

The Transformation of University Governance in Central and Eastern Europe: its Antecedents and Consequences



Prof. Dr. Liudvika Leisyte
Budapest, 28 January, 2015
Central European Cooperation Conference

International trends in Higher Education

- Move towards university differentiation and global competition
- Innovation imperatives, technological change and blurring structural boundaries
- Expansion and diversification of higher education and decrease in public funding
- A shift from input to output control and towards deregulation in public sectors
- Demographic developments
- Europeanisation of higher education
- New Public Management - deliberate changes to the structures and processes of public sector organizations with the objective of getting them (in some sense) to perform better.” (Pollitt & Bouckaert 2000:17)

Sweeping changes in higher education policy

- Competition has been reshaping higher education governance in European universities partly due to national demands or transnational pressures (Bleiklie, Enders, Lepori, & Musselin, 2011; Bleiklie, Musselin, & Amaral, 2008).
- Significant university transformation in European countries (CHEPS consortium, 2010; Estermann & Nokkala, 2009; Kehm & Lanzendorf, 2006).
- The complexity of the governance reforms cover: formal structures, management, financing, quality control and evaluation, human resources, course planning, access and internationalization.
- Given different backgrounds and political realities, countries have developed their 'own versions' of the very same 'management movement' (Kettl, 2005).

Common features of HE systems heritage in CEE

- 1) a high level of integration between higher education and research and the economic planning process,
- 2) separation of teaching and research – universities dealing with teaching versus Academies of Science carrying out research in their institutes,
- 3) highly politicized higher education and research sectors,
- 4) entirely state funded higher education and research with students paying no fees (Hüfner, 1995, p. 31).

HE Governance mechanisms and institutional logics (Leisyte, 2014)

	Logic of Quasi-Markets	Academic Logic
Academic self-governance	Low	High
Competition for resources	High	Low
Managerial self-governance	High	Low/Medium
State regulation	Low	Low/Medium
Stakeholder guidance	High	Medium

Academic Self-Governance since 1990s

- Professors have been in powerful positions
- Traditional collegial decision-making structures were prevalent in CEE universities in the 1990s
- Rather strong ASG with high degree of autonomy since 1990s
- Academic appointments are overseen by peers
- Academics participate in national peer review procedures distributing research funding and evaluating study programmes
- The Academy of Science in some countries retained its power on the research institutes and is distributor of research funds
- Differences can be noted between Humboldtian tradition countries and Napoleonic tradition countries as well as uneven implementation of the socialist type of higher education model (Leisyte, 2014)

Competition for resources since 1990s

- Competition for students has increased (also demographic changes)
- Privatization of higher education (private HEIs)
- Changing financing models towards performance-based research funding
- Research evaluation systems introduced (Dobbins & Leisyte 2013; Tillet, 1995, Kwiek 2013, Sadlak 1995)

Managerial self-governance

- A shift to more centralization of decision-making at universities since 2000
- The regulatory frameworks have empowered university management to act in strategic dimensions
- The university boards were established and share the powers regarding strategic directions of institutions
- However, fragmented universities persist (Zgaga et al. 2013) - resistance to centralisation

State regulation

- The deregulation of the 1990s
- In 2000 – the state has intervened towards regulating quality assurance, of study programmes, performance in terms of research as well as number of students. Tighter control tradition countries saw a turn towards control via monitoring
- The role of the state has been redefined towards more steering at a distance instead of direct state control, the role of the Ministries of Education and Science as well as Academies of Sciences have become more steering at a distance
- The control is more result-oriented and based on accountability (Zgaga et al. 2013, Leisyte and Dee, 2012)
- Path dependence in terms of bureaucratic and procedural control and the modus operandi of HE institutions

Stakeholder guidance

- Since 1990s external stakeholders have gained power via participation in university boards (from industry, business, other public organizations)
- Needs of employers, skills of graduates and openness of universities to societies are more emphasized
- Stakeholders have a say in regular quality assurance processes
- The power of employers in governance bodies has increased (Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Slovakia) (Westerheijden et al. 2013)
- The power of university boards with external stakeholders is lower in the countries with Humboldtian tradition
- Professional Associations are important in quality related issues of study programmes

Two logics prevalent in two time periods in CEE HE systems

- 1990-2000 – restoration of academic freedom and university autonomy (a shift towards academic logic)
- 2000-2013 consolidation of universities in CEE countries and asserting themselves in the European higher education arena (a shift towards quasi-market logic)
- Academic logic prevails when it comes to micro level change dynamics

LITHUANIA



Lithuanian HE in 1990s

- Expansion of HE
- Bologna signatory country in 1999
- Quality Assurance System: SKVC
- Low funding of HE and low HR capacity
- The role of foreign programmes/donors – Eurofaculty, the World Bank, Nordic programmes, DAAD, Fulbright, Muskie, Soros Foundation
- Changed HE entrance procedures
- Opening HE to private sector in 1998
- The changed status of the Academy of Sciences in 1991 – 29 independent state research institutes
- Low number of publications, especially in English
- A strong role of professional communities

Managerial self-governance in 2005

- The Senate is the supreme authority for strategic questions in universities
- Function of the University Rector – elected from university professors by the Senate - general governance, “hostage of academics” (Daujotis, et al. 2002)
- Poor conditions to strengthen university leadership and management and to streamline their decision-making processes – elections and lack of managerial capacity (Leisyte 2002, Zelvys 2002, World Bank 2003)

In 2005 stakeholder involvement was rather low

- Limited role of community and business in decision-making process at universities: limited rights in university Boards of observation and protection, more rights in college Boards, they elect the Director
- Academic mistrust in the capacities of stakeholder guidance from academic community
- Active interest in HE matters of stakeholders is expressed through other means of communication and participation, also active role in non-university sector

Competition in HE 2005

- Little competition among universities in terms of specific types of students, staff
- Competition in terms of research funding appearing due to funding formula incentives, due to government and business research contracts, and possibilities of the EU structural funding
- Third-stream income is emerging at some universities
- Lithuania is performed poorly in advancing its innovation system

The Law on HE and Science 2009

Addresses:

- principles of quality assurance in higher education and research;
- restructuring of higher education and research institutions;
- management of higher education and research institutions and accountability;
- rights and duties of the academic staff, research staff and students of higher education and research institutions;
- funding of higher education and research;
- use and disposal of the assets of state higher education institutions.

Main trends in HE in 2003-2013

- Monitoring increased via new actors emerging at the supra-institutional level (not only SKVC, but also MOSTA – which uses strongly quantitative measures when it comes to institutional review, which was strongly opposed by some institutions)
- SKVC performed institutional reviews have played a role in professionalizing internal quality management systems
- Different HE institutional landscape: reorganization in internal governance and mergers of institutes.
- Academic salaries and working conditions remain strong impeding factors for attracting research talent from abroad (Leisyte, 2013)

HE governance in Lithuania in 2013 – towards quasi-market logic

- State regulation getting stronger
- Decreased academic self-governance
- Increased stakeholder guidance
- Increased national competition for resources
- Significantly strengthened managerial self-governance



Conclusion

- The role of the state in steering HE in CEE countries has been redefined
- Quasi-market logic and NPM mechanisms are stronger present in CEE countries
- Path-dependencies are visible in regard to academic self-governance and state control – thus quite some differences between the mixes of logics as well as the concrete dynamics of governance mechanisms across the CEE countries
- Further systematic comparative research needed in this area



Thank you for your attention

- It is suggested that the institutional norms of governing academic work
- at universities are thus changing whereby the academic logic guiding
- academic self-regulation, which encompasses professional and institutional
- autonomy, is being challenged by a different type of quasi-market
- logic which may lead to a very different environment for academic
- work, thus encompassing mixed logics (Greenwood et al. 2010, Thornton
- and Ocasio, 2008).