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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-government 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.
Foreword

Professor John Taylor
Department of Educational Research
Lancaster University, UK

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 unprecedented 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), Antonio 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 Svetlik 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 Zayim-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 Zayim-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.

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.
Preface

Understanding University Governance and Academic Leadership in China and the EU
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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.

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 Universiteit 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 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 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 & 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.
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