) stresses the need for alignment without homogenization, framing empathy as mutual respect and co-development in partnerships.

Warter (2019) critiques tokenism (superficial inclusion of stakeholders without real influence) as a failure of empathetic engagement. Nadalutti (2020) calls for participatory, value-driven governance, linking rootedness to ethical responsibility and local ownership.

Overall, the document analysis underscores the need for transparent standards, stakeholder engagement, and ethical alignment in QA practices, with sensitivity to national laws, cultures, and institutional diversity.

The survey emphasised the three core ethical principles, rootedness, empathy, and justice, and aimed at exploring how they are perceived and enacted by professionals engaged in international quality assurance (QA) collaborations. The core of the survey is divided into three thematic sections, each corresponding to one of the ethical principles:

Rootedness investigates the extent to which QA practices are sensitive to local cultural and institutional contexts. It includes both scaled and open-ended questions to capture nuanced experiences of cultural alignment or conflict.

Empathy focuses on interpersonal and inter-institutional dynamics. It assesses the quality of communication, mutual understanding, and the perceived inclusiveness of QA processes. This section is crucial for identifying relational and dialogical dimensions often overlooked in technical QA frameworks.

Justice addresses issues of fairness, transparency, and equity in cross-border QA. It probes whether institutions feel equally treated and whether decision-making processes are perceived as just and inclusive.

The final section 'Reflections' invites respondents to articulate broader ethical concerns.

The survey collected feedback from 15 professionals involved in quality assurance (QA), mostly affiliated with European QA agencies across nine countries. Ten respondents reported prior experience with cross-border quality assurance (CBQA), serving in roles such as reviewers, coordinators, and decision-makers.

The analysis showed that the ethical dimensions of QA are complex and wide-ranging. Overall, participants expressed a positive perception of CBQA practices. Most agreed that cross-border QA processes generally respect local cultural and institutional contexts, demonstrating sensitivity to diversity in national systems. Mutual understanding and respect among international QA partners were rated very highly (mostly 4–5 on a five-point scale). However, questions of fairness and equality in CBQA remain complex. While most respondents acknowledged efforts to ensure equal treatment among institutions, many noted persistent challenges related to unequal resources, differing national regulations, and the relative influence of larger agencies. Equality is widely regarded as an aspirational goal rather than an established reality.

Transparency in decision-making was also rated highly, particularly by those with direct CBQA experience, reinforcing the view that openness and accountability are well-integrated into international QA procedures. Still, respondents suggested several improvements to strengthen fairness and equity - such as clearer and more consistent methodologies, better contextual understanding of national systems, structural measures like EU-level coordination, fairer cost structures, and expanded inter-agency dialogue.

As for ethical challenges in CBQA, respondents emphasized issues of fairness and equity across diverse contexts, the financial influence of wealthier institutions, the need for integrity and transparency in evaluations, and the importance of cultural sensitivity. Emerging ethical frontiers, such as the use of artificial intelligence in QA processes, were also mentioned as areas requiring thoughtful regulation.

Conclusions and recommendations

The findings highlight that CBQA in Europe is guided by strong principles of respect, collaboration, and transparency. Yet, practical challenges remain—particularly regarding fairness, equity, and ethical consistency across different contexts. Strengthening mutual understanding, harmonizing standards, and fostering ongoing dialogue among QA bodies will be essential to ensure that CBQA continues to evolve as a fair, empathetic, and trustworthy process.

So far, CBQA must go beyond technocratic or compliance-based models. Rootedness, empathy, and justice are not only moral ideals but necessary preconditions for effective and sustainable QA in cross-border contexts. Embedding these values requires deliberate structural design, transparent operations, and authentic stakeholder partnerships.

In the context of the internationalization of higher education and increasing QA activities across national borders, the biggest ethical challenges relate to ensuring fairness, equity, integrity, and sensitivity to diverse contexts. Financial inequalities, cultural differences, regulation and new technologies like AI complicate this landscape, demanding thoughtful and ethical responses from QA bodies and professionals.

This scenario calls for an approach that is not only technical and regulatory, but also deeply ethical and culturally aware. From this perspective, three fundamental principles can guide more inclusive, sustainable, and respectful QA practices: rootedness, empathy, and justice.

So far, CBQA full implementation remains a challenge, and concerns (i.e. varying national contexts, ethical issues, trust, etc.) arise about creating an open market for quality assurance.

The authors acknowledge that Microsoft Copilot was used to assist with exploratory data analysis and language editing in the development of this paper.

References

Blanco Ramírez, G. (2014). International accreditation as global position-taking: The case of the AACSB. *Higher Education*, 68(3), 397–410.

Carvalho, Nathan et al. (2022) “Cross-Border Higher Education and Quality Assurance. Results from a Systematic Literature Review.” *Journal of Studies in International Education* 27; 695 – 718

ENQA, EUA, EURASHE, ESU. (2015). *Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG).* Brussels: ENQA.

EQAR. (2014). *Key Considerations for Cross-Border Quality Assurance in the EHEA.* Brussels: EQAR.

EQAR. (2020). *EQAR Policy Paper on Cross-Border Quality Assurance.*

Grifoll, J., Hopbach, A., Kekale, J., Rozsnyai, C., & Tavares, O. (2015). *Quality assurance of cross-border higher education.* Brussels: ENQA.

Hocht, A. (2006). Quality assurance in transnational education: The need for recognition of a paradigm shift. *Higher Education*, 52(3), 403–419.

IMINQA. (2023). *Thematic Analysis: Cross-Border Quality Assurance and Transnational Education.* Brussels: EQAR.

Knight, J. (2002). Trade in higher education services: The implications of GATS. *The Observatory on Borderless Higher Education.*

Knight, J. (2005). Cross-border education: Programs and providers on the move. *CBIE Research Millennium Series.*

Lim, F. C. B (2010). Do Too Many Rights Make a Wrong? A Qualitative Study of the Experiences of a Sample of Malaysian and Singapore Private Higher Education Providers in Transnational Quality Assurance. Quality in Higher Education, 16(3), 211–222. https://doi.org/10.1080/13538322.2010.506700

Nadalutti, E. (2020). The ethics of cross-border cooperation and its values. *Regions and Cohesion*, 10(2), 41–63.

OECD. (2012). *Guidelines for Quality Provision in Cross-Border Higher Education: Where Do We Stand?* OECD Education Working Papers, No. 70.

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

QACHE Toolkit. (2016). *Cooperation in Cross-Border Higher Education: A Toolkit for Quality Assurance Agencies.* Brussels: ENQA.

Sánchez-Chaparro, T., Remaud, B., Gómez-Frías, V., Duykaerts, C., & Jolly, A.-M. (2021). Benefits and challenges of cross-border quality assurance in higher education. *Quality in Higher Education*, 27(3), 288–304.

Trifiro, F. (2018). Inter-agency cooperation in the quality assurance of transnational education: challenges and opportunities. Quality in Higher Education, 24(2), 136–153. https://doi.org/10.1080/13538322.2018.1481805

Trifirò, F. (2019) “The importance of cross-border cooperation in the quality assurance of TNE.”

Vincent-Lancrin, S., & Pfotenhauer, S. (2012). *Guidelines for Quality Provision in Cross-border Higher Education.* OECD Education Working Papers.

Warter, I. (2019). The nexus between ethics and quality in higher education. *Journal of Intercultural* Management and Ethics, (2), 113–120.

European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA). Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG) (2015).

Westerheijden, D.F. (2007). Ex Oriente Lux?: National and Multiple Accreditation in Europe after the “Bologna Declaration”. *Quality in Higher Education*.