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Based on Burton Clark’s five pathways of university entrepreneurial transformation, this chapter aims to demonstrate Zhejiang University’s vivid transformation from a research university into an entrepreneurial university. This chapter will consider ZJU’s most representative organizational reforms including personnel system, academic governance system, and technology transfer system reforms and further illustrate the logic behind these reforms. First, it will assess the integration of entrepreneurial abilities with academic research abilities, focusing on how to stimulate academic productivity and how to connect academic production and technology transfer. Second, it will look at the integration of basic research and application research, and how the research loop is made possible. Last, the integration of research and talent cultivation will be assessed, translating “research advantage” into “teaching advantage.” It is essential that the university possesses “good governance” to promote entrepreneurial transformation which makes the most of organizational and institutional reforms.

Section 2
University Governance and Academic Leadership in the EU

Chapter 7
Fostering Academic Citizenship With a Shared Leadership Approach.............................. 99
Lucas Zinner, University of Vienna, Austria

What type of leadership is the most successful in persuading academics to contribute to the multifaceted mission of modern universities? Recent reforms, in which universities have achieved different levels of institutional autonomy, were accompanied by the establishment of new public management (NPM) methods that allow governments to steer the system more effectively. Central management was strengthened, while values such as collegiality received little attention. The reforms have also fostered an exchange between universities and other actors in terms of networked governance. Using the example of doctoral studies, this chapter shows that there is evidence for both NPM and networked governance. Their perception depends on the role of academics in the reform process and partly undermined the commitment of academics to the system. Thus, to address the modernization of university management while (re-)strengthening the commitment of academics, the chapter proposes a shared leadership model that integrates the emphasis on values and participation to stimulate academic citizenship.
Chapter 8
“Research and Innovation” as an Integral Part of Strategic University Governance: The Case of VUB – A Subtle Power Game in a Complex Academic Ecosystem

Jan Paul Herman Cornelis, Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Belgium

The chapter sketches some governance features of a medium-sized, comprehensive, urban, public university that are essential to ensure the delicate equilibrium between structured, efficient management and openness towards the changing society, exceptional personalities and breakthrough thinking. Features of university governance are analyzed at all levels, from rectorate to schools (faculties), departments, and research groups. “Research” and “innovation and valorization with societal impact” are situated in relation to three other main academic pillars, namely education, student affairs, and institution-wide internationalization. Building blocks are described and assembled in a coherent governance structure. Vrije Universiteit Brussel (VUB) case is taken as an example. Generalization of the discussed concepts should be done with care because choices are dependent on the university’s vision, strategic plan, and road map, and one single best governance structure that is appropriate for all contexts does not exist.

Chapter 9
Cultural Transformation and Academic Leadership: The Context of Turkish Higher Education

Yasar Kondakci, Middle East Technical University, Turkey
Merve Zayim-Kurtay, Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Belgium

This chapter aims to elaborate on the leadership properties in the transformation in higher education across the world by advancing specific illustration from the Turkish higher education context. Three specific objectives were identified around this broad aim: (1) document the current forces of change surrounding HEIs, (2) identify the culture shift in HEIs, and (3) provide literature-based evidence for the leadership gap in the face of culture shift and develop preposition for academic leadership. Higher education institutions (HEIs) form one of the sectors which has been drastically affected from the trends and developments in the economic, political, social, and technological spheres and responded to these change forces by radical transformations that have touched their traditional and historical value systems. This chapter argues that HEIs need leadership practices to survive the crisis and conflict era successfully, which carry some properties of transformational leadership while holding the traditional academic leadership perspective.

Chapter 10
Vision and Strategic Planning of University Governance: The Case of Middle East Technical University

Gülser Köksal, Middle East Technical University, Turkey
Altan İlkuçan, Middle East Technical University, Turkey

This chapter describes the participative and iterative strategic planning process that was used in Middle East Technical University (METU), as a “good practice” for other institutions of higher education in two major stages: (1) preparation of the strategic plan and (2) its deployment to all organizational units via a catch-ball approach. Both stages are iterative as they involve consecutive phases of collection, evaluation, sharing, and alignment of findings along with strategies, first among different strategic planning areas in the preparation stage, and second among different organizational units in the deployment stage. It
is participative in that a large body of internal stakeholder representatives organized into various cross functional teams have carried out strategic planning at the university level. A support team assumes a critical role in coordinating the studies carried out by separate committees, and reporting the process its outcomes to University Strategic Planning Council to ensure the consistency.

Chapter 11
Between Academic Self-Governance and State Control: The Case of the University of Ljubljana... 183
Ivan Svetlik, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia

This chapter presents the model of university governance at the University of Ljubljana. Basic information on the university and its history is given at the beginning. The chapter continues with the description of the university governing bodies and procedures, and with the national system of higher education governance which significantly shapes the institutional governance. The presentation is based on the University of Ljubljana and national documents, and on the author’s introspection being rector of the university in the period 2013–2017. Referring to some recent scientific publications, the chapter concludes with the discussion on the governing dilemmas and responses to the existing University of Ljubljana governance model which may be described as an amalgam where the primary tension exists between academic self-governance and the state-centered elements. This tension could be expressed as a permanent struggle for greater autonomy within the university and for control of the university by the state and other external stakeholders.

Chapter 12
Governance of Portuguese Universities Within European Higher Education: Nova University Lisbon Experience .............................................................................................................................................. 196
António Rendas, Nova University Lisbon, Portugal

National legislation for higher education that was introduced in 2007 by the Portuguese Government changed the higher education governance model into a more centralized system with increased institutional autonomy. This allowed for a better strategic planning process that was more able to respond to society needs and, in public university foundations, gave rectors a stronger leadership role supported by a general council and by a board of trustees. A decade later, the overall autonomy scores of Portuguese universities when compared with those from other European countries according to academic, financial, organizational, and staffing (senior) criteria showed better Portuguese performance when compared with most Southern and Central European countries. This pattern remained stable between 2011 and 2016. Changes that occurred at Nova University, Lisbon, are described as a case stud to exemplify the effects of this new governance model on the sustainability of long-term strategic planning and its management.

Chapter 13
Governance Within Diverse University Structures: The Case of Charles University ......................... 210
Tomáš Zima, Charles University, Czech Republic

This chapter focuses on university governance, which reflects the structure of an institution, whether it is centralized or decentralized, but most importantly democratic and autonomous. The case is illustrated using the example of Charles University, which is a large and highly decentralized organization that has been affected by developments in the Czech Republic after 1989 and their consequences for higher
education in the country. In this regard, different governance models and recent challenges for higher education institutions are explained. The structure, main bodies, and management of Charles University are described and put into context within the national regulatory framework. The chapter further explores the division of powers and control mechanisms. A special focus is placed on the role of the Academic Senate, which underlines the democratic principles of the institution. The final remarks highlight the importance of a democratic, autonomous environment for both research and education.

Chapter 14
Global Challenges and Trends of University Governance Structures................................................. 233

Anthony Antoine, Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Belgium
Luk Van Langenhove, Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Belgium

This chapter tries to identify the different trends in university governance and their underlying causes. Although it focuses on university trends in Europe, it makes reference to global trends and causes, such as digitalization, inter-connectivity of our societies, and growing international competition. In sum, the chapter argues that the digital evolution has led both to a changed approach to teaching as well as to growing global competition in the race to obtain the best talent. This, in combination with a generation that has a growing access to higher education and that thrives on “instant knowledge-satisfaction,” has led to university governance changes that better fit current needs. Government-led austerity programs have further accelerated these changes, as universities seek to optimize their financing whilst, at the same time, striving to move up the international rankings. University governance trends include a professionalization of management, the creation of international excellence networks, and the establishment of interdisciplinary but specialized schools.

Chapter 15
Academic Leadership Skills: Managing Teams and Conflict Management ............................................. 246

Melita Kovacevic, University of Zagreb, Croatia

Academic leadership shares many features with any other kind of leadership, but at the same time, it is unique due to the specific features of academia and the way in which the system functions. Academia and the university setting consist of members among whom many have the same academic status and comparable levels of achievement. Although there is universal recognition of the relevance of leadership, not enough attention has been focused on ways in which academic leadership could be enhanced. In particular, the question of how someone’s individual style of academic leadership is related to their capability to manage teams and conflicts remains unanswered. This chapter outlines academic leadership skills that have been observed from the perspective of the European academic context and looks at major ways in which teams are managed and conflicts are resolved, particularly in academic settings. Different strategies of conflict management are presented, and rationale for the employment of focused training courses and the sharing of experiences among leaders are provided.
Section 3
University Governance and Academic Leadership: Perspectives From EU-China Cooperation

Chapter 16
University Governance and Academic Leadership Capacity Building: Perspectives of European and Chinese University Staff Members.......................................................... 259

Chang Zhu, Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Belgium
Merve Zayim-Kurtay, Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Belgium

Challenges of modern society require universities to be able to respond to the new challenges and offer innovative teaching and learning for the new generations. The changes and modernization of universities require competences of academic leaders for sound university governance as well as comprehensive leadership skills. The literature and practices show that capacity building for academic leaders is highly needed as academic leaders often operate based on experience or contextual norms while showing a lack of a broad understanding of university governance and the necessary skills for their roles. This chapter investigates the perspectives of both European and Chinese university staff members regarding the areas of capacity building that are needed for middle-level and top-level academic leaders. The results provide us with a deeper understanding regarding the priorities for capacity building in order to enhance academic leadership. The findings also offer an understanding of capacity building of academic leadership in both the European and Chinese higher education contexts.

Chapter 17
Institutional Attitudes Towards Research-Related Academic Integrity in Recently Internationalizing Higher Education Institutions: A Comparative Analysis of Chinese and Turkish HEIs .......................................................... 283

Ceren Ergenç, Middle East Technical University, Turkey
Serap Emil, Middle East Technical University, Turkey

Higher education systems throughout the world are mostly based on the institutions and values of the Western education system. World university ranking systems, quality assurance mechanisms, assessment frameworks, promotion, and evaluation systems are universalized. Many universities in developing countries have now joined these ranking systems and introduced vigorous faculty promotion criteria to create world-class universities. Research reveals that those who publish in predatory journals are mostly young and inexperienced researchers from developing countries. China and Turkey are among the countries frequently associated with predatory journals and related academic corruption schemes. In this chapter, both regulations and discourses that shape the institutional cultures in these two countries that are in close cooperation with the EU regarding higher education are examined. It is concluded that there is a global diffusion of rules and values, and national identity construction processes influence actual practices.
Chapter 18
Academic Leadership and the Business Gateway to the Chinese and Portuguese Speaking World ............................................................................................................................................303

*Joao Amaro de Matos, Universidade Nova de Lisboa, Portugal*

NOVA School of Business and Economics (NOVA SBE) identified the opportunity to complement the training of the best language universities in China to bring Chinese students with basic fluency in Portuguese to Universidade NOVA de Lisboa (UNL). They would be trained in Economics and Management at NOVA SBE and complement their Portuguese language studies at the School of Social Sciences and Humanities (FCSH-UNL) obtaining at the end a joint degree from UNL. After a lobby from the university leadership, the Portuguese Government eventually recognized this degree focused on its unique characteristics, namely (1) a Portuguese university as a means to cooperate with Chinese institutions to achieve their strategic goals in Africa and LATAM, (2) multidisciplinary cooperation putting together social sciences and business and economics, and (3) a potential internationalization cooperation for the Portuguese and Chinese HEI’s markets far beyond the simple exchange of students.

Chapter 19
Challenges Facing Chinese and European Universities in Mobility Cooperation: Managerial Administrative Staff Perspectives ........................................................................................................................313

*Joanna Mrowiec-Denkowska, Silesian University of Technology, Poland*

*Yujuan Chen, Ningbo University, China*

*Fryderyk Stanisław Zoll, University of Silesia in Katowice, Poland*

*Kai Wang, Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Belgium*

In recent years, professional mobility opportunities for university staff and students enshrined within various initiatives have been an effective tool in increasing the international visibility of universities. Activities such as participation in EU sponsored programs (mainly Erasmus-MUNDUS followed by ERASMUS+) as well as opportunities provided by national agencies like the China Scholarship Council, Polish National Academic Exchange Agency, and relevant schemes in other EU member states are perceived as perfect tools for turning ideas into reality. Aside from the scientific profits collected by the beneficiaries, opportunities for academic mobility serve as eye-openers, triggering new ideas and solutions based on good practices and experience. The purpose of this chapter is to study the background, practices, and effects of cooperation between China and the EU. It argues that the process of accelerating mobility cooperation between universities in China and Europe should not only start from people mobility but also from project mobility and policy mobility.

Compilation of References ........................................................................................................................................................................325

About the Contributors ................................................................................................................................................................................359

Index........................................................................................................................................................................................................367
Foreword

In the era of internationalization, dialogue and communication among different cultures are becoming more and more vital in promoting common understanding and cooperation in all aspects. As pivotal forces, China and the EU have played crucial roles in this regard. Due to the tremendous efforts made by contributors from various fields and levels on both sides, great achievement has been made in accelerating the friendship and cooperation between the two sides. Among these, the exchange and communication in the field of higher education functions as the core in the whole course.

The Chinese government and Chinese universities attach great importance to international cooperation with their counterparts in Europe. In recent years, China-Europe cooperation in higher education has seen a great deal of positive progress, particularly in terms of the introduction of the educational action strategy under the “Belt and Road Initiative” and the establishment of an EU-China high-level exchange dialogue mechanism, which bring opportunities for the deep development of international cooperation in higher education between China and Europe.

Today, the world is undergoing a new round of important development, involving major changes and readjustments. In the higher education sector, both China and Europe are in a critical period of reform and development. Both sides are in a great need of integrating science and technology education resources and improving their innovation ability and quality. Of course, there are many differences in the higher education systems between China and European Countries, for instance, the mechanisms of academic personnel management, the way of talent cultivation, research funding model, and the university-govern- ment relationship. However, the functions and the governance concepts and values of universities of two sides are in common. Therefore, it is of great necessity to forge a discussion on university governance and related topic to address the common issues confronted by the two sides.

University governance involves the structures, rules, and practices of governance which have been implemented by a university in order to achieve its strategic goals. It includes the identification of governance bodies and the distribution of responsibility to each part, the standards of stakeholder behavior, the procedures and rules associated with decision-making, and the exploration of problems which cannot be solved effectively in practice, etc. A university is an organization with the core task of developing academia. Therefore, academic leadership is the key to determine the quality of university governance. Academic leadership influences, leads, and guides the multiple stakeholders to create a common academic vision through participation, interaction and coupling, and to motivate the members of the university to accomplish the common academic vision. It is the soul of university development and permeates the procedure of implementing the strategic vision of the university, supporting knowledge development,
promoting the willingness to share, boosting multi-subject co-governance, and other aspects. It determines whether or not the university is able to adapt to external needs and expectations while preserving its own unique style. It ensures that the university adjusts itself in a changing world, and actively responds to internal and external requirements, challenges, and even criticism.

With such a background, the LEAD project and the publication of this book are timely in order to promote exchanges and encourage cooperation between universities in China and Europe in terms of university governance and academic leadership building. The book consists of three main parts. The first part is about Chinese university governance, academic leadership, university management structure, university management system reform, and trends. The second part is about European universities with regard to academic research management, academic leadership, management technology, vision and strategy development, cultural change, globalization challenges, and so on. The third part covers the development of academic leadership in colleges and universities under the framework of China-Europe cooperation, the internationalized scientific research system, and the challenges faced by mobilized cooperation. The book provides a perspective of multiple comparisons, not only in terms of the current situation and experience of Chinese and European universities in university governance and academic leadership development, but also a comparative study of the governance system and its impact on Chinese and European colleges and universities.

This book is useful for both management practitioners in the higher education sectors including university top and middle-level leaders, and the scholars doing research in this field. It also might be a good consulting resource for those who are engaged in the exchange and collaborations between China and the EU countries.

Jingtian Yu

National Academy of Education Administration, China
Foreword

Higher education is changing across the world. There is nothing new about this. Universities and colleges are enduring institutions, but they have always been subject to change, reflecting evolving social, economic, and political priorities. Today, however, the pressures for change are, perhaps, stronger than ever, creating both new opportunities and deep tensions within higher education institutions of all kinds.

The massification of higher education is a key trend. In most countries, authorities are seeking to increase participation driven by a desire to broaden opportunities, by income and social background, gender, ethnicity, age, physical capability, and geography. At the same time, governments are looking to increase the numbers of graduates with skills to help fuel economic growth. With massification has come increasing complexity, within and across institutions. Traditional models of full-time study are now complemented – sometimes challenged – by new models of part-time study, distance learning and online programs, each offering new forms of student experience and each requiring new forms of institutional oversight. Massification has also required the development of new forms of funding and quality assurance. Massification has brought with it new financial pressures; additional student numbers and increasing complexity bring with them some economies of scale, but more often mean further costs. New funding models have been established and, in many countries, a private sector has emerged.

Linked with massification has come the increasing marketization of higher education. Competition between institutions is widely seen as a means of allocating scarce resources, encouraging organizational efficiency and increasing student choice. Marketization has stimulated new debates over the role of a student as a “customer” or “consumer” for, rather than a partner in, the educational process. The extent of competition varies widely. Few countries would consider a “pure” market and most governments seek to retain some control, normally over levels of fees, forms of student support and levels of quality. Equally, few countries have escaped the impact of increasing competition in some way. In effect, higher education is changing from a supply-driven “business” to a demand-driven “business”. This has stimulated a new emphasis on “the student experience” in all its forms, from the academic content of study programs to residences and support services. One consequence is the emergence of a “league table” or “rankings” culture, both international and domestic within countries. Intended by advocates to contribute to informed decision-making by students or by funders of research, rankings have prompted huge debate. Despised by many for their methodological vagaries and for undermining a true educational ethos, they also have acquired an almost obsessional interest for many institutional governors, leaders and managers.

There are further forces for change impacting upon higher education. New technology has stimulated a revolution in program design and methods of delivery, enabling students to study effectively outside the physical university or college. In research, collaborators can work easily together across the world. For managers and leaders, new technology has ushered in an era of instant communication and unprec-
edented scope to analyze institutional and comparative data. The use of social media now permeates the contacts between students, offering immediate and unmediated comment and feedback. New technology is both an opportunity and a threat to higher education; the pace of change is a challenge to all concerned.

Changing technology and new forms of communication are also central to globalization. Higher education institutions have responded to the pressures of globalization in many ways. In essence, a new interest in internationalization now pervades most universities and colleges, an aspiration to meet international standards (itself a vague and elusive term) and to be seen as an international player (an equally vague term). Thus, institutions seek to recruit international staff and students, to provide their students and staff with an international experience, to be active in international research partnerships and to engage in forms of transnational higher education.

More generally, it is fair to say that higher education is now subject to external scrutiny in ways that would not have been foreseen in the past. In part, this trend reflects the growth of what has been called “the audit society”. Quality in teaching and learning and in research is now commonly measured and assessed, by governments, in the press and by institutions themselves. Moreover, such scrutiny is widely applied, not only at institutional level, but at the level of courses, departments, and individual members of staff.

Taken together, these pressures for change pose a massive challenge for higher education, for national systems, for every university or college, and for every student or member of staff. In particular, they have challenged established forms of governance and leadership within higher education. The need for research on these topics, for the sharing of experiences and for the dissemination of findings within and across countries is clear and provided the context for the LEAD project funded by the European Union under its ERASMUS Mundus program. The project brought together colleagues from a number of European countries and from China, to consider issues of governance and leadership, to contribute to shared understandings and to help in the acquisition of necessary knowledge and skills. Through the LEAD project, a number of highly successful workshops and conferences have been organized, and a MOOC developed in order to share expertise and findings with a wide audience.

This book is another outcome from the project. The book provides a series of important insights into issues of governance and leadership in Europe and China, and represents a significant addition to literature in the field. Contributions have been made by established researchers and by active practitioners, creating a rich blend of academic insight and practical experience.

The book covers both issues of governance and issues of leadership. These two aspects of higher education are inter-locked. An effective system of governance, both internal and external, provides the framework within which institutional leadership at all levels can operate. Pressures for change can affect arrangements for institutional governance and thereby influence the forms of leadership that may be exercised. This can be seen, for example, in the degrees of autonomy allowed to institutions and in the extent to which decision-making and, especially, budgetary arrangements are devolved within institutions. Such powers help to shape the forms of leadership in place.

In their chapter on “Global Challenges and Trends of University Governance Structures” (Chapter 14), Anthony Antoine and Luk Van Langenhove discuss how governance arrangements have evolved in response to changes in the working environment. They show how increasing pressures for change have led to an increasing professionalization in university leadership and management. Given the complexity of issues to be mastered and the high risks encountered, it is unusual, now, especially in senior leadership positions to be able to combine academic teaching and research with leadership and governance responsibilities. They also point to changes in organizational arrangements, with the emergence of large
interdisciplinary groupings, often to replace smaller departmental units. Such changes are often linked with more devolved management, enabling decision-making to be taken nearer to the point of delivery, but also with new arrangements for accountability within the organization.

Themes of centralization or de-centralization are also pursued by Baocun Liu and Hui Zhang in their “Governance of Higher Education Institutions in China” (Chapter 1). They discuss differences in approach at national level and within institutions. Most important, they consider whether change can be imposed or whether it evolves more slowly over time. In discussing these issues, like many other researchers, they emphasize the importance of institutional culture in shaping the effectiveness of changes in governance and leadership. Similarly, Yan Wang and Ruixue Li look at issues of decentralization in their chapter “Comprehensive Reform of the University Governance System in China” (Chapter 5). Their analysis uses a case study to consider the transformation of a particular university and also covers processes for decision-making and external involvement in institutional governance.

In his chapter “Governance of Portuguese Universities Within European Higher Education” (Chapter 12), António Rendas assesses the significance of the 2007 reforms on governance in Portuguese Universities. The reforms were notable in giving increased autonomy to universities and, thereby, in strengthening the role of the Rector. The tension in governance between university autonomy and the role of the state is highlighted by Ivan Švětlík in his study of the University of Ljubljana “Between Academic Self-Governance and State Control” (Chapter 11). This is a very personal account written by a former Rector of the University. Another case study is presented by Tomáš Zima in his chapter “Governance Within Diverse University Structures” (Chapter 13). In this chapter, the importance of democratic decision-making is stressed. The relationship between universities and government is also highlighted by Cheng Jiang, Yao Luo and Meng Li in their chapter “The Counselor System Under the Perspective of Chinese University Governance” (Chapter 4). The Counselor system is a feature of higher education in China with no real counterpart in European institutions. Their chapter sheds new light on the work of counselors and offers suggestions for how their role might develop in the future.

One response to the pressures for change in higher education has been the application of principles broadly known as New Public Management. These ideas are discussed by Lucas Zinner in his chapter “Fostering Academic Citizenship With a Share Leadership Approach” (Chapter 7). However, an alternative approach is also proposed, emphasizing the importance of values and participation.

A major theme running through the book is the importance of effective leadership within universities. In their study “Cultural Transformation and Academic Leadership in Turkey” (Chapter 9), Yasar Kondakci and Merve Zayım-Kurtay discuss many of the pressures for change facing higher education. They emphasize the need for effective leadership if institutions are to respond effectively. Different approaches are considered and the chapter concludes by advocating a form of transformational leadership, whilst, at the same time, maintaining many of the traditional characteristics of university leadership. In their chapter “Academic Leaders in Leading Chinese Universities” (Chapter 2), Meiying Jing and Xiang Yao also identify key criteria for leaders in Chinese universities. The authors make some important points about the qualities of leadership sought by government, concluding that leading Chinese universities will increasingly be headed by leaders with international standing and experience.

In universities across Europe and China, leadership is increasingly exercised at all levels within the organization. Further, it is now widely recognized that a traditional academic career based on teaching and research is no longer sufficient to equip leaders with the necessary skills to lead within the modern university. This point is picked up by Chang Zhu and Merve Zayım-Kurtay in their chapter “University Governance and Academic Capacity Building” (Chapter 16). Their study compares perspectives of
leadership at senior management level with those in middle management, and between European universities and Chinese institutions. The focus is on capacity building and creating new pathways for the development and support of new leaders. This emphasis on the skills necessary for effective leadership is also pursued by Melita Kovacevic in her chapter on “Academic Leadership Skills” (Chapter 15). She identifies a range of important skills for effective leaders, especially in aspects of conflict management, and concludes by stressing the importance of formal leadership training.

As well as considering broad issues of governance and leadership, this book also includes a number of chapters that focus more closely on issues of governance and leadership as they impact on specific areas of work. In his chapter “Research and Innovation as an Integral Part of Strategic University Governance” (Chapter 8), Jan Cornelis uses a case study to discuss how an equilibrium can be struck between research and societal benefit, and between the interests of individual researchers and their institutions. Research is often seen as a very personal aspect of academic life, but, in the changing world of higher education, it is now subject to unprecedented levels of institutional management and external scrutiny. This chapter shows how one university has coped with these pressures.

Sadly, the pressures to perform at the highest international levels of research have led some institutions and individual researchers to bend or break the “rules” of research. Academic misconduct is rarely discussed openly, but includes plagiarism and the falsification of results. These issues are considered by Ceren Ergenc and Serap Emil in their chapter “Institutional Attitudes Towards Research-Related Academic Integrity in Recently Internationalizing Higher Education Institutions” (Chapter 17). Broad issues, such as the impact of university rankings and differing opportunities for publication in leading journals, are addressed, and the policies and practices of different European and Chinese universities are contrasted.

Research funding is the topic of the chapter by Xi Yang, Huan Li and Bing Chen “Research Funding and Its Influence on Academic Research Under China’s University Governance System” (Chapter 3). They highlight the impact of the centralized funding of research on scientific output and offer some suggestions about how the governance of research might be improved.

The pressures for change in higher education have served to transform many aspects of governance and leadership, including core management functions. One example is in strategic planning. The pressures facing institutions today often compel them to make difficult decisions, especially to identify areas for new investment and, even more difficult, to decide areas for disinvestment. The importance of effective strategic planning, including dissemination and implementation, has never been higher. This is the topic of a chapter by Gulser Koksal and Altan Ilkucan, “Vision and Strategic Planning of University Governance” (Chapter 10). Using a case study, the authors emphasize the importance of effective structures and the need for broad participation within the planning process.

Another important aspect of the changes facing universities is the broad acceptance by governments, funding bodies and institutions themselves that they need to work more closely with business. This can pose some particular challenges to institutional cultures and governance, and often requires specialist leadership skills. These are among the issues covered by João Amaro de Matos in his chapter “Academic Leadership and the Business Gateway to the Chinese and Portuguese Speaking World” (Chapter 18).

Wider university cultures may also change as a result of the pressures facing institutions. One response is the development of “the entrepreneurial university”. Using a particular case study, Wei Yao, Mosi Weng and Tiange Ye consider governance issues relating to the implementation of the entrepreneurial university. Their chapter “Towards Good Governance of an Entrepreneurial University” (Chapter 6) gives particular attention to organizational structures and staffing arrangements.
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Overall, the book represents a wide-ranging contribution to research on governance and leadership in higher education in Europe and China. Most important, perhaps, the authors have based their observations on real experience, actual examples and original research. The result is a collection of studies that will encourage further research and inform organization and practice in Europe and China, and beyond.

John Taylor
Lancaster University, UK
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UNDERSTANDING UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE AND ACADEMIC LEADERSHIP IN CHINA AND THE EU

Spurred on by the unprecedented changes in the external environment, along with the increased expectations of society and governments, higher education institutions have undergone various structural and functional reforms, which are likely to have repercussions on their major policies and strategies, the way they are governed, and/or the prevalent dominant culture. As these changed environmental and reform interventions require multiple leadership identities to be displayed, academic leaders are more than ever, generally indirectly, on target in terms of these reform efforts in terms of their qualifications and skills, the leadership approaches they display, the atmosphere created in the organization or the unit, the resources provided, and the way that they are used, the national and international collaborations established, and the quality and quantity of the outcomes produced. With the widening opportunities for mobilization, along with the increasing importance attributed to internationalization, these have also caused higher education institutions and academic leaders to face the challenge of attracting and retaining the necessary talent. Importantly, academic leadership training and the development of the role-relevant skills needed to deal with the diversified and increasingly complex missions of higher education institutions have exacerbated the pressure on sitting and future academic leaders.

Within this turbulent context, Europe and China, being two of the most significant competitors in the global higher education arena, have placed a great deal of importance on collaboration within higher education due to the associated benefits and opportunities for both sides. To achieve further collaboration between China and Europe, and to make use of, and transfer, European expertise and experience to the Chinese higher education institutions, the LEAD Project (Governance and Academic Leadership of Chinese and European Universities in the Context of Innovation and Internationalization), an Erasmus+ KA2 Capacity Building Project, was launched in 2015. Even though the major driving force of the LEAD Project was to strengthen the capacities of academic leaders, particularly in the Chinese higher education context, through knowledge and experience sharing, internationalization opportunities, unique training, workshops, seminars, and job shadowing activities, we witnessed throughout the project events that EU-China collaboration could not reach its full potential due to the lack of mutual understanding, and the scarcity of the theoretical and practical knowledge needed to guide this collaboration. First, during the series of events and activities that have been organized, not only the qualitative and quantitative data collected for evaluating the impact of the project, but also the personal communications between the diverse Chinese and European participants underlined the need for better understanding about the European and Chinese higher education contexts, university governance structures, and the academic
leadership approaches utilized. When the vast diversity in terms of Chinese and European higher education systems is also taken into consideration, a lack of clear knowledge on these aspects is considered to be one of the most important limitations when it comes to achieving further EU-China collaboration and the factors that mitigate the applicability of the transferred knowledge into the respective contexts. Second, even though there are multiple university governance and academic leadership practices and experiences, and both parties want to learn from the other, we also observed that there are not enough means for sharing this knowledge and experience, which are valid, not only for the partner and non-partner project participants, but also for the other higher education institutions in China and Europe aiming to establish or strengthen EU-China collaboration for mutual development, innovation, and internationalization. However, the literature is quite limited with regard to studies that directly focus on EU-China collaboration, and generally fails to address the above-mentioned limitations. Also, European and Chinese colleagues and academic leaders indicate that knowledge and experience sharing, apart from being one of the most useful ways of enhancing the leadership capacities of current and future academic leaders, is also extremely useful when it comes to broadening their perspectives, enriching their repertoire of responses, and utilizing different point of views in order to deal with the challenges. Thus, with the feedback we received from a variety of Chinese and European university staff members who hold different positions at different levels in the hierarchy, sharing good and bad practices with other current and future academic leaders is seen as being of critical importance and being highly influential in job-related skill and competence development.

All these needs and experiences have motivated us to create this book, not only as a concrete output of the LEAD Project, but also with the primary aim of creating a relevant resource for the practitioners and institutions aiming to enhance EU-China collaboration, researchers focusing on EU-China relations in higher education, current and future academic leaders with diverse functions at different levels within the university structure seeking role-relevant knowledge and experience, or those individuals who are curious about academic leadership and university governance in European and Chinese higher education contexts. However, this broad aim and the diversity of potential readers turned out to be another challenge, given the difficulty of deciding the scope of the book and the way to present the contents. University governance and academic leadership are two broad and multidimensional issues, which have gained increasing popularity and significance over the last few decades. First, the content of the book was an important issue to consider since we wanted to show the unique characteristics of European and Chinese higher education contexts, and also to provide an insight into the possible common grounds for achieving mutual understanding and collaboration. At the same time, we wanted the book to be useful for academic leaders, particularly for those working in European or Chinese higher education contexts, to allow them to gain new perspectives and to enrich their leadership knowledge and skills. Thus, the content and the way to present the content must be unique in terms of integrating theory, research, and practices in a coherent way. To achieve this aim, we have accordingly decided to include three different types of papers: theory-based, research-based, and case-based. Theory-based papers largely draw upon the existing literature even though the majority of them have elaborated the theoretical discussion with interpretations of some specific cases and of the characteristics of their own higher education contexts. Research-based papers, additionally, put forward empirical findings on various issues about academic leadership in an attempt to go beyond descriptions and generalizations. The inclusion of case-based papers is one of the other unique characteristics of this book. These aim to show actual academic leadership
practices from diverse higher education contexts, the challenges such leaders encounter, and the way they come up with solutions, rather than engaging in theory-based discussions on specific academic leadership cases. Furthermore, as we have targeted university staff members with different functions, including academic leaders, academics, students, researchers, and administrative staff, we also decided to invite authors with diverse positions in their respective universities. Thus, we welcomed contributions from current and former academic leaders, academic staff members and students, researchers, administrative staff with managerial and non-managerial roles from diverse higher education systems and institutions to provide insights into the perspectives of various important stakeholders, and to show how academic leadership is displayed and perceived at different hierarchical levels within the university structure.

**Organization of the Book**

We have organized the book into three major sections: university governance and academic leadership in China, university governance and academic leadership in Europe, and perspectives in terms of EU-China collaboration. The first section of the book focuses on university governance and academic leadership in Chinese higher education and contains six chapters.

Chapter 1 is meant to constitute a background for the rest of the chapters about the Chinese higher education system, by providing a deep analysis of the historical development of the governance structure of Chinese higher institutions, with particular emphasis on the centralized structure and influence of state political power on higher education governance. The current challenges, trends, and reforms with regard to higher education governance are also reviewed, which pave the way for future reform efforts in a search for the comprehensive social and economic development of the country.

With the growing importance of higher education as an additive to the competitive advantage of countries in the new era, China has increasingly invested in improving the quality of higher education and creating world-class universities. The Double First-Class initiative is one those initiatives that has been launched to achieve this end. Accordingly, Chapter 2 focuses on the academic leaders of the Level-A Double First-Class universities, and empirically explores the characteristics of these academic leaders to reveal the commonalities between academic leaders in terms of demographic characteristics, academic background, and work and international experience. Based on the data from 36 Double First-Class universities and 108 senior-level academic leaders, some representative characteristics are identified in this chapter that characterize the academic leaders, while the need for increased diversity is underlined in the discussion.

Chapter 3 extends the discussion of university governance models and endeavors to manifest the complex link between the governance models of public Chinese universities, the sources of research funding, either governmental or non-governmental, and the research outputs. The first type of university governance model is the bureaucratic model, which is characterized by hierarchical decision-making and a clear distinction between the roles, responsibilities, and authority of the academic and administrative bodies. The second model explored is the collegial model, which incorporates democratic and participative decision-making, and positive relationships between academic and administrative bodies. Even though there is a trend in terms of transforming the Chinese higher education governance model from a bureaucratic to a more collegial one, the findings of the study reveal the need to consider the internal and external realities, the opportunities, and the limitations in establishing governance models of the public universities while promoting academic productivity.
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Another central aspect of university governance is the management of student affairs, which is effectively dealt with in China through the university counselor system. Chapter 4 focuses on this system in Chinese universities with a consideration of the major responsibilities with regard to the ideological and political education of students, along with the responsibilities concerning the daily affairs of students, their self-development, and the protection of their rights and position in the organization. Even though the counselor system basically serves the national interest and the major stakeholders of higher education, it faces some challenges due to the lack of clearly defined roles and responsibilities, and to the limited professional skills and capacity for intervention on the part of the counselors, which are more visible when compared with the student management systems in Europe and in the US. Thus, the chapter concludes with potential areas of improvement and solid recommendations for increased effectiveness.

As part of the nationwide initiatives launched in China in the last few decades in an attempt to create world-class universities, different universities have had different experiences. Chapters 5 and 6 are case-based chapters that manifest the experiences of two well-known Chinese universities in the process of transformation to become world-class entrepreneurial universities. Chapter 5, specifically, elaborates on the case of Tongji University in the process of building a world-class university. Based on the characteristics and problems of reforms in national higher education governance, how the governance structure of Tongji University has been reshaped is analyzed, with a specific focus on the reforms of the corporate governance structure, the teacher personnel system, and the teaching management system. A variety of different reforms enacted in three specific colleges also constitute examples for those universities undergoing similar transformation processes, with further decentralization, increased delegation of power, and the improved governance capacity of colleges, being discussed as critical for further comprehensiveness and better coordination of the reforms.

Similarly, Chapter 6 shows the case of Zhejiang University, in terms of its transformation from a research university into an entrepreneurial university, while analyzing the reform efforts in three important aspects of entrepreneurial university governance: the academic governance system, the personnel system, and the technology transfer system. The ultimate aims of these reforms are discussed as the integration of academic and entrepreneurial skills to enhance knowledge production in such a way as to allow it to be transferred into societal development, the harmonization between basic and applied research, and the achievement of the transfer of scientific research into teaching and educational processes.

The second section of the book comprised nine chapters that focus on various different aspects of university governance and academic leadership in the European context.

The first chapter in this section, Chapter 7, explains the tension between new public management and network governance, given that these are contradictory forces in the way academic leadership is perceived and practiced. Reform of doctoral education in Europe is analyzed as a case, given that some practices and approaches can be closely coupled with the new public management approach, while some are closely associated with the network governance characteristics. To strengthen academic citizenship, the chapter suggests shared leadership as a viable approach, which not only values the contribution of people regardless of their position in the hierarchy or their role, but also promotes dialogue within the organization.

Chapter 8 is another case study that offers a deep analysis of the research and innovation and valorization aspects of university governance in a Flemish university, Vrije Universiteits Brussel (VUB), in its search for an equilibrium between creativity and openness, and the introduction of a structured management seeking efficiency and effectiveness. The chapter utilized the analogy of the power game to describe the ever-increasing importance of universities in terms of serving social interests, which is
linked to growing private and public interests and the resulting tension between dominance and autonomy. The VUB model is further elaborated and a central leadership that can maintain a balance between sustained understanding and dialogue with decision-makers and internal and external stakeholders of the university, is highlighted.

Chapter 9 discusses the latest social, economic, political, and technological change forces that challenge the traditional mission and deeply-rooted values of higher education organizations, and that trigger transformational change. The chapter further explains transformational leadership as an alternative lens with regard to surviving the struggle between retaining the traditional characteristics and values of universities, and producing relevant responses to the forces pressuring for change. The issues of cultural transformation and the applicability of transformational leadership are also discussed within the context of the Turkish higher education system, which is challenged due to a centralized structure, a lack of autonomy, the need for quality maintenance, and neoliberal policies.

In line with the same challenges, Chapter 10 presents the case of the Middle East Technical University in Turkey with regard to the strategic planning process, which is a legal requirement for all public universities in that country. Based on the experiences the university gained from previous strategic plan implementations over the last few years, a collegial approach is given the utmost importance in the strategic planning process, which centers on the widespread participation of internal stakeholders in the preparation process, while in the deployment stage, a Hoshin-Kanri (catch-ball) approach is utilized. In addition to the step-by-step process presented, the chapter also draws attention to the active involvement of the top-level academic leaders, the composition of the support team, and the continuous monitoring and assessment of the plan produced, as keys for the success of the strategic planning process.

The subsequent three chapters are also case studies that show how different European institutions respond to the calls for greater centralization, control, and effectiveness. Chapter 11 discusses the case of the University of Ljubljana. The chapter first introduces the internal and external governance of the university. This is followed by the responses to the governance dilemmas concerning organizational effectiveness, management structure, institutional decision-making, and the degree of centralization. The analysis of the governance model of the university reveals the helpfulness of the unique responses produced, and the way the governance structure is shaped in order to retain the core characteristics of the organization. It provides an alternative perspective to dealing with those dilemmas without implementing a new public management approach.

Chapter 12 analyzes how the new national legislation introduced by the Portuguese government calling for greater centralization in decision-making and for the empowerment of the role of the rector influenced the governance of higher education institutions in Portugal, by taking Nova University Lisbon as an example. The chapter deals with the way this new legislation has been implemented in Nova with a specific focus on strategic plan development based on multiple key performance indicators. It specifically considers the implementation and monitoring to show the priority areas for improvement. Moreover, through using the autonomy scorecards of the European University Association, the possible effect of the new legislation on university autonomy is analyzed, and suggestions are made concerning the overall improvement of Nova University with regard to this new governance model.

The interconnected influences of the Bologna process, increased competition accompanied by globalization, massification, and the introduction of new public management approaches and their implementation are highly influential in shaping higher education governance, which is also true throughout Europe. The Czech Republic and Charles University are not exempt from these challenges, as is further explained in Chapter 13. This chapter primarily describes the challenges in the operating environment
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of European higher education institutions and particularly focuses on the way Charles University has dealt with those challenges. In line with the changes the Czech Republic has undergone in three distinct periods, the Charles University has also experienced three waves of reform, the last of which involves the introduction of a new public management approach. The chapter shows how the governance structure, decision-making, and the communication mechanism of the university underline its core values through supporting a decentralized structure, academic autonomy, collegial collaboration, and solidarity.

Chapter 14 addresses the recent trends of technological developments and digitalization, growing international competition, changing patterns of funding, all of which are influential in shaping university governance, particularly in Europe, and discusses the professionalization of university management, setting up interdisciplinary schools, and creating networks as recent trends in university governance, while referring to the VUB case with regard to such implementations.

The last chapter of this section, Chapter 15, explores teamwork and conflict management as two important assets of academic leaders when it comes to making them more empowered and efficient in their positions. Given the tremendous changes in the operating environment of higher education institutions, change leadership is of great importance for higher performance and increased efficiency in the implementation of large-scale changes, where communication and teamwork are central. Thus, the chapter elaborates on the major ways of managing teamwork and the different strategies of conflict management, particularly in an academic context with idiosyncratic characteristics, and makes suggestions for the ways of developing academic leaders and possible topics to be covered in academic leadership training.

The third section of the book contains four chapters that integrate Chinese and European perspectives to achieve EU-China collaboration.

The first chapter in this section, Chapter 16, touches upon one of the most critical issues regarding academic leadership, and aims to contribute to filling the gap in the literature. Specifically, the major purposes of this chapter are to explore the capacity building needs of European and Chinese academic leaders, and to understand which training themes are critical for middle and top-level academic leaders serving in these two contexts. The findings of the study not only reveal the central role of context, but also the hierarchical level, given that different leadership roles and responsibilities are required when it comes to identifying the areas of training needs and role-relevant skill development.

Moreover, the increasing importance placed on rankings and the aspirations of universities to be among the world-class ones leads to the adoption of promotion and evaluation systems based on research outcomes. This, in turn, is closely associated with the unintended outcome of academic corruption, which is the major focus of Chapter 17. This chapter concentrates on academic corruption cases from Chinese and Turkish higher education contexts, and discusses the institutional responses produced in a comparative manner. Despite the similar development processes these countries went through, their similar higher education cultures prioritizing research outputs over quality, and the tenure and promotion systems adopted, the different institutional responses produced underlined the need to look beyond structural problems, including the socio-political and economic realities of the countries concerned.

Chapter 18 covers a case about the creation of a joint degree program in Lisbon in in the form of a collaboration between Nova University Lisbon and Chinese institutions. The chapter discusses the major motivators behind the creation of this program, while documenting the challenges encountered in the process, including legal constraints and the need for displaying various different academic leadership skills including setting and sharing vision, negotiation, and creating a common organizational culture. The Nova experience is not only of practical value for the provision of internationalization and student
exchange opportunities, but also unique for being a case that shows the key role played by a Portuguese university in establishing a collaboration that has economic value and worth in the market.

In the last chapter, Chapter 19, the internationalization experiences of the Silesian University of Technology in Poland and Ningbo University in China have been analyzed, and the strategies and practices of these universities in promoting mobility are discussed. Utilizing Knight’s framework for cross-border education, the chapter shows that people mobility, project mobility, and policy mobility are common forms of EU-China collaboration in the cases presented, which have the potential to provide insight into the different ways of realizing EU-China focused internationalization and the mobility strategies of universities.

In addition to the comprehensive content the book offers about university governance and academic leadership, this book is valuable because it provides deep insight into diversity of higher education systems and university governance practices, which is likely to improve the readers’ understanding of how the context matters in university governance. The book further provides the perspectives of various important stakeholders of higher education institutions including the ones with managerial and non-managerial roles to enable knowledge sharing and learning across different levels (university level and unit level) and positions in the organizations. In addition, the book integrates European and Chinese perspectives not only to strengthen mutual understanding but also to promote and extend EU-China collaboration.

Chang Zhu
*Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Belgium*

Merve Zayim-Kurtay
*Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Belgium*
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Chapter 1

Governance of Higher Education Institutions in China: Structures and Trends

Baocun Liu
Beijing Normal University, China

Hui Zhang
Beijing University of Aeronautics and Astronautics, China

ABSTRACT

This chapter analyzes the background, structures, problems and challenges, reforms, and trends in the governance of higher education institutions in China. It concludes that the centralized governance and management system of higher education institutions in China is deeply affected by the long history of centralized culture, and the current administrative and management system of state political power. The system has undergone many reforms and changes, and it is expected to undergo more reforms and changes in the coming decades.

INTRODUCTION

The governance and management of higher education institutions in China is specified by different national laws and regulations. The State Council and local government at various levels are responsible for guiding and administering educational work, applying the principles of administration at different levels and an appropriate division of responsibilities. Secondary education and education at lower levels are administered by the local governments of the people under the guidance of the State Council, while higher education is administered by the State Council, and/or the provincial governments, governments of the autonomous regions, or municipalities directly under the central government. This governance and management system of Chinese higher education has its roots in a long history of centralized culture, and the administrative and management system of the country, but it is also affected by the current administrative and management system of China.

DOI: 10.4018/978-1-5225-7441-5.ch001
Over the last 30 years, an increasing number of domestic scholars have engaged in the field of higher education and have published valuable research related to the structures of governance in higher education institutions from different perspectives, and of the trends in those structures. The structures of higher education governance have been a particular focus of research.

Gu and Meng (2003) discussed a new concept of international teaching, which is strongly reflected in modern education. In their study, they examined a wide range of new educational concepts drawn from Western developed countries and the Soviet Union over the preceding three decades and explain them with broad vision and simple writing. These concepts include postmodern education, cooperative education, environmental education, and innovative education. These concepts have laid the theoretical foundation for the development of the higher education system. Focusing on the reform of higher education system, Wang and Liu (2009) argued that there was a need for the structural adjustment of higher education, including adjustment of the internal organizational structure of higher education, adjustment of the external organizational structure of higher education, and adjustment of the structure of planning in higher education institutions. More specifically, they considered many measures, including establishing a college system, college mergers and the construction of university towns. They also pointed out that the change from “management” to “governance” was not only a major transformation in the strategy of governing the country, but also a fundamental change in the policy of higher education. Taking the internal power structure as a starting point, Zhu and Yu (2013) examined the relationship between the Party and the Chinese government and proposed that the state should establish a coordinated and orderly university governance mechanism. As to higher education institutions, it was suggested that universities needed to establish institutional linkages between the School Council and the Party Committee (the Standing Committee) in order to build an effective structure of internal university governance that fully conformed to national conditions, and thus make a breakthrough in the reform of higher education. Based on the previous study of Zhu and Yu (2013), Zhou (2014) pointed out that the core issue of higher education governance was the distribution of decision-making power, which included three aspects: system level, university level, and grassroots academic organization. In his research, Zhou summarized ten issues in China’s higher education governance, namely separation of politics and school, social accountability, organization, corporate governance structure, the university board of directors, the mechanism for selecting the university president, academic power, the internal organizational structure, the autonomy of grassroots academic organization, and the construction of the university charter.

Another focus of research was related to the trends in higher education governance. Yuan (2014), Qu (2014), and Bie (2015) studied the modernization of governance systems and governance capabilities in higher education, and how they have adapted to changing times. With the same focus on governance systems and trends, Liu and Yang (2016) studied social participation in higher education governance from a comparative perspective. They held that China must adjust the role of the government, and change the way the government governs, to improve national legislation and university regulations, establish a modern university system, and improve disclosure of information, social accountability, and supervisory systems. Compared with traditional Western universities, Li and Yin (2016) proposed that Chinese higher education had different core values and characteristics, mainly including their independent faculty and freedom of thought, active participation in government-led national construction projects, and internationalization of Chinese universities represented by two-way exchanges of teachers and students, as well as international cooperation with Confucius Institutes. Lao (2015) and Zhan (2016), additionally, made a study on the modern university system, which was a key issue and core objective in the implementation of the Higher Education Law of the People’s Republic of China. They found out that university...
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Academic Leaders in Leading Chinese Universities
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ABSTRACT

The Double First-Class Initiative is now underway in a number of Chinese universities, of which about 36 are designated as level-A first-class universities of China. What kind of academic leaders do these universities have? In order to answer this question, the chapter firstly defines who can be classified as academic leaders at institutional level and their characteristics; secondly, it generalizes the common features of academic leaders in these universities such as education and academic research background, overseas study or research experience, work experience, and so on; thirdly, it analyzes the government policies and institutional strategies related to academic leaders so as to identify benchmark criteria (if in existence) regarding academic leaders in China’s first-class universities. It also examines the extent to which these criteria or official requirements coincide with academic leaders’ common features and puts forward policy advice on relevant issues.

INTRODUCTION

The Chinese higher education system functions under a state control model (Yan, 2016) under which the government plays a vital role in the top-down decision-making system. The government exerts its power on university governance by adopting a national degree system, through the unified discipline specialty catalogue and the teaching requirements, and via nation-wide regulations and code of conduct, etc. (Zhao, 2006). In such a centralized system, universities are considered as part of the governmental body at different levels. For instance, local universities are directly regulated under the provincial and municipal government while national universities are directly regulated under the Ministry of Education and other ministries. Both the national and local governments execute their influence on universities by allocating financial funding, making pivotal personnel appointments and through other issues.
Compared with most developed countries, China is a developing country that also runs a large-scale higher education system. Therefore, the key issue is how to use limited resources effectively (Zhao, 2006). As a developing system with exogenous institutional settings, Chinese higher education has to chase global developed higher education systems through state efforts (Yan, 2016). Since the late 1980s, the Chinese government has endeavored to improve higher education quality through various approaches including building world-class universities; For instance, through the ‘211 project’, ‘985 project’ and the ‘2011 Plan’. The “211 Project”, initiated in 1995, is a plan to create 100 world-class universities capable of meeting the challenges of the 21st century. There are 112 universities in this group. The “985 Project”, announced in 1998, is a key program following on from the “211 Project”, in that it provides for the building of high-level research universities in China. This project allocated RMB 32.9 billion to assist 39 Chinese universities to attain a certain goal as world leading universities by 2007. The “2011 Plan”, established in 2011, is a national plan to enhance the innovation capacity of universities by promoting collaborations between universities, research centers, industries and other related stakeholders.

Then, in 2015, the “Double First-Class” (hereafter DFC) initiative was established to build a number of world-class universities and dozens of world-class disciplines. Different from the past projects and initiatives, the DFC initiative emphasizes the equal importance of the development of individual disciplines and universities (Yan, 2016). According to the DFC universities list that was released by the Chinese Ministry of Education, 42 universities are included and are divided into 2 levels: 36 universities are Level A, while 6 are Level B. All Level-A and 3 Level-B universities belong to the “985 project” group. Three of the “211 project” universities are also included in Level B, which are local universities from Yunnan Province, Henan Province, and Xinjiang Autonomous Region, respectively.

All of these initiatives pose both opportunities and challenges to individual universities. For those designated as DFC universities, on one hand, this means an adequate flow of financial support and plenty of opportunities; on the other hand, they are widely exposed in the beam of public supervision. The only thing they can do is to fulfill the public understanding of being DFC universities, i.e. they must verify that they are worthy of state funding. They have been pressured to demonstrate greater accountability on issues of access, cost containment and learning outcomes (Rich, 2006). In such circumstances, leaders of these universities are crucial. They have to facilitate change to enable their universities to survive the golden period. Since universities are communities of scholars, the leaders, especially the academic leaders, will have to exercise their leadership within settings different from those in other sectors in terms of institutional purposes, cultures and expectations (Moore & Diamond, 2000).

There have been quite a few studies of the institutional leaders at different levels in China’s leading universities and their role in promoting academic progress (Guo, 2012; Huang, 2015; Wang et al., 2018); however, few have touched upon the topic of academic leaders in Chinese universities. Therefore, this study aims to define who the academic leaders in Chinese universities are and to identify what attributes the academic leaders should possess to accomplish their task of leading a university? In order to answer these questions, this study intends to conduct a data analysis of the academic leaders of the 36 Level-A DFC universities in China.

The term academic leaders in this study refers to those who have formal managerial positions in a university including presidents and vice presidents responsible for academic affairs, for instance, research, teaching affairs, discipline construction, postgraduate degree programs and so on (Bolden et al., 2012).
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ABSTRACT

One of the most important goals for universities in China today is to enhance research competence. Focusing on the role of research funding from government and non-government sectors, this chapter aims to examine research productivity under different governance systems. Based on a sample of faculty members from 30 public universities in China, it describes how various university governance systems influence scientific research in different ways. A bureaucratic governance system increases the amount of government funding, which contributes to academic publications and patents. Whereas, a collegial governance model has a lesser effect on non-government funding, which could promote patenting and technology transfer. The findings indicate several policy implications regarding the reform of research management and university governance in China.

DOI: 10.4018/978-1-5225-7441-5.ch003
INTRODUCTION

In China, academic research used to be managed by a centralized administration system, which could undermine academic autonomy and lead to complicated management. Recently, enhancing the research competence of Chinese universities and setting up a modern university governance system has become an important policy initiative in China.

The reform of university governance started in 1985 when a decision was taken regarding the reform of the educational system requiring priority to be given to university autonomy. The 1993 Program for Educational Reform and Development in China further empowered universities to run their internal affairs in relation to teaching, research, and social services (Zha, 2006). In 1998, the ‘principal accountability under the leadership of the party committee’ was written into China’s Higher Education Law, providing a legitimate foundation for university autonomy with Chinese characteristics. Following the release of the Outline of China’s National Plan for Medium and Long-term Education Reform and Development 2010–2020, universities were allowed wider discretion to set up internal organizations and decide income distribution within the university. In brief, the governance model of Chinese universities has gradually become less centralized with increasing autonomy in terms of financial and academic matters (Li & Yang, 2013).

Plenty of literature has examined the influence of university governance, and a great deal of it has focused on academic research. However, there are no consistent findings about which type of governance model has a greater influence on academic productivity. On the one hand, some researchers believe that a collegial model benefits academic research. For example, De Silva Lokuwaduge and Armstrong (2014) found that a governing board with more faculty members could produce better academic performance. On the other hand, some researchers have shown that the bureaucratic model could benefit academic output through standardized management, strengthened incentives, and greater capacity to attract resources (Cheng & McKinley, 1983; McCormack, Propper, & Smith, 2014).

In general, the effect of university governance on academic research is mixed, and little is known about how the governance system affects scientific research. This chapter attempts to examine the relationship between the governance system and research outputs, focusing on the intermediating effects of research funding from different sources. As universities develop ‘triple helix’ relationships with the government and industry, university research is increasingly steered by grants from multiple agents (Etzkowitz & Leydesdorff, 2000). A diversified financial system might benefit academic research. Some studies have found that government funding can promote academic research. For instance, Payne and Siow (2003) examined the effect of federal research funding on university-level research output and found that $1 million of federal research funding was associated with ten more articles and .2 more patents. Some studies found small positive effects of funding on individual researchers (Arora & Gambardella, 2005; Averch, 1989). However, there is the potential for selection bias, which could lead them to overstate the true impact of grant receipt. Whereas, some researchers argue that private research contracts could promote researchers and give them access to additional resources, which could help to generate research ideas, and achieve higher academic productivity (Gulbrandsen, & Smeby, 2005; Van Looy et al., 2004).

This chapter aims to answer two questions: (1) What is the relationship between university governance systems and academics’ research funds from different sources? (2) Does governmental and non-governmental funding affect academic output in different ways? The analysis is based on a survey of faculty members from 30 public universities in China. The rest of this paper is organized as follows: section two reviews university governance model theories and introduces the practices in China. Section
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ABSTRACT
The university counselor system, an essential part of the development of college students, is the mainstay of quality-oriented education and modern management. This chapter focuses on the Chinese university counselor system and the relationship between the system and university governance. The chapter probes into the features and dilemmas of modern Chinese university governance, discusses the content and historical development of the Chinese university counselor system, and proposes ideas on how to learn from the advantages of similar systems in European countries and the USA from a comparative perspective. This chapter analyzes the effect of the Chinese counselor system on the university governance system from the perspective of Chinese university governance, including the positive effect of the system on university stakeholders’ governance and modern university governance. Then, the chapter discusses suggested improvements for the university counselor system, and puts forward some suggestions, including moral education, role definition, and professionalization.
INTRODUCTION

The deepening reforms in China have ushered in new opportunities and challenges for the universities. The education model has currently evolved from product-like training education to human-oriented elite education.

The Chinese university counselor system is an ideological and political education system that suits its national conditions and that is typical of universities with socialist characteristics. Established early at the start of the People’s Republic of China, the Chinese university counselor system has been operating in China for 57 years. The majority of the counselors work with a realistic and innovative style. They have accumulated many successful experiences in various aspects, such as the moral education, service and management of students, and have played an important role in cultivating qualified socialist builders and successors.

This article focuses on the Chinese university counselor system and the relationship between the counselor system and university governance. The article probes into the features and dilemmas of the modern Chinese university governance, discusses its content and the historical development, and talks about how to learn from the advantages of the similar systems in European countries and the USA. In addition, this article also analyzes the effects of the Chinese counselor system on the university governance system from the perspective of university governance, including the positive effect of the system on university stakeholders’ governance and modern university governance. Finally, the article discusses future improvements for the university counselor system, and puts forward some suggestions, including moral education, role definition and professionalization.

BACKGROUND

The concept of “governance” originated from research into corporate problems. Subsequently, it was gradually applied to the research of governance on various non-profit organizations, such as governments and schools (Fu & Zhao, 2009). Researchers in European countries and the USA studied university governance earlier than China. The foundation for the study of university governance is John Corson’s publication in 1960, Governance of College and Universities: Modernizing Structure and Processes (Zheng, 2011). The study of university governance in China is still in its infancy, and the research of governance theories comes mainly from the foreign works or experiences of university governance. Based on the connotation of university governance, Gan (2007) analyzed the model of modern university governance, believing that there are three major international models in the structure of contemporary university governance: the relational governance model, based on the supervision of the insider; the administrative type of governance, based on national supervision, and the compound governance model based on intermediary institutions (which are usually on behalf of the government). Chinese universities have transformed their governance model from government control into government supervision, reflecting the mutual adaptation of the relations between Chinese universities and the government. This has not only reduced the burden of the government, but has also accelerated the development of colleges and universities (Jiang et al., 2005). Overall, Chinese research on the governance model is still in its infancy. Further research is needed to reveal how the governance theory can truly integrate into the practice of university management. The present research requires an in-depth and meticulous analysis with regard to the potential value and significance of university governance.
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ABSTRACT
This chapter introduces and discusses changes with respect to the university governance system in China which is in the process of creating a world-class university by taking Tongji University as an example. It presents an analytical framework on the basis of four powers: (1) the internal democratic nature of the governance structure, (2) the external involvement in university governance, (3) the level of centralization of the decision-making authority in the university, and (4) the concentration of authority in an individual leadership position versus authority in a collective body or spread over various collective bodies. It analyzes and summarizes the reforms of three colleges at Tongji University in these four aspects and puts forward some reasonable suggestions for other universities.

INTRODUCTION
Over the last decades, many national reforms have been initiated in China with the aim of strengthening the executive capacity of public universities. The internal leadership system of the university is mainly carried out between the responsibility of the university presidents, the responsibility of the University Council under the leadership of the Party committee and the responsibility of the university presidents under the leadership of the Party committee.
In 1989, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China (CPC) decided that the higher education institutions still implemented the president responsibility system under the leadership of the party committee, stating: “The practice proves that the implementation of the responsibility of university presidents under the leadership of the party committee is beneficial to ensuring the university’s socialist direction and comprehensively achieving the talent training goals”. In 1998, the Higher Education Law of the People’s Republic of China clearly stated in the legal form that the current leadership system of the university is “the president’s responsibility under the leadership of the Party organizations at the primary level”, that is, the president has the responsibility under the leadership of the party committee of the university.

Before the reform and opening up policy, Chinese universities were completely controlled by the government. The government was both the organizer and the administrator. In May 1985 the “Decision of the Central Committee of the CPC on the Reform of the Education System” proposed to expand the autonomy of higher education institutions. The government and the education administration have taken a series of measures. The functions of the government no longer include university administration. Instead, they provide policies, regulatory services and laws for the development of higher education. In addition, the transfer of more power from the central government to the local government has significantly increased the enthusiasm of local universities. In 1998, the “Law of the People’s Republic of China on Higher Education” was promulgated, and the autonomy of higher education institutions was determined in legal form.

The Responsibility of University Presidents Under the Leadership of the Party

University governance is generally divided into “external governance” that harmonizes the interests of universities with the government and society and the “internal governance” that harmonizes the various rights and relations within the universities (Yang, 2018). In the past ten years, the external environment has been greatly improved. The country has gradually begun to pay more attention to internal governance issues in universities. Chinese education reform and development of long-term planning programs (2010—2020) clearly defined that its aim was: “To improve the modern university system with Chinese characteristics and the governance structure”. This was expressed in these words: “the university runs according to law, self-management, democratic supervision and social participation” (Cai & Yang, 2008). At the end of 2013, the Decision of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China on Several Major Issues Concerning Comprehensive Deepening Reforms (hereinafter referred to as “the decision”) was issued. The “Decision” pointed out that it was necessary to deepen the comprehensive reform in the education field and improve the internal governance structure of the university. Perfecting the governance structure of universities is an important part of deepening the reform of higher education, and its core is to establish and improve the governance idea, institutional framework and operational mechanisms of Lide Shuren, which means fostering integrity and promoting rounded development of the people.

These reform agendas have many things in common, including the strengthening of institutional autonomy, the professionalization of institutional leadership and administration and the introduction of more competitive, performance-oriented funding models. All these items have been studied from various perspectives, which include reference to the research on the internal governance of foreign universities (Feng & Shi, 2016; Pei & Zhou, 2011; Zhang, 2010; Zhou, 2015) and research on the problems existing in the internal governance of domestic universities (Cai & Ma, 2014; Wang, 2013; Zhang & Pu, 2014),
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ABSTRACT

Based on Burton Clark’s five pathways of university entrepreneurial transformation, this chapter aims to demonstrate Zhejiang University’s vivid transformation from a research university into an entrepreneurial university. This chapter will consider ZJU’s most representative organizational reforms including personnel system, academic governance system, and technology transfer system reforms and further illustrate the logic behind these reforms. First, it will assess the integration of entrepreneurial abilities with academic research abilities, focusing on how to stimulate academic productivity and how to connect academic production and technology transfer. Second, it will look at the integration of basic research and application research, and how the research loop is made possible. Last, the integration of research and talent cultivation will be assessed, translating “research advantage” into “teaching advantage.” It is essential that the university possesses “good governance” to promote entrepreneurial transformation which makes the most of organizational and institutional reforms.
INTRODUCTION

In terms of university development paths, the entrepreneurial university has gained growing attention. The rise of the entrepreneurial university occurs in tandem with the evolution of the social norms of science, from disinterested to entrepreneurial science (Etzkowitz, 2016). The entrepreneurial university is characterized by closer university-business partnerships, by greater faculty responsibility for accessing external sources of funding, and by a managerial ethos involving institutional governance, leadership, and planning (Subotzky, 1999). Just as the university trains individual students and sends them out into the world, the entrepreneurial university is a natural incubator, providing support structures for teachers and students to initiate new ventures: intellectual, commercial, and conjoint (Etzkowitz, 2003). Consequently, the keywords of entrepreneurial university are innovation and developing with the surroundings. An entrepreneurial university can mean three things: the university itself, as an organization, becomes entrepreneurial; the members of the university - faculty, students, employees - are somehow turning themselves into entrepreneurs; and the interaction of the university with the environment, the structural coupling between the university and the region, follows an entrepreneurial pattern (Röpke, 1998). The nature of an entrepreneurial university requires the university to take a leap in terms of its traditional mission, which also requires the full support of governance system reforms.

The governance system of a university can be divided into two parts: academic and administrative governance. Bureaucracy, which is regarded as the foundation of modern organization, offers efficient support to university operations. The current American system of university governance has four principal participants: trustees, academic leaders, professors, and students, all of whom present individual strengths and weaknesses. The success of shared governance depends on the mutual trust and cooperation of these participants (Bok, 2012). Therefore, the reform of the university governance system aimed to bring out the subjective initiative of the principal participants. There have been only a very limited number of studies of university governance system reform in terms of entrepreneurial universities. This study aims to analyze this issue through a typical case study, in order to analyze the governance system reform elements necessary to promote university entrepreneurial transformation.

We believe that the governance system reform of Zhejiang University in China is a typical case. China has implemented succeeding waves of nationwide educational initiatives aimed at catapulting Chinese universities to World Class University (WCU) status. This has included “Project 211” “Project 985” and, most recently, the “Double First-rate Strategy” (Douglass, 2017). From “Project 211” and “Project 985” to the “Double First-rate Strategy”, China has made a considerable effort that has resulted in huge progress in the endeavor to establish world class universities. Among these efforts, integrating with regional development, and consequently increasing competitive advantage, has become an important strategy for Chinese universities. This path is an appropriate one for the development of entrepreneurial universities. Zhejiang University (hereafter ZJU) has top 3 status among Chinese universities and has a long history of development featuring innovative development. The main root of the current version of ZJU, Qushi Academy, was founded in 1897, and was one of the earliest modern academies of higher education in China (ZJU, 2018). With a long history of co-development with the region, conducting an entrepreneurial strategy is a natural fit for ZJU, which, in turn, vividly conveys the motto of ZJU, “Seeking Truth, and Pursuing Innovation”.

While transforming into an entrepreneurial university, ZJU has constantly explored its management system, trying to introduce “good governance of the university” which, in turn, pushes forward entrepreneurial transformation. Good university governance means using the best aspects of bureaucracy to
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ABSTRACT

What type of leadership is the most successful in persuading academics to contribute to the multifaceted mission of modern universities? Recent reforms, in which universities have achieved different levels of institutional autonomy, were accompanied by the establishment of new public management (NPM) methods that allow governments to steer the system more effectively. Central management was strengthened, while values such as collegiality received little attention. The reforms have also fostered an exchange between universities and other actors in terms of networked governance. Using the example of doctoral studies, this chapter shows that there is evidence for both NPM and networked governance. Their perception depends on the role of academics in the reform process and partly undermined the commitment of academics to the system. Thus, to address the modernization of university management while (re-) strengthening the commitment of academics, the chapter proposes a shared leadership model that integrates the emphasis on values and participation to stimulate academic citizenship.

INTRODUCTION

In recent decades, the focus of public attention in many countries has shifted to higher education systems. The increased attention given to higher education has resulted in major changes in the system, particularly in Europe. For example, the legal framework conditions have often been adapted with the aim of making universities more efficient and aligning the structures so that universities can respond better to new tasks and challenges. Quality assurance systems have become an increasingly dominant regulatory instruments in higher education management. Sometimes these changes are also seen in the context of approaches to enforce market-oriented, competition-oriented rationalities on the basis of neo-liberal managerialism (Ekman et al., 2018; Enders et al., 2014; Jarvis 2014; Olssen et al., 2005).
In any case, changes in the framework conditions and the use of these instruments have an impact both on the relationship between the state and the university and on the network of relationships within the university, especially with regard to the different hierarchical levels. In many places, the executive management has been strengthened, while the power, but also the inertia of advisory bodies and collegial governance has been weakened. Thus, the new governance structures not only altered the balance of power in the universities, but also changed the leadership roles and demanded a different understanding of leadership. As Sporn (1996, p. 1) stated:

*Universities are complex social organizations with distinctive cultures. On the one hand, academic freedom and autonomy are inviolable values and, on the other hand, changing environmental conditions exert strong influence on the primary functions of universities.*

This statement is still valid unchanged twenty years later. Ultimately, the changes in the system are also aimed at changing the behavior of university staff. University leaders are called upon to promote and help shape their institutions without neglecting the uniqueness of university culture.

The management of universities is fundamentally different from leadership in other contexts due to their organizational complexity, disciplinary diversity, different goals and traditional values. It requires additional competences and makes leadership a balancing act between partly - at least seemingly - contradictory objectives, e. g. the demand for strategic planning on the one hand and the creation of space for curiosity-driven research and creativity on the other.

*Leadership becomes an essential quality for an institution to allow it to develop a completely new self-understanding, to be strongly present in the outside world, capable of defending its own interests as well as being reactive to inside demands and needs (Felt, 2007, p. 11).*

**Autonomy With a Different Focus**

The strength and importance of universities lies in the independent thinking, creativity and autonomy of the people who work in them. In the past, it used to be the primary role of the state to guarantee the autonomy of education and research. The focus was not on government control, although the sector was and still is largely publicly financed (OECD, 2018) and thus dependent on the public sector. In the traditional view, it was left to the academic community to produce, increase and use knowledge while the exchange of knowledge with society was not a primary objective. As an independent and autonomous self-organization the academic community itself defines its own values and quality criteria and receives a monopoly from the state to exercise its function. The latter, in turn, has the duty to protect the community from external influences and to finance them adequately. When Polanyi (1962) argues in “The Republic of Science” for the understanding of science as an autonomous sphere, he also demands that the management and governance of higher education should be left primarily to academics in order to ensure high-quality research. In this tradition, rectores magnifici, deans and other academics elected to leadership positions would rather avoid than favor the term “manager” or “leader” for themselves. Polanyi goes even further and declares a clear rejection of any attempt to steer research with regard to its impact when he writes “I appreciate the generous sentiments which actuate the aspiration of guiding the progress of science into socially beneficent channels, but I hold its aim to be impossible and nonsensical” (Polanyi, 1962, p. 62). This position can no longer be maintained today and must be considered as outdated when
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ABSTRACT

The chapter sketches some governance features of a medium-sized, comprehensive, urban, public university that are essential to ensure the delicate equilibrium between structured, efficient management and openness towards the changing society, exceptional personalities and breakthrough thinking. Features of university governance are analyzed at all levels, from rectorate to schools (faculties), departments, and research groups. “Research” and “innovation and valorization with societal impact” are situated in relation to three other main academic pillars, namely education, student affairs, and institution-wide internationalization. Building blocks are described and assembled in a coherent governance structure. Vrije Universiteit Brussel (VUB) case is taken as an example. Generalization of the discussed concepts should be done with care because choices are dependent on the university’s vision, strategic plan, and road map, and one single best governance structure that is appropriate for all contexts does not exist.

INTRODUCTION

The chapter sketches some of the features of public university governance that are essential to ensure the delicate equilibrium between structured, efficient management and openness towards the changing society, exceptional personalities, and breakthrough thinking. The processes analyzed are strongly influenced by the VUB model that is used to describe them more explicitly. Not all aspects of university governance are covered, because the paper considers only five important academic pillars as well as their interactions, namely research, education, student affairs, innovation & valorization with societal impact.
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and institution-wide internationalization. Features of university governance are analyzed at all levels, from rectorate to schools (faculties), departments and research groups. Institutional accreditation of the university by an external body requires the central university governance to be in control of the main quality processes throughout the whole university, and hence special attention will be given to internal communication. The emphasis of governmental agencies on output performance, usually assessed through key performance indicators (KPIs), must be accommodated in a harmonious model of internal operation supporting responsibilities and ensuring autonomy. The answer to the question “What works, what fails, what is work in progress?” inevitably depends on the context in which the university operates. Hence some chapter-wide assumptions have been made: the generic models are described with a medium-sized comprehensive European university in mind that has a strong structural international embedding. This is the case of VUB and hence to a large extent it is the VUB model that is described in this chapter. Generalization of the discussed concepts should be done with care because choices are dependent on the university’s vision, strategic plan and road map and one single best governance structure that is appropriate for all contexts does not exist. The current chapter focuses on strategies and management for two of the five mentioned academic pillars, namely “research” and “innovation & valorization”. These cannot, however, be analyzed without considering the global university’s central governance and the synergy with education, student affairs, and internationalization, which will be discussed whenever necessary. The following topics will be addressed: governance models, research, innovation, valorization, PhD school, R&D management, transdisciplinarity, university networks, internationalization policy, leadership styles, internal and external communication, outreach, technology transfer, entrepreneurship, innovation platforms, university venture capital fund, and university networks.

Strategic governance of the university’s ecosystem has some similarities with power gaming although gravitas and dignity remain essential academic characteristics inherited from the past, different individuals or groups - internal and external to the university - are competing to achieve their specific (often well-intentioned) goals by gaining power, authority, and influence.

The one-sided perception of the university as an ivory tower has been abandoned. Recent economic impact studies reveal that in 2016 - through their core activities, students, research, commercialization and graduates – the 23 LERU Universities contributed €99.8 billion GVA and 1.3 million jobs to the European economy (BIGGAR Economics, 2017a). Each €1 of subsidies generates almost €7 GVA to the European economy, and every job directly created by the LERU Universities supports almost 6 other jobs. For the 5 Flemish universities (BIGGAR Economics, 2017b), a similar study reveals a combined contribution of €12.0 billion GVA and 121,800 jobs throughout Europe. The ratio of core government funding to impact is estimated at €1:€10 in Flanders. For each person directly employed by the 5 Flemish Universities almost three additional jobs are supported in Flanders. Also, knowledge transfer becomes visible to the public at large, through its increasing scale and impact. It contributes to transformation processes in industry and society, and it generates new economic activities. The university is recognized for its increasingly prominent role in society. This central societal position, going far beyond the primary missions of education and research, makes the university attractive to the private and public sectors, the ideal stage for a power game, the battlefield of autonomy versus dominance by several external interest groups. Government might be the most threatening one because it provides the main source of funding, increasingly accompanied by regulations interfering with internal university functioning and governance.
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ABSTRACT

This chapter aims to elaborate on the leadership properties in the transformation in higher education across the world by advancing specific illustration from the Turkish higher education context. Three specific objectives were identified around this broad aim: (1) document the current forces of change surrounding HEIs, (2) identify the culture shift in HEIs, and (3) provide literature-based evidence for the leadership gap in the face of culture shift and develop preposition for academic leadership. Higher education institutions (HEIs) form one of the sectors which has been drastically affected from the trends and developments in the economic, political, social, and technological spheres and responded to these change forces by radical transformations that have touched their traditional and historical value systems. This chapter argues that HEIs need leadership practices to survive the crisis and conflict era successfully, which carry some properties of transformational leadership while holding the traditional academic leadership perspective.

BACKGROUND: THE IMPACT OF THE FORCES OF CHANGE IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Myriad of internal and external forces push HEIs to undertake transformational changes in their structural and functional characteristics (May, 2006). Several scholars highlighted the importance of confronting these forces on the part of HEIs to ensue their survival (e.g., Chevaillier, 2002; Jeliazkova & Westerheijden, 2002). Altbach and Forest (2006) stated that growth in demand for higher education (HE), diversification, increased global interconnectedness, and advances in technology are the key forces putting DOI: 10.4018/978-1-5225-7441-5.ch009
Cultural Transformation and Academic Leadership

imperative on HEIs for change. Similarly, Scott, Coates and Anderson (2008) provided a detailed list of forces that push HEIs to undertake comprehensive change in which generic forces putting pressure on organizational world in general and concrete implication of these forces on HEIs are specified. Sporn (2006), furthermore, suggested a list of key forces of change in the HE context as financial constraints, proliferation of information and communication technology, competition and marketization in the HE sector, and increasing professionalization in the academic administration, which have pushed the universities towards adopting the characteristics of Anglo-Saxon university model. In a similar way, Taylor (2006) stated that emergence of quality assurance systems, change in the funding modes, globalization and internationalization, integration of new technologies into HE, and ever-increased focus on market dynamics call for universities to adapt their organizational and structural characteristics. Decades of research attest that these forces bring about new forms of university governance, which, in turn, give rise to the development of new modes of management, leadership approaches, and work for academics (e.g., Jayasuriya, 2015; Scott et al., 2008; Sporn, 2006; Taylor, 2006). Under the influence of these forces calling for change, in addition, the traditional ideals and deeply rooted values of HEIs are challenged (Macfarlane, 2005) and HEIs have left not only with a struggle to maintain balance between these conflicting forces but also with a more complex mission to fulfill. Thus, the roles and responsibilities of academic leaders also turn to be another challenge to be more demanding and arduous (Rich, 2006; Scott et al., 2008) and the leadership displayed has become an important issue of concern to manage this cultural transformation. Similar to other developed and developing countries, Turkish HE has been also under intense pressure of change even though some structural characteristics and contextual realities prove to be obstacle. Thus, gaining deeper insight into these change forces and their implications on HEIs are crucial to embark on the transformation process with culture as one of the most important aspects and achieve managed change process in HEIs. In this respect, the major purpose of this study is to shed light on the current change forces on HEIs and explore transformational leadership as an effective leadership style to be displayed to achieve cultural transformation HEIs have been undergoing. This study also aims to discuss current reform trend in Turkish HE system and utilize transformational leadership as an additional lens to the current management practices and guide the future ones in Turkey.

Forces of Change and Implications on HEIs

Different scholars elaborated on the detailed impact of each of these developments on HEIs. First, the shrinking public resources and new modes of finance have had major impacts on teaching and research practices (Simsek, 1999). HEIs, thus, have been in a rush for finding new financial sources to sustain their research and teaching and ensure the quality of their practices. They basically involved in entrepreneurial activities (e.g., technology transfer, investing in technology, knowledge transfer, and start-up firms), fundraising activities, and initiating new modes of academic delivery (e.g., privatization, developing paid programs, and competing for limited research funds). Jayasuriya (2015) affirmed that increasing cuts in public funds in the UK, USA, and Australia have pushed the universities into marketization, which resulted in the development of a corporate culture. The author elaborated on this cultural shift at universities accompanied by these developments and stated that “rather than eroding the ideological function that ‘public good’ plays in shaping the public university, these changes have reconstituted the nature and character of the public university” (p. 974). Additionally, global economic rationalism has been suggested to result in new modes of performance evaluation (e.g., English publications), which subsequently impacted the dominant academic culture in Hong Kong (Lin, 2009). Universities tend to
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ABSTRACT

This chapter describes the participative and iterative strategic planning process that was used in Middle East Technical University (METU), as a “good practice” for other institutions of higher education in two major stages: (1) preparation of the strategic plan and (2) its deployment to all organizational units via a catch-ball approach. Both stages are iterative as they involve consecutive phases of collection, evaluation, sharing, and alignment of findings along with strategies, first among different strategic planning areas in the preparation stage, and second among different organizational units in the deployment stage. It is participative in that a large body of internal stakeholder representatives organized into various cross functional teams have carried out strategic planning at the university level. A support team assumes a critical role in coordinating the studies carried out by separate committees, and reporting the process its outcomes to University Strategic Planning Council to ensure the consistency.

INTRODUCTION

Roots of strategic planning dates back to the early 1920s, with the use of the Harvard Policy Model which aims to develop a fit between the institution and its environment – taking management values and social obligations of the firm into account. The major advantage of this model is its relying on the use of Strengths-Weaknesses-Opportunities-Threats (SWOT) analysis (Kretovics, 2011) to identify internal and external environments, which is one of the key activities in contemporary strategic planning processes.
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The literature on strategic planning has flourished throughout 1980s, along with new approaches, with the notion of strategic planning spreading to the public sector (Bryson & Roering, 1987).

The idea of strategic planning in universities was discussed as early as the 1980s by Kotler and Murphy (1981) arguing that universities are capable of undertaking “operations, that is, efficiently, doing the same things day after day”, yet they are not capable of strategic planning, which involves determining objectives, goals and strategies for a predetermined time frame to be implemented. While Kotler and Murphy’s (1981) understanding of strategic planning had a keen focus on marketing, with an orientation to understand consumer (or students to be more exact) needs and serving those needs, this focus had to be widened to encompass all stakeholders (Freeman, 1984) including students (and their families), academic and administrative personnel, graduates and their employers, and institutional and individual third parties who collaborate with the university in its primary services (that is, education and teaching, research and development, and community service). Identifying stakeholders and understanding their needs help universities to anticipate external threats and opportunities, while bringing forward the overlooked or marginalized constituencies into perspective (Burrows, 1999).

Ackoff (1990) differentiates between strategical and tactical planning, as the former planning, by nature, tends to require a top-down flow, as top management determines the long-term objectives (selection of ends) and how the system (that is, the organization) is affected by the ways of pursuing them. Tactical planning (the selection of means), on the other hand, has a short-term focus, and the means for reaching them affect only a part of the organization. Such a clear distinction between strategies and tactics may not be evident in the real world, as top management may not be aware of the details of the mundane operations that take place at the lower levels, as well as their relation to long term strategies.

For Sanaghan (2009), university strategic plans fall short because of the disconnectedness of internal stakeholders to the plan and its implementation, as a top-down process excludes campus stakeholders' involvement in a meaningful way—that is, they may not have the “opportunity to share their ideas and aspirations, learn from others, and help influence the future goals and directions of the institution”. Sanaghan offers what he calls a Collaborative Strategic Planning (CSP) approach designed particularly for institutions of higher education that ensures meaningful engagement of internal and external stakeholders, transparency of information (to them) and flow of diverse ideas (among them), ownership of the planning process, reflection and making sense of the issues, discovery and learning, and community building.

In this chapter, strategic planning in higher education is studied in the context of an international research university located in three campuses in Turkey and Northern Cyprus, which followed different approaches until developing a participative and iterative strategic planning process.

BACKGROUND

In Turkey, the legal foundation for strategic planning in universities is laid by the Ministry of Development (MoD). Besides the Ministry, two important bodies play significant roles in strategic planning of the Turkish universities: The Council of Higher Education (CoHE), and CoHE Quality Council. CoHE is mainly responsible for strategic planning of higher education and coordination of universities in Turkey, while establishing and maintaining quality assurance mechanisms are undertaken by the CoHE Quality Council. The Public Finance Management and Control Law (No. 5018) dated January 1, 2015 obliges
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Between Academic Self-Governance and State Control: The Case of the University of Ljubljana

Ivan Svetlik
University of Ljubljana, Slovenia

ABSTRACT

This chapter presents the model of university governance at the University of Ljubljana. Basic information on the university and its history is given at the beginning. The chapter continues with the description of the university governing bodies and procedures, and with the national system of higher education governance which significantly shapes the institutional governance. The presentation is based on the University of Ljubljana and national documents, and on the author’s introspection being rector of the university in the period 2013–2017. Referring to some recent scientific publications, the chapter concludes with the discussion on the governing dilemmas and responses to the existing University of Ljubljana governance model which may be described as an amalgam where the primary tension exists between academic self-governance and the state-centered elements. This tension could be expressed as a permanent struggle for greater autonomy within the university and for control of the university by the state and other external stakeholders.

ABOUT THE UNIVERSITY OF LJUBLJANA

In order to understand the specifics of the University of Ljubljana’s governance, it should be placed in a historical and organizational context. The University of Ljubljana was founded in 1919 as the first Slovenian university to introduce teaching in the Slovenian language. This was made possible by the collapse of the Austro-Hungarian Empire which had previously opposed such a project, and despite the opinion of the Yugoslav authorities in Belgrade that Ljubljana did not need a university.
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The University of Ljubljana was the only Slovenian university for more than five decades and represented the center of research and higher education in the country. Its main missions were to nurture basic research, educate young generations, and contribute to strengthening the national identity. Initially composed of just five departments (named faculties), it has grown to become a comprehensive university covering all fields of study, today entailing 23 faculties and 3 art academies. It retains its leading position in the country with the best international rankings, encompassing around half the research and half the higher education area. It has 39,000 students, about 11 percent of whom come from outside Slovenia, and nearly 6,000 employees (UL Home Page, 2018).

The University of Ljubljana was established as a public institution. It was organized along the lines of a traditional model with an accent on collegial governance. During the time of socialism (1945–1991), the Communist Party exerted its influence and control over the university. The Party’s deepest interference in organizational and academic issues came in the 1970s when the student unrests that erupted across Western Europe penetrated Yugoslavia. The Party elite was afraid of a strong university that might incubate new ideas among a united and growing student body. A new organizational model was therefore introduced under which every faculty was established as a separate legal entity. The central university bodies lost their power at the expense of the faculties and the university as a whole developed quite a loose structure. The same happened with the student organization (Mihevc, 2008). In addition, a new public university was established in Maribor in an attempt to prevent an excessive concentration of academics and students in Ljubljana. The official justification for this was that smaller units would facilitate more effective direct democracy according to the self-management model then being practiced in all spheres of life in Yugoslavia (Simmie & Dekleva, 1991).

The governance model of the 1970s was abolished in the early 1990s when Slovenia gained its independence and started its transition to a political democracy and a market economy. The University of Ljubljana intensified its communication with international institutions such as the European University Association, which evaluated its organizational model twice. As a consequence, the University of Ljubljana established a strategy of stepwise re-integration, while also trying to avoid excessive levels of centralization. Centralization and integration are considered to be two different modes of organization, although they somewhat overlap. Unlike the centralization of power at the university level, integration retains a significant share of power at the overall faculty level achieved by adopting a soft approach to working towards attaining shared goals.

This introduction should help readers understand the University of Ljubljana’s present governance model, which will be presented in the following pages on two levels: institutional (the university) and national.

INSTITUTIONAL GOVERNANCE

The model of governance implemented at the University of Ljubljana may be described as an amalgam, with an accent on stakeholders and academic staff (collegial) model elements (Trakman, 2008). It occurs on two levels: central (university) and departmental (faculty) (UL, 2017). The main governing bodies on each level are senates, governing boards and student councils. The top executive bodies at university level are the rector and secretary general and, at the faculty level, the dean and faculty secretary. An organizational peculiarity of the University of Ljubljana is that the faculties hold dual legal statuses.
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Governance of Portuguese Universities Within European Higher Education:
Nova University Lisbon Experience

António Rendas
Nova University Lisbon, Portugal

ABSTRACT

National legislation for higher education that was introduced in 2007 by the Portuguese Government changed the higher education governance model into a more centralized system with increased institutional autonomy. This allowed for a better strategic planning process that was more able to respond to society needs and, in public university foundations, gave rectors a stronger leadership role supported by a general council and by a board of trustees. A decade later, the overall autonomy scores of Portuguese universities when compared with those from other European countries according to academic, financial, organizational, and staffing (senior) criteria showed better Portuguese performance when compared with most Southern and Central European countries. This pattern remained stable between 2011 and 2016. Changes that occurred at Nova University, Lisbon, are described as a case study to exemplify the effects of this new governance model on the sustainability of long-term strategic planning and its management.

INTRODUCTION

The national legislation for Higher Education (HE) introduced in 2007 by the Portuguese government had a significant effect on the governance of Portuguese universities. It led to a new leadership approach which unified and centralized decision-making processes and allowed the strategic application of university autonomy, which supported a better system of internal management and allowed for more commitment to society. The key role is played by the Rector, together with the Rectoral team and the Deans, on the one hand, and by the General Council and the Board of Trustees (in the case of public university foundations), on the other. The last two bodies include external individuals who are not members of
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the university. The implementation process occurred between 2007 and 2009 and was fully operational in 2010, a time when Portugal, as part of Southern Europe, was affected by the global economic and financial crisis which had started in the United States of America a few years before. In order to assess the effects of the crisis on the new university autonomy legislation, a comparison is made between the overall levels of autonomy of Portuguese universities, resulting from the new reform, and the European results obtained from the European University Association Scorecard 2017. The comparison shows that Portuguese universities present high levels of autonomy, possibly because of the governance measures implemented as a result of the new legal framework. It is also possible to argue that this higher level of autonomy had a positive effect on the performance of Portuguese universities during the financial and economic crisis. In the case of NOVA University, Lisbon, this new governance experience was further extended because the institution not only fully applied the new governance model, including a long-term Strategic Plan based on key performance indicators, but has recently become a public university foundation in line with the new law. The advantages and disadvantages of this new governance model need to be evaluated in the coming years taking into account the implications of the increased academic leadership roles played by the new governing set-up, namely those of the Rector, the General Council and the Board of Trustees. The purpose of the present chapter is to address these complex issues, emphasizing not only the importance of the existence of a national legal framework for the governance of higher education institutions (HEIs), (public and private), but also how it was applied by the institutions. Based on the European University Scorecard, the level of autonomy of Portuguese universities, achieved as a result of the new legal framework is compared with other national university networks, taking into account the diversity of the university governance systems within Europe. The example of NOVA University is presented as a case study with particular emphasis on the development and application of the strategic planning process.

BACKGROUND

More than ten years have passed since the publication of a new national legislative HE framework in Portugal. This legislative package included not only a new legal regime of autonomy and governance for HEIs, but also the application of the Bologna Process nationwide, with the consequence of full inclusion and recognition of Portuguese HE degrees in the European Higher Education Area (EHA), while establishing, at the same time, the National Agency for Assessment and Accreditation of Higher Education (A3ES). In addition, academic careers were also reviewed, allowing for international recruitment in an attempt to reduce the existent high levels of endogamy.

Two years before, in 2005, as a background to the publication of the legislative package, the Portuguese Government requested the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), to perform a global analysis and evaluation of the HE system based on the following reference terms: (i) the role of HE in stimulating students to acquire knowledge in the context of diversified environments such as those that occur in the knowledge society, including lifelong learning, in the globalization era. At the national level the need was pointed out for increased contributions to social cohesion and equity, while maintaining the cultural identity of the country; (ii) a focus on strategic management procedures and the related specific structures in the development of teaching and learning, research and development, investment, finance and internationalization.
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Governance Within Diverse University Structures: The Case of Charles University

Tomáš Zima
Charles University, Czech Republic

ABSTRACT
This chapter focuses on university governance, which reflects the structure of an institution, whether it is centralized or decentralized, but most importantly democratic and autonomous. The case is illustrated using the example of Charles University, which is a large and highly decentralized organization that has been affected by developments in the Czech Republic after 1989 and their consequences for higher education in the country. In this regard, different governance models and recent challenges for higher education institutions are explained. The structure, main bodies, and management of Charles University are described and put into context within the national regulatory framework. The chapter further explores the division of powers and control mechanisms. A special focus is placed on the role of the Academic Senate, which underlines the democratic principles of the institution. The final remarks highlight the importance of a democratic, autonomous environment for both research and education.

INTRODUCTION
European universities have always played an important role, and borne significant responsibility, in society. However, the mission of institutions of higher education is changing in the modern world. Nowadays they are also expected to contribute to the resolution of economic, social and environmental problems. They must also respond to new technological and demographic developments. In order to meet these aspirations, especially in research and education, governance must be strong and, at the same time, democratic and transparent in order to provide academics and researchers with a high degree of independence.
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Governance issues are of relevance to all states and mainly concern issues such as the relationship between institutional self-governance and process of steering by the central authority (in European countries this is often the Ministries of Education), the participation of external representatives, student participation, and the relationship between the university and its constituent parts/faculties. These issues and others, such as funding, have a profound impact on institutional autonomy. At the same time, higher education governance as defined in Europe today is hardly conceivable without autonomy.

The article shows how the changes in the public sector in recent decades have affected governance in higher education – be it the governance of the higher education system, i.e. the relationship between the state and higher education institutions, or the internal governance of institutions themselves. It is neither possible for, nor is it the aim of, this article to convey a full picture of the European landscape; it is rather to outline developments in Europe and their impact on the Czech Republic and Charles University.

The Czech system of higher education has undergone dramatic changes since 1989, and is still in the process of being reformed. In order to better understand those changes, this paper identifies three distinct periods of higher education reform. In fact it has copied, in an accelerated way, the processes undergone by universities in the western part of Europe from the 1960s onwards. The reason for this is that, in the period between the Second World War and the year 1989, the Czech Republic was a communist country, in which all aspects of society were controlled by the state and higher education, in line with the Soviet model, was organized entirely by the state. Higher education institutions were directly managed by the Ministry of Education and served as only teaching entities, while research was performed at the Academy of Sciences. After the fall of the so called “Iron Curtain” in 1989, the Czech Republic underwent rapid development. Changes in the legal environment, the internationalization of higher education (namely the European Union educational and research programs and the Bologna Process) and the expansion (and later universalization) of higher education were the most important drivers of change that shaped the higher education system in three main waves.

Each of the waves of reform can be characterized by different relationship between higher education institutions and the state, and consequently by different policy. The first phase (1990-1998) could be regarded as the return of Czech higher education institutions to the Humboldtian ideals of unity in research and education, critical thinking and academic freedom, and into the community of free European universities. The second phase (1999-2006) was a period of a relative stability for the Czech higher education system, accompanied by quantitative expansion (in terms of both the numbers of institutions and students), a process which rapidly accelerated between 2006 and 2010. The governments of the third period (after 2006) have introduced the New Public Management (NPM) reforms into the public sector and tackled the impact of the global economic crisis by introducing budget cuts. Together with the quantitative increase in the number of students, this led to the substantial underfunding of Czech higher education.

National developments are furthermore projected on Charles University as an institution that must deal with the new policies. Its faculties and other constituent parts are very diverse. On one hand, the University is based on the principle that the procedures and tools for the development of educational and scientific activities and related activities must be applied first within its constituent parts, and therefore endeavors to preserve and develop their internal cultures and traditions. On the other hand, external factors have been slowly changing its internal governance due to the requirements placed on it by the state authorities.

Therefore, Charles University can be used as a case study to demonstrate the model of Humboldt higher education governance into which the elements of NPM have been incorporated, and can serve as
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Global Challenges and Trends of University Governance Structures
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Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Belgium
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ABSTRACT

This chapter tries to identify the different trends in university governance and their underlying causes. Although it focuses on university trends in Europe, it makes reference to global trends and causes, such as digitalization, inter-connectivity of our societies, and growing international competition. In sum, the chapter argues that the digital evolution has led both to a changed approach to teaching as well as to growing global competition in the race to obtain the best talent. This, in combination with a generation that has a growing access to higher education and that thrives on “instant knowledge-satisfaction,” has led to university governance changes that better fit current needs. Government-led austerity programs have further accelerated these changes, as universities seek to optimize their financing whilst, at the same time, striving to move up the international rankings. University governance trends include a professionalization of management, the creation of international excellence networks, and the establishment of interdisciplinary but specialized schools.

INTRODUCTION

Universities are often referred to as one of the oldest structures in the world, with it being commonly recognized that the first universities (as we know them today) were establish around the 11th Century. It would, however, be ill sighted to suppose that university structures had not changed at all over the past millennium. Already at the outset, the structure and mission of medieval universities differed: whereas the universities in Germany, France, and England were self-regulated (through “an independent corporation of scholars”) (Scott, 2006), universities in Spain and Italy were created by royalty or government.
to serve the needs of the state (Pryds & Darleen, 2000). It would also be unwise to compare a society with merely 27 universities worldwide to today’s reality with more than 26,000 universities\(^2\). Even if we only go back one hundred years, scholars in the UK, the US, and in continental Europe agree that, by and large, three particular stages can be identified in the development of universities and university structures in the past century, with a fourth one emerging\(^3\). A first stage is the pre-war stage of ‘old school’ universities that are in most cases self-regulated and self-financed; a second stage is the post-war period that was marked by a democratization of higher education and a proliferation of government-subsidized universities alongside private initiatives; and a third stage started in the 1980s following financial crises and austerity programs on the part of governments, urging universities to rethink their funding (and their spending) and subsequently their (management) structure. We argue that a fourth stage has begun to emerge since the beginning of the new millennium, induced by digitalization and globalization. Contrary to the first three stages, which were largely triggered by government policy, restructuring in this fourth stage is mainly the result of global and technical (r)evolutions.

Therefore, to state that “Universities are old, long term institutions that have persisted through many different regimes, contexts and situations before”, as Oxford professor Chris Rowley declared in the Financial Times on 3 January 2017\(^4\), is ignoring the different changes that have occurred over the past centuries. These changes have even accelerated in the past few decades. Rowley also stated that “Brexit should [in this context] be taken as just another example. Indeed, research obviously occurred pre-EU membership.”

Critics of current trends in university governance indeed tend to look back to a utopian traditional model that ‘always existed’, but the evidence suggests that the internal balances were always to a considerable extent contingent on external conditions and fluctuated accordingly (Shattock, 2017).

**BACKGROUND**

**The Higher Education Landscape in the World**

It is a truism to say that we are living in exciting times. The world is changing dramatically and rapidly. Not only do geopolitical changes transform the world order, there are also technological revolutions that strengthen globalization and challenge many old business models. As a result of this, universities are now true international players that have become more competitive – and this amidst austerity programs around the world that envisage university’s public financing. There are also the global problems that need a deep understanding of what is going on and what can be done. All of these trends force universities around the world to reinvent themselves – not only content-wise but also structurally.

**Technological Evolutions**

Without a doubt, widespread digitalization and global access to information through the internet and social media have contributed to a true globalization of universities. The universitas magistrorum et scholarium has never been as ‘universal’ as today. Spurred by governmental and supra-national initiatives with regard to student and staff exchange (e.g. the Erasmus, Erasmus Mundus and Erasmus+ programs of the EU, and the very idea behind the Bologna reforms, but also the widespread Study Abroad programs in the US and the growing initiatives of the Chinese Scholarship Council in mainland China), universi-
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Academic Leadership Skills: Managing Teams and Conflict Management

Melita Kovacevic
University of Zagreb, Croatia

ABSTRACT

Academic leadership shares many features with any other kind of leadership, but at the same time, it is unique due to the specific features of academia and the way in which the system functions. Academia and the university setting consist of members among whom many have the same academic status and comparable levels of achievement. Although there is universal recognition of the relevance of leadership, not enough attention has been focused on ways in which academic leadership could be enhanced. In particular, the question of how someone’s individual style of academic leadership is related to their capability to manage teams and conflicts remains unanswered. This chapter outlines academic leadership skills that have been observed from the perspective of the European academic context and looks at major ways in which teams are managed and conflicts are resolved, particularly in academic settings. Different strategies of conflict management are presented, and rationale for the employment of focused training courses and the sharing of experiences among leaders are provided.

INTRODUCTION

Higher education systems have been undergoing many changes for more than twenty years. The need for change in higher education has been recognized worldwide and regardless of the fact that educational systems differ considerably both within Europe and from continent to continent, many similar challenges have been identified (Vukasovic et al., 2012). Universities live and perform today in a new social (and economic) context (Sursock & Smidt, 2010). Societal changes have been both rapid and intense, including geopolitical turnovers. Technological development, especially in the field of information technology, has happened in a way that no one could have predicted it a few decades ago. Humankind has been faced with a tremendous expansion of information together with the explosion of digitalization. All of these changes have led to an overall effect of globalization, frequently overshadowed by economic crisis. In
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turn, this new context has required more profound and intense changes within academia (Rumbley, Helms, McGill Peterson, & Altbach, 2014). University autonomy and academic freedom, as well as university accountability became crucial for future development and sustainability of universities. At the same time, it has been observed the governmental tendency to interfere and to be more involved in university life via different mechanisms such as funding, national rankings, or stimulating institutional merging processes (Bennetot Pruvot, & Estermann, 2017). Only appropriate academic leadership, skillful and well prepared, could address all the challenges in changed political and societal contexts in Europe and worldwide. In principle, today, university governance must adapt to a very complex and demanding environment with very different expectations than it was a decade or two ago.

The number of higher education institutions has increased significantly across the world and at the same time, the number of students is still growing. The mass education movement has presented universities and other types of higher education institutions with a new agenda. At the same time, the role of research has been intensified, and researchers and academic staff have been facing new demands for good quality research. Even though many countries have coped with economic crisis, particularly in the first decade of this century, overall research funding has increased on one hand, while on the other, more and more demands have been placed on the recipients of funding (Altbach, 2004). The process of internationalization has been another big area of change. Internationalization has intensified and many universities put special effort into defining their strategic planning in order to enhance their international visibility.

In this new scenario of academic institutions, many new questions have emerged, directing university leaders to act differently than their predecessors. Are universities ready for all those changes? Who is responsible to set up a new agenda for universities? Do universities have sufficient human resources to develop and implement all those changes? The question was also whether the existing academic staff could respond to new requirements? Who should be the agents of change?

Regardless of the fact that many higher education institutions are faced with a decision: to choose between change management and change leadership – they have to choose an approach that might lead to institutional development and appropriate institutional adjustments to a new context. University leaders were inevitably placed in a new situation, the very demanding context of managing and governing higher education institutions.

Higher education institutions recognized their frequent need for change management. Although they were managing change, it became crucial for them to be led by leaders that were capable of change. In general, Management serves to organize and coordinate activities relevant to the achievement of defined objectives. Kotter (2012) defined change management as a set of basic tools or structures intended to keep a change effort under control with the goal of minimizing the destruction and negative impact of the change, while change leadership consists of driving forces, visions, and processes that fuel large-scale transformations. Such a leadership would assure faster performance and more efficiency in the implementation of large-scale changes, and it would be characterized by big visions and would be capable of empowering large groups of people (for more see Kelly, 2010).

Academic teamwork and conflict management are in the focus of this chapter due to their relevance for leadership positions. Leaders prepared adequately for a teamwork and conflict management are empowered and more efficient in their positions (for more see e.g. Black, 2015). Research pointed to importance of teamwork, addressing causes of conflict, effective management and personal skills to manage teamwork within specific academic context. Good academic leadership capable of supporting positive team dynamics and communication is a prerequisite for changed academic environment.
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ABSTRACT

Challenges of modern society require universities to be able to respond to the new challenges and offer innovative teaching and learning for the new generations. The changes and modernization of universities require competences of academic leaders for sound university governance as well as comprehensive leadership skills. The literature and practices show that capacity building for academic leaders is highly needed as academic leaders often operate based on experience or contextual norms while showing a lack of a broad understanding of university governance and the necessary skills for their roles. This chapter investigates the perspectives of both European and Chinese university staff members regarding the areas of capacity building that are needed for middle-level and top-level academic leaders. The results provide us with a deeper understanding regarding the priorities for capacity building in order to enhance academic leadership. The findings also offer an understanding of capacity building of academic leadership in both the European and Chinese higher education contexts.
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INTRODUCTION

Over the last decades, higher education institutions (HEIs) have encountered unprecedentedly changing internal and external environments that fuel serious alterations at individual, institutional, and national levels. The commodification of higher education (HE) with the rise of neo-liberalism (Altbach & Knight, 2007; Zomer & Benneworth, 2011), reduced state funding, increased accountability, excessive privatization and marketization, transition to knowledge-society, and the emergence of new competitors (Rich, 2006; Scott, Coates, & Anderson, 2008) are the major challenges that indicate the complexity and instability in the operational environments of HEIs. These challenges, in turn, tend to define the governance structures of universities with managerial characteristics rather than collegial one (Macfarlane, 2005; Yielder & Codling, 2004). New managerialism perspective, furthermore, has increased the importance placed on entrepreneurial activities (Mercer, 2009) and seeking alternative ways of doing things with a particular emphasis on efficiency and effectiveness and setting up new forms of organizations (Deem, 2001). Additionally, HEIs have turned out to be more complex and professionalized, which, in turn, has caused a shift in the demands for leadership skills from academic to more administrative ones (Waught Jr., 2003).

Although many scholars hold the view that managerialism underpins the current governing practices in the modern universities, the distinctive values and the features of HEIs reduce its viability in this context. Specifically, Middlehurst and Elton (1992) emphasized collegiality, individual autonomy, academic freedom, and trust-based relationships as the distinctive values of HEIs while self-governance, self-regulation, and self-directedness go hand in hand with these values (Thomson, Constantineau, & Fallis, 2005). The mutual influence of these idiosyncratic characteristics and the pressures of the external environment, indeed, cause universities to have plural and fluid identities that call for academic leaders to utilize several perspectives because using only the corporate management skills alone is not considered functional (Winter, 2009). Although the contribution of business leadership practices and management models on the academic operations has already been recognized, it is strictly underlined that the leaders should harmonize the qualifications needed for business organizations and the ones truly unique to academic context and its distinctive ethos (Ramsden, 1998; Reponen, 1999; Davies, Hides, & Casey, 2001).

Higher Education, indeed, is one of the most typical contexts in which the paradox between management and academic leadership is witnessed very often and this makes leadership training a critical issue for academic leaders (ALs) to develop role-relevant skills and demonstrate more effective leadership (Yielder, 2004). However, due to the fact that academics majorly start out on their career paths with faculty positions and head towards administrative roles, they are generally not trained with the intention to promote leaders, which causes role-relevant preparation, particularly for unit-level positions, turns to be an on-the-job training depending on trial and error (Gmelch, 2000; 2002; Strathe & Wilson, 2006).

The issue of university governance and academic leadership also hold merit for Chinese and European universities as an area for cooperation to enhance their competitive capacity and accompanying mutual benefits (Cai, 2013a; Cai & Hölttä, 2014). Chinese HE context constitutes an interesting case across the world given the political and collegial contradictions emanate from its dual system in HE governance and the unprecedented developments in HE in terms of student numbers enrolled and strikingly high performance and quality of the universities, visible in the world rankings (Huang, 2015). Although this duality in the university governance and resulting political intrusion on university operations have been stressed to hamper further developments in some Chinese universities (Cai & Yan, 2017; Salmi, 2011),
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ABSTRACT
Higher education systems throughout the world are mostly based on the institutions and values of the Western education system. World university ranking systems, quality assurance mechanisms, assessment frameworks, promotion, and evaluation systems are universalized. Many universities in developing countries have now joined these ranking systems and introduced vigorous faculty promotion criteria to create world-class universities. Research reveals that those who publish in predatory journals are mostly young and inexperienced researchers from developing countries. China and Turkey are among the countries frequently associated with predatory journals and related academic corruption schemes. In this chapter, both regulations and discourses that shape the institutional cultures in these two countries that are in close cooperation with the EU regarding higher education are examined. It is concluded that there is a global diffusion of rules and values, and national identity construction processes influence actual practices.
INTRODUCTION

Higher education systems throughout the world are largely modeled on the institutions and values of the Western education system. While the rules and regulations are of universal applicability, actual practices vary according to the local ecosystems of higher education depending on the given contexts. University ranking systems across countries and regions have been gradually centralized through ranking agencies like Quacquarelli Symonds (QS), Times Higher Education or Shanghai; and quality assurance, assessment frameworks, promotion and evaluation systems become increasingly universalized. Many universities in developing countries have now joined these ranking systems and introduced rigorous faculty promotion criteria in the ambition to create world-class universities and attract international students. Ranking systems mainly evaluate institutional research outcomes.

As negative side effect is that the structural changes of promotion criteria in those countries have created loopholes and “side industries” that primarily serve to increase publication rates. Research reveals that those who publish in predatory journals are mostly young and inexperienced researchers from developing countries (Beall, 2016; Xia et al., 2015). Experts have also detected several systematic fraud attempts in the recent past (e.g. Beall, 2016; Normile, 2017). Research-related academic integrity is a code of ethics that upholds honesty with regards to the ownership and authenticity of data and ideas used in scientific publications.

China and Turkey are among the countries frequently associated with predatory journals and related academic corruption schemes. While the fraud schemes are similar in these two cases, the ways China and Turkey fight against it differ. Higher education institutions and central supervisory agencies in China crack down on fraudulent networks altogether, while their Turkish counterparts only investigate individual cases. This chapter examines the differences in official and public attitudes towards academic pollution in China and Turkey. The research on centralized institutional responses to research-related academic corruption is based on comparative case study approach using the method of difference. The method of difference inquires factors that lead to different outcomes in otherwise similar case studies.

There are many dimensions of internationalization of higher education such as teaching and academic governance that academic integrity is a concern. The reason why this chapter focuses solely on academic integrity in research is that institutional research outcomes weigh significantly more than other factors in the university ranking systems and therefore academic fraudulence in this pillar of higher education affects internationalization practices directly.

Since a longitudinal dataset on the academic corruption and the legal and administrative action taken against them is not available in neither of the selected cases, a causal argument regarding the effectiveness of the intervention by the central state cannot be tested at this point. The purpose of this study, therefore, is to describe the difference in institutional responses in two otherwise similar cases and analyze the reasons behind this difference.

For this purpose, this chapter is divided into three sections. The first section outlines the similarities in the higher education environment in China and Turkey. We look at both regulations and discourses that shape the institutional cultures in these two countries that are in close cooperation with the EU regarding higher education are examined. The next section offers prominent cases of academic dishonesty in China and Turkey. While the cases used in this work are far from being exhaustive, their widespread coverage in media shapes the debates on academic integrity in these two countries both in domestic and international public sphere. The final section discusses the reasons behind the difference in institutional
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ABSTRACT

NOVA School of Business and Economics (NOVA SBE) identified the opportunity to complement the training of the best language universities in China to bring Chinese students with basic fluency in Portuguese to Universidade NOVA de Lisboa (UNL). They would be trained in Economics and Management at NOVA SBE and complement their Portuguese language studies at the School of Social Sciences and Humanities (FCSH-UNL) obtaining at the end a joint degree from UNL. After a lobby from the university leadership, the Portuguese Government eventually recognized this degree focused on its unique characteristics, namely (1) a Portuguese university as a means to cooperate with Chinese institutions to achieve their strategic goals in Africa and LATAM, (2) multidisciplinary cooperation putting together social sciences and business and economics, and (3) a potential internationalization cooperation for the Portuguese and Chinese HEI’s markets far beyond the simple exchange of students.

INTRODUCTION

This paper is a case study about how the economic value of a teaching language can stress the role of Universities in the development of international relations through curriculum restructuring and offering of programs that fill a gap in the market. In particular we call the attention to the role of the academic leadership in identifying that opportunity and fighting for its implementation when facing the political regulation.
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As a story-telling document, this paper cannot – and should not - be seen as a traditional academic article. If that was the case, it would have been written in the context of the intersection of several different areas of knowledge, namely higher education studies (curriculum design), academic leadership, cross-cultural management, international business, and international relations. In that case, this paper would have been written in a completely different setting, using an adequate research methodology, a proper literature review that would put the problem into its theoretical context and would provide a lot of possible insights for further research.

However this was not the intended goal of this piece. This article simply reflects a case study based on the experimental implementation of a pedagogical program led by a very pragmatic need of European and Chinese institutions. As such, the suggestions for further research are self-contained in the text, to be analyzed by the experts in these different fields.

**STRAIGHTLY POSITIONING A BUSINESS SCHOOL**

Around 2010, Nova School of Business and Economics (Nova SBE) was concerned in developing a meaningful international strategic positioning. In the very competitive landscape of Business Schools, Nova SBE has had the chance of claiming its South Atlantic Triangle Strategy, based on the fact that it was the top Business School in the only European country with simultaneous cultural links with both sides of the South Atlantic (the three vertices of an imaginary triangle): Latin America (with a strong emphasis in Portuguese-speaking Brazil) and Sub-Saharan Africa (with a strong focus in Angola and Mozambique, the two leading Portuguese speaking countries in the continent). These cultural links are reflected in strong business educational connections with the strongest institutions in those countries.

When compared with the main European players this strategic positioning based on the Portuguese language would provide a very distinctive feature, non-replicable by Schools in any other European country. However, something was missing in the competitive higher education landscape. At that point in time most of the main global players were already well established in the Asian continent, with a particular focus in India and, in particular, in China.

The Chinese market has been seen as the most promising market for recruiting higher education students from the perspective of international universities, especially for the USA, UK and Australia who would carry a very strong brand image associated to the Anglophone educational system. The reason was not only for the excellent level of the top trained Chinese students, but also because of (1) the significant Chinese market volume; (2) the limited capacity of absorption by local top Universities; (3) the growth levels of the Chinese economy in the last decades, and (4) the obvious need of increasing levels of qualified people in the near future in order to sustain such economic growth.

The fact is that most of the main Chinese recruitment hubs were filled of very tough competition among most foreign Universities, including all main European countries such as France, Italy, Spain, Sweden and others. The perception that Nova SBE had at that time was that it was arriving too late to find its own niche in that market. The challenge posed to Nova SBE was to find a creative and different way to enter that market, in a way that could be hardly replicated by any other foreign University.
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ABSTRACT

In recent years, professional mobility opportunities for university staff and students enshrined within various initiatives have been an effective tool in increasing the international visibility of universities. Activities such as participation in EU sponsored programs (mainly Erasmus-MUNDUS followed by ERASMUS+) as well as opportunities provided by national agencies like the China Scholarship Council, Polish National Academic Exchange Agency, and relevant schemes in other EU member states are perceived as perfect tools for turning ideas into reality. Aside from the scientific profits collected by the beneficiaries, opportunities for academic mobility serve as eye-openers, triggering new ideas and solutions based on good practices and experience. The purpose of this chapter is to study the background, practices, and effects of cooperation between China and the EU. It argues that the process of accelerating mobility cooperation between universities in China and Europe should not only start from people mobility but also from project mobility and policy mobility.
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INTRODUCTION

Following the rapid development of economic globalization, people with high-level talent from all countries are now exchanging and learning across a range of fields, including politics, economic, and technology. The development of a country’s overall education level and the accumulation of high-quality talent are important prerequisites for the comprehensive development of social economy and culture. Higher education can only meet the challenges of economic globalization by going international and cultivating talent with a global vision capable of displaying such talent on the international stage. To adapt to the growing trend for contact and exchanges in the future, countries generally attach great importance to strengthening the internationalization of education. International exchanges and cooperation between Chinese and European universities provide a platform for further convergence and the mutual influence of different cultural backgrounds and values. This provides an effective way to enhance scientific and technological development, cultural communication, and the exchange of talent between countries. International cooperation between colleges and universities refers not only to the exchange of higher education across borders, ethnic groups, and cultures but also the exchange of advanced science and technology and high-level talent. Chinese universities have been heavily involved in such cooperation. By the end of 2015, the Central Government of China issued an “Overall Plan for the Overall Development of First-class Universities and First-class Disciplines” (The Charlesworth Group, 2017), which stipulated that international exchanges and cooperation will be promoted, and that substantive cooperation with first-class universities and academic institutions across the world will be strengthened. All Chinese universities are now actively participating in the strategy of “The Double First-class”. Thus, the transnational and trans-regional flow of students, academics, and staff has become the modern norm in Chinese higher education. Increasing mobility and cooperation is also an important policy goal for many European countries. The European Commission (EC) stated that the international mobility of students and staff was one of the primary ways to elevate the position of European higher education in the world (EC, 2013). The European Commission’s Erasmus program plays a key role in this task, offering convenience and subsidizing overseas study experience for more than 250,000 students each year (EC, 2014a). Additionally, the new Erasmus program covering the 2014-2020 budget preparation period, the so-called Erasmus+, aims to “double the current number of participants” (EC, 2011).

The world of higher education is changing and the world in which higher education plays an important role is also changing. The international dimension of higher education is becoming ever more important, complex, and confusing. International mobility for short or longer periods is perceived as an important tool in achieving university and local community internationalization, which is an obvious must in the current globalized world (Jonkers & Tijssen, 2008). Internationalization is also an important index by which the educational quality of universities can be measured and a fundamental feature of the world’s first-class universities (Deem, Mok, & Lucas, 2008; Gao, 2018; Olcay & Bulu, 2017). It has therefore become a central issue for European and Chinese HEIs willing to achieve ambitious goals, especially to promote the bi-directional mobility of students, academics, and other staff such as international and management staff (Altbach, 2015; Liu & Metcalfe, 2016; Yang, 2016). However, universities in China and Europe are deeply rooted in the society, history, and culture in which they have developed, and this has given rise to unique school traditions and styles (Wagenaar, Gilpin, & Beneitone, 2015). Therefore, the challenges facing colleges and universities arise from external environmental factors as well as the expectations associated with the internal interests of the university (Liu, 2015). Although institutional
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