



**Directorate of school, out-of-school and higher
education
Higher Education and Research Division**

***Higher Education Governance between
democratic culture, academic aspirations and
market forces***

**COUNCIL OF EUROPE HEADQUARTERS
PALAIS DE L'EUROPE**

Strasbourg

22 – 23 September 2005

**Synopses of presentations
Statements by panel members
European Year of Citizenship through Education**

Learning and living
democracy

1. Keynote speech – Pavel Zgaga, Slovenia

SYNOPSIS

Reconsidering Higher Education Governance

The concept of *higher education governance* is of rather *recent origins*. As such, it was not characteristic for traditional higher education; yet, it does not mean that traditional higher education was not 'governed'. Origins of the concept lie in a complexity of the societal context within which a transformation from elite to mass higher education has occurred. No other concept is so heavily affected by the interaction of higher education and society. Many independent elements resonate in it: the power which makes and enforces laws and regulations (e.g. for higher education, but not only); the manner in which an (academic, but not only) institution is or should be directed; the strategy and processes that need to be followed in a successful/efficient institution or in a successful/efficient system ('good governance'); the organization of functioning that allows the rights and interests of the stakeholders to be respected by the executives in a spirit of democracy ('fair governance'), etc. As political philosophies – and their popular applications – have changed substantially during last decades their echo has affected the sector of higher education as well.

Also for these reasons, the concept of *higher education governance* is *multidimensional*. As the title of the conference suggests, its 'space' is defined by three dimensions: democratic culture, academic aspirations and market forces. Within these frames it is possible to distinguish between the 'internal' and 'external' dimension of governance; it is possible to approach governance either as 'institutional management' or 'institutional culture'; it could be understood either in collision with individual academic freedoms or in consonance with institutional autonomy. For working purposes and on a very general level, reflecting on four aspects of higher education governance is proposed: three '*fixed*' – government's view, academic view and external view – and a '*fluid*' one, students' view. Government's view stresses the systemic dimensions of governance (legal framework, public financing), academic view exposes the institutional dimensions (epistemologically based self-governance) and external view calls attention to reality dimension (efficiency). The students view is connected to the most important dimension: it brings the concept in motion.

Therefore, the concept of *higher education governance* is not *uniform, finished, non-problematic and non-disputable*. Far from that! Under this light, it could be interesting to ask how the concept has been appearing in recent discussions on higher education, in particularly within the Bologna Process. Obviously, it is connected to several questions, problems and dilemmas. For example: efficiency of higher education seems to be most important principle from any point of view; yet, where was it leading to if it would be understood as broadly open gates for commercialization? Asking these questions and disputing dilemmas makes possible to identify potential collisions that could affect higher education. And to leave the concept open to further reconsiderations.

2. Working Group A – The objectives of and expectations towards higher education in the changed societal context and its implications for governance

Speaker: Aleksander Lomaia, Minister of Education, Georgia
Chair: Virgílio Meira Soares, Portugal, overview of key issues
Rapporteur: Dionyssi Kladis

Aleksander Lomaia, (Minister of Education, Georgia)

SYNOPSIS

Reforms in the Education System of Georgia

Georgia signed the Lisbon Recognition Convention in 1997 and the parliament ratified it in 1999. Since 1997 the Division of Mobility and Academic Recognition at The Ministry of Education and Science is functioning as Georgian ENIC. Georgia is participating in the Council of Europe EDC project since 1997 and at present actively implements the “European Year of Citizenship through Education” in cooperation with non-governmental organizations and other partners. In 1996 Georgia and the European Union signed and in 1999 the parliament of Georgia ratified the Partnership and Cooperation Agreement in which education and science are included as separate chapters (Ch.53-54). Also an Action Plan is drafted for the EU new Neighbourhood Policy in which cooperation in the field of education and science is included under the chapter “Cooperation on Reforms and Economic Development Issues”. This year Georgia joined the Bologna Process alongside with Armenia, Azerbaijan, Moldova and Ukraine. Against the backdrop of such major developments aiming at integrating Georgia with the European education area, implementing the major reforms has become an international requirement and obligation.

Presently, the educational reforms in Georgia are both praised and criticized for being accelerated and radical. They are accelerated because they envisage utter transformation of the system in terms of *strategy, content, legislation, governance, financing and structure* and they are radical hence the *shift is systemic* and incorporates all forms and levels of education such as *formal, non-formal, informal, pre-primary, primary, secondary, higher and vocational education*. Different societal strata support the reforms and admit the inevitability of the process. However, there are also cases of vigorous opposition from mostly conservative groups of society who shun any attempt of change that “pose a threat” to their lifestyle. Despite such diversified approach there is not a single group in the country who would openly declare that the existing system was progressive and merit-based. Degeneration of academic and professional values was so glaring that, to put it mildly, denying the regress would simply be unreasonable.

During the decade prior to the Rose Revolution, the reform process was piecemeal and nominal. The sharp decline in financing of the system, superficial introduction of innovations, implying the adjustment of new trends to firmly entrenched soviet traditions,

engendered myriad of anomalies such as, dilution of quality, rampant corruption, bribery, elitism, nepotism, brain drain, degraded standards, crumbling infrastructure, unprecedented mushrooming of private higher education institutions mostly at the cost of quality thus leading to augmenting gap between academia and the world of work. In a nutshell, the system was on the brink of collapse. However, due to traditional high societal demand to acquire education at any cost saved the system from total destruction.

The value of education was always duly apprehended in Georgia. The history of Georgian *grand école* originated as early as 12th century when the glorious king of Georgia David the Builder established the Gelati academy that was followed by the establishment of another academy in Ikalto. These spiritual centres also served as educational and cultural centres of Georgia. Different spiritual-educational centres already existed long before the 12th century and Georgian youngsters acquired knowledge through organized mobility programmes to Greece, Bulgaria, Palestine, Syria etc. Outstanding Georgian scholars served all over the world and contributed to local as well as wider societal development.

Despite the long-standing history and traditions, the first European-type Georgian university was established as late as in the beginning of the 20th century. During the rule of the tsarist Russia, the foreign-educated Georgian founders of the Tbilisi State University encountered lots of trouble and resistance. However, thanks to strong determination and perseverance of the Georgian scholars the University was established and still remains to be the main public university in Georgia.

During the Soviet era, the Georgian education system was as ideologically-driven, authoritarian, prescriptive and teacher-centred, as elsewhere in the Soviet Union. Therefore, after gaining the independence in 1991, Georgian academia was left without direct instructions from Kremlin as well as without proper skills and experience to design and lead the educational activities independently. To address the problem, universities were declared autonomous, however autonomy did not or at least nominally envisaged accountability and transparency thus giving leeway to illegal activities and cheating. It took Georgia more than a dozen of years to come to the conclusion that decisive and goal-oriented approach is essential.

Presently, the ultimate goal of the reform is to transform the system in line with the ongoing reforms throughout the whole Europe and so that it is built upon the principles of mutual trust, cooperation, excellence and relevance. In this direction, a number of major projects have already been implemented, such as adoption of two major laws. Georgian Law on Higher Education was adopted on December 21, 2004 and The Georgian Law on General education on April 8, 2005. Also, the Law on Licensing is enforced and the first institutional accreditation of higher education institutions (HEI) was conducted this year, resulting in granting accreditation to 110 institutions out of 227 applying. It is envisaged that the programme accreditation that is due in a couple of years will also significantly reduce the number of HEIs. The Ministry of Education and Science policy is to integrate HEIs and faculties aiming at decreasing the excessive number of HEIs.

In July this year, the test-based Unified National Admission Exams will be held in Georgia. This is the first attempt of this kind and it is anticipated that the exams will ultimately eradicate corruption in the system. Besides, out of 17 000 admitted 4000 students will receive portable state grants. Besides, grants for ethnic minorities, Internally Displaced Persons and other economically disadvantaged families are envisaged from the special social fund. This novelty totally changes the formula of financing the HEIs from

lump sum allocation to money following student model. On top of all the reform envisages adoption of the law on deinstitutionalization; professional and vocational education; science and technology; preschool education etc.

Starting this year, according to the Ministerial Order the Georgian HEIs, will issue standardized Diploma Supplement developed by UNESCO-CEPES, Council of Europe and European Commission. ECTS will be universally introduced in 2007. According to the newly adopted Law on Higher Education, university management will become inclusive and participatory inviting students (comprising 1/3 of the university academic board), academic and administrative staff to participate in the decision-making process. Herewith, it is worth mentioning that educational reforms since the Rose Revolution was launched by restructuring the Ministry of Education and Science and optimizing the material, human and financial resources there.

Despite already visible results, education reforms in Georgia are still at the inception phase and the challenges ahead are enormous, changing behaviour and mentality of people being the major challenge. However, preconditions are appropriate for hoping that the reforms will be successful – these preconditions are strong will and support of the government, civil society, grassroots and international community.

Virgílio Meira Soares (Portugal)

SYNOPSIS

It is widely accepted that the challenges Universities are facing nowadays have their main roots on the developments of the last three to four decades. The so-called state control model gave place to the state supervisory model in the 70's/80's, mainly due to the massification of Higher Education (HE), the resulting increased difficulties of funding the HE systems, the competition for more funding of the different sectors of the society (health, social security, etc.) and the rise of the private sector as the main employer. These findings suggest that governments, faced with the need to cut funding of HE Institutions, had to introduce measures that, on one hand, would safeguard them from accusations of decreasing the quality of teaching and research in HE and, on the other hand, would also put the necessary pressure on the institutions to demonstrate that they were doing their best to maintain quality while they were given more autonomy. This paved the way to the introduction of forms of evaluation (quality assurance and quality evaluation are now widespread) that were viewed by the universities as a means to continuously improve their performance and by the governments as a means to introduce accountability, to steer the system and to justify the decreasing funding, in what Neave¹ called the rise of the Evaluative State.

Not surprisingly, the results of these “exercises” led to some obvious conclusions. Universities were not a model of efficiency and the funding cuts would affect the quality of their performance. Therefore it was also not surprising that governments started to

¹ Neave, G., (1996), “Homogeneization, integration and convergence”, in V. Lynn Meek *et al* (eds.), *The Mockers and the Mocked: Comparative Perspectives on Differentiation, Convergence and Diversity in Higher Education*, London, Pergamon Press.

encourage Universities to diversify their funding base and launched a campaign to discredit their decision-making processes, calling for changes that would make them more efficient and responsive to the “needs of society”, by doing more with less, by changing their own internal structure and balance of power, in short, change their governance to meet those demands. And it seems that society at large has been supportive of these attitudes.

Words like stakeholders, managerialism, entrepreneurialism, market, for-profit activities, competition, just to mention some of them, started to be part of the official discourse. Universities, like many other public services, were progressively pressed to act like private enterprises, the governments transferred part of their steering functions to the “external stakeholders”, although not leaving their main control functions, whereas “internal stakeholders” (teachers, non-academic staff and students) were more and more regarded as consultative actors, while students were being regarded as “consumers”.

As a result, in many European countries, the central administration of the institutions was strengthened, in some cases “external stakeholders” were appointed to the directive boards as “representatives” of different sectors of the society and of the market (unlike the practice in the US, where the trustees are external people, not representing any specific sector of the society, who help maintaining values and missions of the institutions and protect them from other external interferences), forcing the marketisation of universities (or shall we call it “privatisation?”) to “contribute to development of the economy of the country” and to obtain funding from market-oriented activities, instead of protecting them from that same market (one must not forget that until the 80’s the State used to protect them from external interferences!), the “internal stakeholders” were kept away from the decisions or saw their influence decreasing.

It is still early to draw conclusions from these changes and how Universities are adapting or reacting (if they are!) to the new situation. There are reports suggesting that “internal stakeholders” are not very much willing to cooperate with these new developments but, at the same time, others suggest that the strengthening of the central administration is providing good results in the performance of the institutions. New alliances are already being developed and this will also have an impact in governance. It is still to be seen how the paradigm of the “entrepreneurial university” as defined by Clark², together with the changes in governance, can be sustainable, especially concerning the “stimulation of academic heartland” and the “integrated entrepreneurial culture”.

The situation, as it is now, poses some questions resulting from the new attitude of the society and governments towards universities.

The increasing importance of the market will have an impact on the traditional missions and values: creating knowledge (research) and transmitting it (teaching), *being places of free debate and critical thinking, independence from outside interests, educating students to respect ideas and their free expression* (Amaral and Magalhães³).

When subordination to the interests of the market is taking over where do those values stand and how can that affect the internal organisation and regulation of academic work?

² Clark, B. R., *Creating Entrepreneurial Universities: Organisational pathways of transformation*, Pergamon, 1998, Oxford

³ Amaral, A. and Magalhães, A. (2002), “The emergent role of external stakeholders in European Higher Education Governance”, in *Governing Higher Education: National Perspectives on Institutional Governance*, Amsterdam, Kluwer Academic Publishers

How can Universities continue to be sites where education for democratic citizenship is part of their mission? Is that compatible with a market-driven organisation? Should they give up these functions? Or will the new paradigm take it into account despite its main basic assumptions being market-oriented?

How can “Universities provide a research base vital for the solution of problems of public concern, even where markets for the solutions do not [yet] exist” and how can “Governments offer incentives to conduct free and fundamental research”, as recommended by the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe recommend (R (2000) 8)? Certainly the internal mechanisms will have to deal with these contradictions. How? Will the “academic heartland” be willing to give up their traditional academic freedom to subordinate their actions to the “dictatorship” of the “market regulation”? Are Reed *et al*⁴. right when they say that *Universities may be regarded as the prototypical “knowledge intensive organisations” and university academics may be likewise be treated as the prototypical “knowledge workers”*?

Being driven by the need to look for huge external funds, some of them to be used only for specific objectives, how can Universities be fully autonomous and free from external interference? Under these circumstances is HE still a public good (as the European Ministers in charge of Education stated in Prague) to be protected and where the society should invest for its own benefit or is it a private good with all the consequences in its social function?

The search for private funding is leading some universities to look for students elsewhere either by “importing them” or by creating branches abroad (the extreme case being, very likely, Australia). Acting like private providers in other countries, Universities may be jeopardising their prestige by competing with non-scrupulous providers that do not care about any social function, do not see HE as a public good or even a good of public interest, and only care about profit regardless of the quality and validity of their services. Transnational education, especially GATS, following the trends imposed by the existing notion of globalisation, is seeing HE as a private good. How can these contradictions be addressed? There will indeed be necessary internal consequences and governance implications. And we can already see some of them in some Universities.

The questions raised above are only part of the results of the changes in different paradigms that will have an effect on governance and on what one can expect of the HEI in the future as a reaction or adaptation to those changes. Will their mission change in fact or can they “circumvent the obstacles”? There is no doubt that the University, seen as an ivory tower, may have to change and that may necessarily not be a disaster. But, just to give one example, as Amaral and Magalhães³ rightfully write, this “Ivory tower” model is now challenged by “*the new ‘Babel tower’ model, in which national interest is supposed to be protected and enhanced by representatives of the outside world acting within the academic institutions themselves*” and that may be, and already is, a matter of concern. As we have just seen there are other challenges and other threats. Will universities, as we understand them, survive? How and at the cost of what?

These issues are developed in the initial overview and will be discussed during the group work.

⁴ Reed, M. I., Meek, V. L. and Jones, G. A., “Introduction”, in *Governing Higher Education: National Perspectives on Institutional Governance*, Amsterdam, Kluwer Academic Publishers

3. Working Group B – The Governance of Higher Education Systems

Speaker: Jaak Aaviksoo, Rector, Tartu University, Estonia

Chair: Michael Daxner, Germany

Rapporteur: To be announced

Jaak Aaviksoo (Estonia)

SYNOPSIS

The presentation reviews the higher education reform process in Estonia from 1988 to 2005, which may be characterized as a market-radical response to the over-centralized and bureaucratic Soviet model. It draws on my experience as a former minister for education and long term rector and vice-rector.

The period between 1988 and 1992 may be characterized as legal vacuum – old rules were violated without real consequences and until the Estonian Law on Education was adopted in 1992 the higher education sector “innovated” following “the best Western practices”. First private HEIs were founded and existing institutions self-appointed new rectors and renamed (upgraded) themselves. The Soviet long cycle diploma studies / candidate of sciences / doctor of sciences framework was enthusiastically replaced by “the Western” Bachelor / Master / Doctor framework, which, however, ended up in an incompatible Estonian model replaced in 2002 by “the Bologna model”.

In 1995 The Law on Universities was adopted that effectively “privatized” the state universities making them independent legal entities under public law with far-reaching academic and financial self-governance. It included: owning the property including real estate and the right to buy and sell it on its own deliberation, right to take up loans in the bank, the right to appoint its staff and to determine their terms of contract, the right to admit fee-paying students above the state-financed quota and determine the level of fees, the right to initiate new programs (subject to rather broad standard of higher education), the right to set admission criteria etc. Starting a new private HEI was made very easy with only a formal requirement that the program offered corresponds to the higher education standard. The guiding principle was that “market regulates” and no external (public) interference in the form of licensing etc is necessary. It is becoming more and more apparent on all levels of “governance” that simplistic market ideas are far from being sufficient to rely upon.

To increase the penetration of the academic labour market into the “stagnant universities” only fixed-term contracts (from 3 to 5 years depending on seniority) were allowed for academic positions.

Quality assurance was thought to be safeguarded by establishing an “international accreditation” mechanism, which is run by a quasi-ministerial body and making use of international review panels. Quality of higher education is a growing concern in the society.

As a result of the above, the student numbers have grown from 25 thousand in 1993 to more than 67 thousand in 2004. Most former Soviet type polytechnics were upgraded to HEIs, dozens of private HEIs were founded (student numbers vary between 24 and 2543), some (state) secondary level vocational schools have been entitled to issue higher education diplomas and the total number of institutions offering HE qualifications is 47 (vs 1.4 million inhabitants).

The presentation is going to analyse these developments from the system level governance point of view. The main checkpoints are: is this new reality a more sustainable one, does it provide better (and more equitable) access (to quality HE), does this (market driven) system offer fair quality, is it more efficient etc.

And last but not least – what are the lessons learned and to be learned.

4. Working group C – The Governance of Higher Education institutions

Speakers: Dijana Tiplic, Norway
Radmila Nedučin-Marinković, Serbia and Montenegro
Chair: Pavel Zgaga, Slovenia
Rapporteur: to be announced

Dijana Tiplic (Norway)

SYNOPSIS

The notion of university governance used to be based on collegiality. However, the management approaches of 1980s and 1990s have shown a trend towards conceptualising higher education institutions as business-like corporations. In line with the recognised shift in the governance of higher education institutions from the collegial to the managerial, various assertions about the development of a new type of university organisation have emerged. This has been variously referred to as the enterprise university, the service university, the entrepreneurial university, etc. However, many of the claims about the emergence of a new university type are seen as lacking to a certain extent the empirical evidence. Thus it is considered as important to analyse what is going on in practice. This becomes more important since there still remains tension within the higher education institution with regard to how it should be run and who should be responsible for it.

A great deal of literature supports a claim that the majority of higher education institutions have experienced significant change in the last several decades. The change is seen to be triggered mainly by an increasingly turbulent and competitive environment, which hosts these institutions. Hence the main precondition to understanding organisational internal dynamics is considered to be the relationship between the external environment and higher education institutions. It would be misleading to assume that change in higher education institutions has been similar or even further same in all cases. Indeed, higher education institutions tend to cope with the change in the number of ways, due to different cultural, political and historical contexts.

Taking this variety of institutional responses as a point of departure, while at the same time bearing in mind the Conference's main title, the forthcoming paper and presentation will encompass the following issues: governance of higher education institutions, democratic culture, academic aspirations and market forces. The number of questions will be addressed, such as: What does democratic culture mean and what kind of implications does it have for the governance of higher education institutions? What do academic aspirations mean and further imply for governance of these institutions? What do market forces mean and imply for governance of higher education institutions?

In order to pave the way to a fruitful debate within the working group, the main purpose of both paper and presentation will be to raise awareness about the practical, yet contextualised, implications, when interpreting higher education policies at the level of a single institution. In addition, the possibility of having the same concepts perceived in the number of ways by different institutions will be addressed. Where appropriate, examples will be used for the purpose of illustrating different governance models, structural relationships in place and ongoing processes.

Radmila Nedučin-Marinković (Serbia and Montenegro)

SYNOPSIS

The Governance of Higher Education Institutions-Universities in Serbia

Initial remarks – defining the starting point for reforms

With positive social and political changes in our country since 2000, new energy for change appeared at the universities, but still under a burden of additional circumstances. Ten years of international sanctions, isolation, war and authoritarian regime caused the deterioration of academic structure and standards. The University Law enacted in 1998 cancelled the autonomy of the university, followed by suspension of Serbian universities from the CRE. After political changes in October 2000, a consensus was made between universities and the government (Ministry of Education and Sports) that universities can practice different forms of democratic procedures in elections of their governing bodies as well as the election of their professors.

Concerning the university structure, the university represented only a weak conglomerate/confederation of highly autonomous faculties (independent institutional development, building its own administrative infrastructure).

Reform strategy

In defining the strategy of change, the universities in Serbia are approaching the EHEA facing three major challenges⁵:

1. How do we better organize and manage universities to become equal partners to other European universities on all playing fields?
2. How do we develop quality management system that matches European trends?
3. How do we cope with wider social and political reforms in our country, specifically with the move from a heavy State involvement in university to a more market oriented system which gives more autonomy, but also lowers revenues from the State.

Current situation

The activities started on national level by the analysis of the European HE system, the analysis of the current state of the Serbian HE and consequently with the outline of the reform strategy of the Serbian HE system, presented in January 2002.

⁵ University of Novi Sad, Self-Evaluation Report, 2002

The new University Law (May 2002), considered as temporary and transitional legislation, restored university autonomy giving provisions for:

- The autonomy in defining curricula (approved at university level)
- Autonomy to appoint professors (approved at university level)
- Governance and management autonomy (17% of University/Faculty Council appointed by Government)
- Financial autonomy, to some extent (bulk sum of salaries and operating costs, distributed by faculty, ownership over acquisitions gained from faculty's income)

The University Law introduced National HE Council in charge of the evaluation and accreditation procedures and strategic issues related to HE. The Accreditation Committee was appointed by the National HE Council in January 2003.

The Law did not change the basic university structure of autonomous faculties (legal entities, representing almost highly specialized “universities”), but introduced a certain level of supervising over the faculties (promotion of professors, PhD thesis). There is still a misbalance between authority of rector (mostly honorary) and the dean (executive), with very limited space for strategic planning on the university level. The Educational/Research Council (all academics), being in charge of curricula, promotions, elections, institutional development and policy, has the major role in management at institutional level/faculty level. The status of student is strictly faculty oriented in all relevant aspects, with consecutive difficulties in organizing multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary studies and research. External evaluation of Serbian universities⁶ underlined university integration processes as the priority in reaching current European standards.

The drawbacks of the existing legal framework could be overcome to some extent by internal regulations within university statute. University of Novi Sad already used “free space” for integration processes (Statute of UNS, July 2002) by introducing various University bodies and by promoting common standards, procedures and services. The internal quality management system was outlined, together with the draft of strategic plan, which defined objectives, ongoing strategy and action agenda. Although some results are obvious, particularly in implementing new approaches to curricula reforms, ECTS and teaching quality standards, there are still many obstacles for university management in a full sense of the word; just to mention the lack of university funds and undeveloped information system limiting information flow within the institution.

Developments

In the beginning of 2003 the National HE Council appointed a Committee for preparing the concept of the new HE Law, which was finished and accepted in July 2003. The concept offered integration of the university as a prerequisite and framework for the insight into further institutional development. The new HE Law was drafted in September 2003, initiating a broad discussion in the academic sector, especially concerning the degree of integration, the relation between university and faculties, the level of organizational and managerial independence of faculties, the status of students and professors, the financial flow on the university level and fanatical independence of faculties. Gradual functional integration of universities was finally envisioned as a sustainable solution, leaving enough space within the legal framework for individual university management structures for each university. The integrative functions were

⁶ EUA evaluation report, 2003

defined concerning quality assurance, strategic planning, employment and enrolment policy, final decision of curricula, international cooperation, and common standards for services, information system, and capital investments. The proposal of the HE Law was passed to the Republic Assembly in May 2005.

The University of Novi Sad, searching for the optimal organizational and management profile through learning from good practice and experiences, initiated the TEMPUS project “Integration through internal agreement”. In cooperation with Serbian state universities, the project is oriented towards shaping the institutional profile, structure and processes, within the new legal framework, towards a modern and efficient scientific-educational framework within and across the fields. The proposal of the overall organizational and managerial structure of the institution is expected as one of the project outcomes, leaving to university Statutes the more detailed regulations according to the specific needs of each institution.

5. Working group D – The actors of Higher Education Governance

Speakers: Robin H. Farquhar , (Canada)
Erdal Emel, (Turkey, case study)
Chair: Marija Stambolieva, Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
Rapporteur: to be announced

Robin Farquhar (Canada)

SYNOPSIS

This presentation will draw on the author's experience as president of two Canadian universities (which, while state-supported, are governed more like private than public institutions in the U.S.) to identify certain issues that should be addressed as part of engaging various actors in the governance of higher education and to offer some suggestions for resolving them. It will not re-do Jochen Fried's identification of these actors in his excellent literature review (except perhaps to note that the media, besides being involved as "stakeholders" in governance, can also function as vehicles for it in a democratic society – as agents of transparency, accountability, and steerage). The focus here is on organizing, motivating, and facilitating participation of the actors in higher education governance.

Consideration will be given first to how their different forms of engagement can be structured. This will include not only the composition and organization of governing boards but the use as well of advisory bodies, task forces, focus groups, social functions, ceremonial events, informal consultations, etc. as appropriate means of participation. The structural relationships between governing boards and their state authorities, academic councils, and executive heads (plus other staff) – as determined through governance actors – will also be discussed.

Secondly, approaches to stimulating the effective engagement of various actors in university governance will be explored. After a review of the diverse reasons for which different actors may become involved, attention will be focused on incentives and conditions to encourage participation and on pre-service orientation and in-service training to render it productive and satisfying. This will include the discussion of institutional understanding, commitment generation, and strategic deliberation.

Finally, some operational issues that must be managed in order to facilitate actors' contributions to good governance will be noted. The conduct of meetings, communication expectations and mechanisms, participants' behavioural norms, decision-making processes, board members' duties and obligations, conflicts of interest, confidentiality, legal liabilities, succession and turnover, provision of information, remuneration of expenses, and self-evaluation will be among the subjects covered.

The presentation will be largely practical in nature, featuring observations supported by examples. Its principal purpose will be to serve as a catalyst for the exchange of useful information, more than to make an original contribution to analytical theory. It is hoped, nevertheless, that this will add to our knowledge about the effective engagement of various actors in higher education governance.

Erdal Emel, (Turkey, case study)

SYNOPSIS

The Actors of Higher Education Governance The Case Study of Uludağ University

Being not only the source for but also the disseminator of human intelligence, the higher education institutions are obliged to evolve as human beings do. As the need for progress in human nature is a virtue in life on earth, a restless process of continuous influence is therefore inevitable between the societies and these institutions. With an everlasting mission in education, research and service to the society's well being, the higher education institutions must have comparable visions corresponding to the evolutionary needs of the society. An institution lacking of such a vision may only be heading extinction, since the human nature will always turn to the right resource to satisfy its needs.

Therefore, the higher education institutions are to live on to their mission, they need to be agile for a timely response to the changing needs. However, agility is a function of the consensus and the commitment of the governance of an institution for a shared vision.

Fully aware of the need for agility, four years ago, Uludağ University (UU) - the only university in Bursa, a highly developed city of Turkey - decided that a reformist change was necessary for responding to the wish of its own academic staff and the expectations of the local community. In the eyes of these stakeholders, UU was too much teaching oriented but not quality conscious and not focused on the issues of the local community seeking a safe transition to European standards.

Therefore, in year 2000, it was the right time for the University to start the change processes when a new Rector was to be elected by the academic staff. Proving the theory that, at the times of need, the system creates its own leader; UU has elected its Rector with a well thought agenda of reforms in education and research. The new rector carried all the qualities of a strong leadership; mainly a clear vision for high achievement in short time, in depth knowledge of the capabilities of almost all UU academic staff for delegation and participative decision making and a good knowledge of all processes of teaching, research and services provided at UU.

It was necessary for leadership to seek the shared ownership of academic staff because the reforms could only be accomplished by highly motivated and participative staff in task oriented committee structures.

UU has first established UU Accreditation Committee, to design and facilitate the quality framework as well as to create an awareness of quality culture throughout the institution. Committee was responsible for coordinating the necessary procedures and standards for quality-conscious activities throughout the institution, and monitoring the quality of the programs by giving a general outline for the structure of the programs, allowing for some variations of practices across faculties.

UU Strategic Planning Committee has also been established in order to perform institutional SWOT analysis by surveys, define main objectives in distinct functions of the institutions and finally determine the priorities. This widespread use of committee structure in decision-making process is itself a framework for the dissemination of knowledge necessary for quality consciousness.

The decision making processes of UU can be separated into three different types; flow of actions initiated by academic staff, flow of actions initiated by rector and deans and flow of actions initiated by centres, committees and councils. Common to all types of decisions is the authority to decide is bounded by the statutes and given to boards of elected members. In all types of decisions, counselling is the principle component to responsibility sharing of the University administration with its internal shareholders: mainly the academic staff, secondly the students. Consensus or tendency of academic staff is searched in Deans Council before many acts or proposals to be taken to Senate or Administrative Board. Transparency of Senate meetings through live broadcasts and the regulation to include Student Council representatives to Senate are the major strengths of the Rectorate.

On the other side external stakeholders, mainly employers' and NGO representatives have been extensively utilized for the review of every teaching program offered at UU. Somewhere around 300 representatives meet twice a year to contribute to the continuous improvement of undergraduate and graduate programs.

Currently UU has gone through many external reviews and program accreditations and still planning others in laboratory and hospital accreditations. Almost all internal and external stakeholders are involved in these processes and despite the heavy burden it brings, the actors of UU and the society are happy with the progress made in teaching quality, research concentration and more involvement in society matters.

After a four year term, the Rector of UU who had initiated all these reformist processes has been highly honoured by the positive reviews of external EUA reviewers who had evaluated the UU institutionally in 2003. In 2004, the immediate response of the academic staff in the election for the second term of the Rector in the office was an almost full support indicating a strong desire to continue these reforms.

Over the course of 2004 to 2005, the bylaws of graduate studies, academic staff appointment and graduate advisorship rules have changed by the work of GSRC and approval of Senate. Mainly, performance based appointments have been emphasized in every decision made. Certainly, these decisions are hard on many academic staff involving assistants and may cause personal implications many times.

An important part of UU's understanding of quality control is the monitoring and enhancement of individual faculty members. Quality monitoring and assessment is carried out at three different points in time. First, when he/she is recruited; secondly when he/she is promoted to an associate professorial position; and thirdly when he/she is up for

promotion to be a full professor. There are different sets of criteria to be used at each step.

Common to many universities, there appears to be a strong sense of ‘academic freedom’ and ‘individualism’ in the concept of teaching at UU, which makes it difficult to develop among the academic staff the type of communication, coordination, and cooperation required to improve the curricula, teaching methods, and ultimately student learning. The rapid growth of academic knowledge, increased specialization, and growing competition in research, have inevitably contributed to the making of this academic ‘individualism’ in teaching. An academic quality assurance mechanism must therefore had to be designed to provide a starting point that would overcome this predicament and improve the transparency of teaching and research without necessarily undervaluing the academic freedom of teaching staff.

The Rector was keen on the righteous demands for minor changes in the bylaws, but many times responded with a solid decisiveness to personal interests in the name of institutional interests. It is obvious that the second stage of reforms has created hardships and the positive results of these changes have yet to be seen. The Rector considers that hardships can be dissolved during the course of his term. As a part of the periodic review process, the implications of these changes will be evaluated in year 2007, if the performance indicators are not as expected; there is still one year to compensate for until the end of his term in 2008.

The rectors can only serve for two terms due to the HEA. UU is yet to see its new rector candidates and their campaign slogan. There are only two options available for UU for the next governance term beginning by 2008: the first one is to decisively continue with reforms, institutionalize the quality management system and stabilize the quality culture; however the second one is rather an environment of uncertainty probably focused on self or group interests.

The future is yet to be resolved

6. Panel debate “Higher Education Governance – What’s at stake?”

Sjur Bergan, Higher Education and Research Division - Moderator

Jan Karlsson, Institutional Management in Higher Education (IMHE/OECD)

Can present Higher Education Governance systems respond to future challenges and tensions?

Governing Higher Education institutions today often means that those involved at various levels have to make important choices between policies and goals, which in some cases can seem contradictory. What is defined as national HE policy is perhaps not always easy to carry out in the pragmatic way that individual institutions must be managed. Making the right choice can also be seen as finding the correct balance.

In my contribution I shall shortly discuss a number of questions related to these issues.

For instance, how can institutions deliver top level teaching and research results in all fields and at the same time provide basic higher education for the half of an age cohort? Can they show excellence and be competitive internationally and, concurrently, be of relevance and at the service of their region? Will they, to the same degree, produce groundbreaking basic research and results that can be commercialised here and now?

- Will all undergraduate education continue to be research based, in countries where it has been so until now?
- Can the governance system of HE be reformed sufficiently by increasing appointed management and external board members?
- Can the best features of collegial management survive and coexist with such elements of corporate management that are suitable for governance of higher education and research, or will such management techniques make the academic spirit and freedom disappear?
- What will imminent demographic changes in western countries mean in terms of competition for funding, demands for accountability and perhaps changed attitudes and priorities?
- Will increasing overall pressure on public funding and growing demand for accountability lead to more mergers of institutions, and if so, should we be concerned?
- In countries where higher education is provided without student contribution, will that be a sustainable system in view of internationalisation meaning that more students from non-European countries where fees are demanded, will come here to study, and social patterns still being such that more students from more well off

families attend universities than from the less well off, the latter thereby having to pay for former?

- Would the level of debate become more informed if indicators were developed, for example such that that measure and compare drop-out rates and achievements within stipulated study times?
 - Can the overall goals for higher education be consistent with other long term socio-economic policy goals?
 -
-

Vanja Ivošević, The National Unions of Students in Europe (ESIB)

....

Roland Vermeesch, European Association of Institutions in Higher Education (EURASHE)

Good Governance in Higher Education Institutions

1 HR management in HEIs is presently challenged by a number of issues:

- increasing dynamics in recruitment, and systemizing staff development
- attracting a new generation of staff in years of ageing population
- bridging the gender gaps in senior management

Enhancement of HRM qualities is therefore imperative, in order to ensure a better governance of the HEIs in future.

2 Leadership in HE is also concerned with the appointment of the CEO (Rector, Principal, General Director) of a HEI.

He/she can be appointed through Academic Senate elections, or another possibility is screening potential candidates, via a selection procedure. It is our opinion that potential candidates should be screened not only on competencies and managements skills but also on their sense of civil responsibility and accountability. The ensuing appointment has to be ratified by a body in which all stakeholders are represented. The underlying idea is that the quality of education provided is proportionate with good management.

Isabelle Le Nir, Research coordinator, Schlumberger Group

Schlumberger hires engineers in every country where we work in almost exact proportion to the volume of our business in the country. We have been doing that for over 30 years now. The move was not popular at first. It had never occurred to the majority of Schlumberger management at the time that Oilfield Services would be one day managed by a team of 21 managers and staff coming from 13 different nationalities. But we stuck

with it, with the result that today our work force has an array of nationalities at all levels of the organization. This creates the cultural flexibility that fits the changing marketplace.

We not only hire engineers and technicians, we also hire PhDs, and it is important for us to have close relationships with research labs in Academia, either for joint PhD subjects or for hiring doctors in the specialties of interest to us at the end of their research study.

This in turn has created an immediate engagement with engineering schools and educational issues worldwide. The engineering schools that we got to know varied from world class to totally inadequate.

Through the actions of an increasingly active university relations program, it has been our privilege for the last 30 years to work with countless engineering schools all over the world providing professors, improved links with the industry, financial assistance to departments, scholarships to students, suggesting improvements to learning curricula etc.

In return we have reaped an important benefit as we continued to hire their students.

We are engaged in actions at all levels including promotion of the interest of Science starting at the end of Primary school, and punctually all the way through high schools. We believe it is also very important that teachers and professors discover our world, and the interest of technical careers so they can orient and counsel their students.

We also promote the study of science for girls.

Key issues:

- some form of involvement (in the Scientific Committee of the university or school) of industry in the decision-making process of HE institutions concerning (1) orientation of research and industrial relations, long term planning/evolution of research domains, cooperation and partnerships to make it happen; (2) evolution of the curricula...this includes evolution of the curricula as well as the number of recruits we plan for the coming year for a certain discipline, etc.
- involvement in teaching or technical conferences within the curricula
- involvement regarding the promotion of the image of science and of dialogue between industry and HE institutions, in particular to attract women to science
- active participation, also, in careers or information days
- also participation to jury for selection of students at entry level of the schools, or final year juries

Josef Jařab, Member of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe (PACE)

Reforming higher education through legislative acts – opportunities and constraints. The necessary balance and complementariness between national legal acts and individual university statutes – a guarantee of institutional autonomy. Academic freedom and university autonomy – the potential for needed accountability and desired creativity and innovativeness. Legal and organizational warrants to assure intellectual pluralism, openness, tolerance and civility in the European academic area. The importance of

distinguishing between university management and academic leadership; unavoidable tensions between traditional university values and pragmatic functions of higher education institutions in contemporary societies. How realistic is today the requirement for the “unity of teaching and research “that the Bologna *Magna Charta Universitatum* considers one of the fundamental criteria for a “true university”?

The role and the scope of participation of students in institutional governance - political will, legal formularization and practical experience.

Philip Nye, Higher Education Directorate, DFES

Higher Education governance now affects a wide variety of interests – national, regional, civic, business, financial, institutional, academic, and personal to name but a few.

Higher Education governance matters to Government because Higher Education is an important tool to deliver overall economic and social objectives. HE governance cannot deliver these objectives by itself but if it is not “right” it can be a barrier to their successful delivery.

The more we understand why Higher Education Governance matters, the less sure we are about how Higher Education should be governed at each level of the system. While few would argue for a “one-size-fits-all” approach, should there be full de-regulation? Are there still things which we or someone else should govern or promote? At what level? HE governance involves balancing different stakeholder interests and can be about deciding what should not be “governed” as deciding when oversight or regulation can be justified.

7. European Year of Citizenship through Education 2005

Krzysztof Ostrowski, Ministry of Education, Poland

Chair of the Ad Hoc Committee of Experts for the European Year of Citizenship through Education (Cahcit)

Henry Teune, University of Pennsylvania, United States

The 2005 European Year of Citizenship through Education was declared by the Council of Europe in the context of the program of Education for Democratic Citizenship (EDC) initiated in 1997 in response to the CoE Second Summit. Although the program is transversal and includes all forms of both formal and non-formal education, the main direction of progress was achieved at the level of primary and secondary education and teacher training. In some countries higher education was closely involved in those activities, but in others, that involvement is still limited. At the international level the CoE successfully completed a pilot project on the Universities as sites of citizenship and included EDC issues into the projects on public responsibility and higher education governance.

The rapid expansion of the global economy in markets and finance became the main challenge to the autonomy of higher education, as the pressures of the Cold War wound down in the 1970s. This pushed administrator, faculty, and student interests away from general education to education for vocations and the professions as manifest in the proliferation of business other professional schools and specialized education programs around the world. At the very time the linkage between democracy and human development became clear in the transitions of political systems to democracy in the 1990s, concerns emerged about the corporatization of universities as they strengthened their political alliances with the private economic sector. But the difficulties in establishing viable democratic states, the popular reactions to the consequences of globalization, and the failures of private enterprises to obey laws and ethical standards raised issues about the responsibilities of universities for educating democratic citizens. Globalization also provided publicity about the questionable conduct of corporations in their global operations. That contributed to the rising concern for human rights that, unlike civil rights based on national constitutions, from their very beginning took form at the international level.

The freedom to pursue new knowledge and the obligation to teach about and exemplify democracy present a challenge to universities to bring these conflicting goals together. Universities assert their universal relevance and can at the same time embrace the belief that democracy depends human rights that are globally inclusive.

New perspectives for higher education are now opening by the challenge of integrating citizenship and human rights education, while at the same time achieving the common goal of humanity to create knowledge that can serve humanity in its quest for a good life in a better environment.