

FUTURE OF HIGHER EDUCATION - BOLOGNA PROCESS RESEARCHERS' CONFERENCE (FOHE-BPRC), THIRD EDITION

27 – 29 November 2017, Bucharest, Romania

Session 5: Financing and Governance

Efficiency of Universities: Drivers, Enablers and Limitations, *Veronika Kupriyanova, Thomas Estermann (European Universities Association – EUA), Norbert Sabic (Central European University, Hungary)*

Supported by qualitative and quantitative data collected under the USTREAM project (Universities for Strategic, Efficient and Autonomous Management, co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the EU) in 2016-2017, this paper explores theoretical and practical approaches to efficiency and investigates system-level and institutional factors that affect it. It presents a multifaceted approach to efficiency based on three levels (system, sector and institutional) and dimensions of efficiency (operational efficiency, academic efficiency and efficiency through strategic governance). This framework is operationalised by analysing institutional trends and practices in efficiency and effectiveness. Leadership commitment, institutional autonomy and staff engagement are found to be among the key enablers of efficiency, whereas institutional reluctance to change, financial constraints for investment into efficiency programmes (e.g. technology and staff training) as well as concerns over quality are among the most common barriers. Efficiency measures are found to have both tangible and intangible outcomes in the short and long term, which could, however, be limited in terms of their replicability and measurability.

University governance: autonomy, structures and inclusiveness, *Enora Bennetot Pruvot, Thomas Estermann (European Universities Association – EUA)*

University governance is a field that has been frequently described as undergoing important transformation in the past decades. The spread of new public management approaches has been said to challenge traditional collegial decision-making in higher education institutions, themselves called to adapt to rising demands and fulfil new missions. In the framework of the 2017 update of the Autonomy Scorecard, EUA tracked and assessed university autonomy in four dimensions (governance and organisational matters; finances; staffing; academic matters). With regard to organisational autonomy, the Scorecard focuses on the capacity to define the leadership model, the composition and structure of the governance, internal academic structures and the creation of legal entities. Rich data was collected on the specific features of each system's university governance model, including the size and composition of governing bodies as well as the distribution of responsibilities between them. In this paper, we propose an overview of the current state of play of university governance in Europe, covering over 20 higher education systems, and an account of the main trends and recent evolutions in the field. Particular attention is devoted to the observed shifts in terms of power distribution and representation of the different university constituencies in the governing structure (students, academic and non-academic staff, external members). The paper exposes the level of autonomy that universities in Europe have today to actually configure their governance model in line with their

missions and with societal expectations, focusing on the evolving relationship between universities and public authorities in this area.

Interconnected Dimensions of University Autonomy in Europe, *Kata Orosz (Central European University, Hungary)*

University autonomy is a multi-dimensional concept. As previous studies have demonstrated, European universities have high levels of autonomy in some dimensions, but their autonomy is more limited in other dimensions. The European University Association (EUA) defines four dimensions of university autonomy: organizational autonomy, financial autonomy, staffing autonomy, and academic autonomy. This paper uses statistical analyses to investigate whether these four dimensions of university autonomy are interconnected. Findings suggest that there is an overall lack of prominent, linear relationships among these dimensions, with the exception of staffing autonomy and academic autonomy, which are significantly positively linked to each other.

The effect of trust on the governance of higher education: the case study of the introduction of chancellor system in the Hungarian higher education, *Gergely Kováts (Corvinus University of Budapest)*

The paper tries to outline the answer to the question of how the level of trust affects the operation of the higher education sector. Trust plays a vital role in the cooperation of social actors. Different theories explain differently the benefits of trust. High level of trust reduces the transaction costs of supervision (institutional economics), increases the predictability and reduces complexity (system theory), increases the ability to adapt to the changing environment (institutional sociology) and autonomy also requires a certain level of trust (critical management).

In the study, I am going to analyse the introduction of the chancellor system into Hungarian higher education from the point of view of trust. How the level of trust affects the success of introduction of this particular governance mechanism on one hand, and how the introduction of the new system affects the level of trust on the other.

Performance agreements in higher education: a new approach to higher education funding, *Ben Jongbloed, Frans Kaiser, Frans van Vught, Don Westerheijden (Center for Higher Education Policy Studies (CHEPS), Netheralnds)*

Increasingly governments have introduced elements of performance in the funding mechanisms for their higher education institutions. One particular development is the rise of Performance Agreements (PAs), which are contracts signed between funding authorities and individual universities or colleges. The key characteristics of the PAs in place in several OECD countries are summarized before turning to the Netherlands, where an experiment with PAs was recently (2016) concluded.

The question is whether this experiment improved performance in the higher education system, where 'performance' is understood in terms of the students' graduation rates, the quality of teaching and learning and the diversity in the provision of education and research. What has been achieved in these areas? And what can be learned from the Dutch performance agreements experiment in general?

Policy learning in Higher Education and universities' governance. A case study of the 2008-2016 policy cycle in Romania, Adrian Curaj, Cosmin Holeab (*National University of Political Science and Public Administration, Romania*)

The aim of this paper is to present a comprehensive analysis of HE governance features and trends in Romania both at systemic and HEIs level. Attempting to explain the impact of national policies in terms of shaping HEIs governance principles, the paper focuses on strategic capacity building in HEIs while framing a policy learning cycle marked by systemic foresight (2008-2011), external institutional evaluation (2012-2014) and recently redesigned strategic plans of universities (2016).

We analyse the redesigned institutional strategies of Romanian universities in relation to the strategic vision for the Romanian HE system (2011) and the systemic evaluation report (2014) by employing a complex semantic methodology based on blending semantic and network analysis that enables the combined operation of complex parametric and non-parametric models, such as structural and loose semantic algorithms together with mathematical and statistical algorithms for dynamic visualisation of data. Subsequently, we elaborate on the analytical relevance of the proposed semantic methodology for policy analysis.

Substantiating the current governance principles of Romanian HEIs in the systemic context, we endeavour to expand the current investigative focus and broaden the dialogue on impact assessment and lessons learned in HE (governance and policy implementation).

National higher education monitoring systems and their synergies with the national quality assurance models, Asnate Kažoka (*Higher Education Quality Agency, Latvia*)

The article looks at the concept of “monitoring” in higher education. The author describes the national higher education approaches to monitoring and analyses the role of the national quality assurance agencies in it with detailed examples of the three Baltic countries – Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. Specifically, the article explores the different systems for data collection and monitoring and also the impact of these systems on the quality assurance procedures. The author provides policy recommendations on how to collect and use the available data effectively. The article gives an insight in how to create a national framework for informed decision-making in higher education with the help of quality assurance agency and without affecting its autonomy. The article is based on the research and analyses performed for establishing the national higher education quality monitoring system in Latvia.

The impact of the Bologna Process on the governance of higher education systems in Eastern Partnership countries, Nicolae Toderas, Ana-Maria Stavaru (*National University of Political Studies and Public Administration, Bucharest*)

In spite of the fact that internal evolutions within Eastern Partnership countries have been slow, their participation in EHEA has led to spillover effects such as strengthening the culture of quality in HE, increasing the use of deliberative policy-making instruments or fostering public accountability. In this context, it is necessary to evaluate the impact of the Bologna Process in terms of structural changes in the governance of their higher education systems. A first question is how did the processes of systemic change occur and how ample were they? In order to answer this question, a cross-country comparison is used. The second research question is how can Eastern Partnership countries be empowered from the perspective of the normative power of EHEA in order to make the processes of consolidating the governance of higher education systems irreversible? Discussing this issue is necessary from the perspective of the efficiency and sustainability of the processes of change, as well as that of supporting institutional convergence.