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0. Foreword

TEMPUS Output Programme (TOP)

TOP was launched in Summer 1995 by the European Training Foundation (ETF) at the request of the European Commission. The aim is to maximise the added value of Tempus through analysis and dissemination of the achievements of the programme. The initial phase of TOP resulted in a number of analytical studies, which are available on request:

- Impact of Tempus on Institutional Management
- University - Enterprise Cooperation
- Tempus Student Mobility
- Impact of the Changes in Higher Education on the National Reform
- Assistance and Cooperation - Mutual Benefits of Tempus Project Partnership

The second phase of TOP, of which this handbook is part, concentrates on disseminating the experience which has been made by over 1000 Tempus projects that have been supported since 1990. The following handbooks have been prepared in cooperation with expert organisations:

- Tempus Outputs: Sustainability through Dissemination
- University-Enterprise Cooperation
- Institutional Management of Universities

The handbooks will be complemented by seminars in the partner countries, which are intended to assist the universities in the areas which represent strategic challenges for higher education in the years to come.

---

1 For further information please refer to the ETF or the National Tempus Offices.
Purpose and Use of the Handbook

Origins
The preparation of this Handbook was inspired by the TEMPUS Outputs Promotion (TOP) site visit. The programme found that the quality of TEMPUS activities was affected by the way higher education institutions in Central and Eastern Europe were managed. Conversely, the pursuit of TEMPUS projects has led to changes in institutional management, in two special respects. The first has been the development in some institutions of short and medium-term strategic planning, so that TEMPUS activities can be located within future institutional developments. The second concerns the recognition of the impact of general decision-making and carefully planned processes on academic programmes within a small part of the university structure. In the PHARE countries at least, the programme also showed that reforms resulted in enough independence within institutions for their leaders to justify pro-active approaches to decisions regarding their establishments and their relationship with society.

At times, TEMPUS programmes were a catalyst for change. However, because of their novelty, they also created tensions between those involved and others, in an institutional context where change was slow. Conflicts between TEMPUS needs, standard operating procedures and bureaucratic cultural norms were also sometimes evident.

A major focus of TEMPUS projects over the next few years will be on university management. The development of the EU SOCRATES programme by the European Commission requires participating institutions to prepare formal strategies within which their specific projects can operate.

Aims and Target Audience
The purpose of this Handbook is thus to help those professionally responsible for the planning and management of higher education institutions in Central and Eastern European countries to consider different ways of approaching this task. It is also
intended to encourage them to think constructively about the individual and institutional input and strategies that might be involved in the process. Hopefully, wider circulation of lessons learnt from the TEMPUS projects will encourage both reconsideration of how institutions are led and managed, and their improved adaptation to future needs.

Potentially, the Handbook is addressed to all who work within higher education institutions, since all, to some extent, exercise management and leadership responsibilities. However, it is expected that it will be of greatest interest to senior and middle management most closely involved in broader institutional policy-making and strategy - everywhere in Europe, but more so in PHARE or TACIS countries.

It is also anticipated that it will be especially useful if individual readers are able to share and develop its content and ideas with others facing similar responsibilities. In this spirit, the Handbook is intended as a background document to a series of seminars planned and run by national TEMPUS offices as part of a dissemination process. However, its collective use is obviously not limited to that venture alone. On the contrary, it should be adaptable to other academic group meetings of staff from higher education institutions almost anywhere. Thus, it is hoped that case-studies will be published later to illustrate the whole process.

Structure and Approach

The chapters of the Handbook move in a logical sequence from concepts to analysis, including a few activities, then on to decision and action and, finally, quality review. Most chapters include models, check-lists, and highlighted questions, while tools provided in three appendices support some of the proposed analyses. Yet the Handbook is not meant to be comprehensive. While its main points can probably be covered in a day, it should normally be suited also to piecemeal study, to meet the needs and time at the disposal of individual readers.

There is no glossary of terms. Key expressions such as “strategy”, “leadership”, “management” and “quality” are
explained as they are introduced. For the sake of simplicity, a few shorthand words have been adopted. In most instances, therefore, “university” means any “higher education institution”, “rector” stands for the “academic chief executive” of an institution (notwithstanding titles of similar rank like “principal” or “director”), and “secretary-general” designates its “chief administrative officer” (in many cases called a “registrar”).

Bibliography and Authorship

While most suggestions for further reading in the bibliography on p.88 come from the English-speaking world, every attempt has been made to identify texts with content and messages transferable to the region of Central and Eastern Europe. Further suggestions as to appropriate sources known to readers would be most welcome.

The text of this Handbook has been prepared by the lead expert to the project, Professor Ian McNay, Head of the Centre for Higher Education Management, Anglia Polytechnic University, U. K. He has been supported by a project advisory team involving two other experts, Professor Janina Jozwiak (Poland), Rector of the Warsaw School of Economics, and Professor Jaak Aaviksoo (Estonia) former minister of education, and Pro-Rector of the University of Tartu, as well as the following representatives of sponsoring bodies:

Sami Kanaan, CRE (project contractor), Geneva
Judit Safrany, TEMPUS Department, European Training Foundation, Torino
Attila Hilbert, Hungarian TEMPUS Office, Budapest
Kari Hypponen, Consultant, IMHE Programme, OECD, Paris
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1. Introduction

The Need for Strategy

In the view of the Handbook project team, a deliberately devised pro-active approach to the planning and management of universities and other higher education institutions is vital. Such an approach may conveniently be termed “strategic”. However, not everyone agrees with this. It is often claimed that rational control of policy is unrealistic because the best plans can be upset by uncertain factors, sudden emergencies or major political events, including war. Clearly, under pressures of this kind, there are limits to what strategic management can achieve. Yet, this Handbook begins in the belief that, even where circumstances are testing in the extreme, management will be better if based on a strategy. Neither does strategic planning rule out speed or flexibility. On the contrary, its purpose is to enable a more effective flexible response to external factors and agencies, particularly government, whose political weight can affect the higher education scene. Furthermore, agreement on the need for strategic planning in a university is liable to empower all its staff to operate and take decisions with due regard for changing circumstances. If so, higher education institutions will probably be more enterprising on their own behalf in the pursuit of excellence, rather than responding passively to external forces.
The importance of these outside influences should not be underestimated. From a representative sample, it is obvious that good strategic management has to take them all into account. At Government or State level, there is always the likelihood of new educational legislation including, in many countries, the possibility of reduced funding, curriculum restructuring and the introduction of novel qualifications, as well as the founding of new institutions or reorganization of those already in existence. Other government decisions may be prompted by economic factors capable, however, of affecting university management in their own right. This applies to the emerging private sector for higher education, changing expectations among employers regarding graduates, or new labour market trends stimulated, above all, by the growth (or disappearance) of opportunities associated with the spread of information technology (IT). Further types of factor with a marked influence on university management are more social in nature. Examples are lower birth rates and, with them, ageing populations and the growth of international business and academic mobility. Finally, over and above its labour market implications, IT seems to have an almost self-contained impact on the world of higher education, given its potential for innovation in the world of teaching and research, through multimedia applications, distance education and similar developments. PEST (for political, economic, social and technological) is a useful acronym for remembering these four major categories! However, in recent years, much discussion and many initiatives have also been subsumed under a concern for “quality”, an elusive notion with different meanings for different interests, but convertible nonetheless into political forces for change. And behind all these, of course, come the parochial matters most seemingly within the grasp of institutional management, like questions of campus property ownership, trends in student course preferences and so forth.

The present Handbook will have served its purpose if it helps higher education management to build the possibility of all such influences and changes into its planning and policy-making in advance, rather than being led by them after the event. At its simplest, “higher education management” refers mainly to the staff categories shown above the level of the dotted line to the right of the rectangle in Fig. 1.
Yet aspects of management at lower staff levels should not be forgotten. Teachers have to plan, organize and deliver courses in their subject, while supporting students and managing their own professional and personal priorities. Junior administrators play a significant part in running university services. And, as their careers progress, both are likely to become responsible for increasingly large groups of staff. But it is with the broad institutional management and responsibility exercised at or close to the top of Fig. 1 that the present Handbook is primarily concerned.

The nature of strategy
Besides representing a systematic pro-active approach to management, **strategic thinking** may also **limit the effects of uncertainty**. Here, identification of trends or events that seem almost inevitable is accompanied by an attempt to assess the probability of others less easy to predict. Although lacking the precision of pure quantitative data, both considerations are then fed into decision-making activity.

Strategic thinking is about both what is done and how. For the daily internal management of institutions, this will be reflected in their attractiveness as places of work, their structure and organization, the effectiveness of communication within them, the commitment of their staff to common goals and their capacity for change. Ideally, staff will take pride in a sense of belonging, in their involvement in decisions about their work and its broader implications.

Strategic management is thus a many-sided concept comprising a mix of **principles**, policies, processes, plans, priorities and, above all, people. Principles represent the core values of institutions, their sense of identity and broader purpose. They are the major platform for **policies** which inform the **processes** of decision-making to arrive at agreement on **plans** and, within them, **priorities**, all of which mobilise and affect **people** (staff, students, their parents, prospective employers, or others in the wider academic world of teaching and research and the community at large).

The sense of certainty with which plans can be made will vary from one institution, issue, set of individuals or time to the next. Yet, whatever the circumstances, successful universities should be seeking to master rather than follow change. For many, indeed, this may be the best hope of avoiding constant crisis, outside control, stressful insecurity, lack of coherence, chaos or even closure. Adoption of a strategy may ultimately be about nothing less than survival!
2. Leadership and management

The concept of leadership

For universities in periods of transition, the role of their leaders has emerged as crucial. The arrival of a new rector has provided not only an opportunity for change, but an impetus to the process and a direction to policy. Equally, the loss of a rector, or the departure from elected office of other key post holders at times creates a loss of momentum. For this reason, leadership should not come from only one person. Policies and processes need to be institutionalised.

One small organization known to the project team had the same leader for over 15 years. When he left, staff found they could not take decisions, resolve conflicts or set priorities because all these tasks had been the responsibility of one man. There was no basic leadership infrastructure to support them.

This suggests the need for shared collective leadership. In universities in the Netherlands, a board of three people together carry corporate responsibility, each with a priority focus. The roles of senior staff, and members of so-called strategic management teams (SMT) will be examined in due course. But as mentioned in the introduction (Fig. 1), aspects of leadership and management may be exercised by many people at all levels of university activity.

Leaders are important in providing links between both the past and the future, and between the university itself and the external world, as illustrated in Fig. 2.1

![Figure 2.1](image-url)
As the two influences of environmental change and the traditions and identities of the past merge, they become a platform for future options: staff values and norms may change, new activities started and new relationships developed. What leaders do is interpret both factors, attaching more or less weight to each, so that the direction into the future is determined by firm deliberate choices rather than submission to external forces.

Asked to say whom they think have been good leaders and what made them so, many people will name figures from politics or the military, with the leader as hero. Terms such as “visionary”, “charismatic”, or “strong” are applied to such personalities. Given more time, the same respondents may cite leaders who have changed the way people think. Some have been little known inspirational teachers who nonetheless changed the lives of many people. Finally come those whose main leadership thrust has been organising for achievement. It takes little imagination to identify personalities from all three categories in the recent history of Central and Eastern Europe.

At the very simplest level, these three key qualities can be depicted in a triangle.

![Figure 2.2: Components of Leadership](image)

Some people combine all three elements to a marked extent and, again, examples will come quickly to mind. Peter the Great and Napoleon both reorganised the way the State was structured and sponsored education. If such attributes are considered essential, one may either seek one individual who possesses them in combination, or others who possess them collectively and should
work together. This matter will be reconsidered in our subsequent discussion of the difference between leadership and management.

However, the way leaders define their own role is crucial. Three possible ways in which they may direct their efforts are the following:

- **strategically** with a broad sense of vision and the path to its achievement;

- **climatically**, focusing on the organization as a place of work, rather than on its tasks – what it is like rather than what it should do. Here the aim is to create a climate in which people perform to their best, though what this implies will depend on the leader’s view of what motivates staff. Where some may need autonomy and self-determination, others may need a firm hand to guide them; yet others may seek extrinsic rewards and incentives, rather than the intrinsic satisfaction of controlling a job and doing it well.

- **specific leadership**, in which a single sub-set of activities is taken on as a personal responsibility. Thus a prime minister may also choose to be foreign minister, while a rector may become dean of a ‘problem’ faculty to get it through a crisis.

Two kinds of new leader, “transformational” and “transactional”, may also be identified. **Transformational leaders** rely on inspiration, tending to be charismatic individuals who command a strong response, whether of loyalty or resistance. They have a clear vision of the world, often strongly ideological or value-oriented, and of the right strategy to adopt. They can be challenging, disruptive, exciting and, in the commercial world, raise individual and collective performance. In universities, they may well inspire confidence in a crisis if radical change and someone to lead it are viewed as essential. Such leaders will be especially alive to the external environment factors of Fig. 2.1 as the basis for a firm break with past patterns of behaviour. The risk of such an approach is that it may verge on tyranny. However, there are signs that transformational leaders need a long time in their jobs to achieve radical changes in their organisations. If they leave an internally diverse institution, with a tradition of distributed
power, too soon, old attitudes and ways may reassert themselves.

Transactional leaders try to work more with their inheritance, in dialogue and a search for consensus with colleagues. Rather than introducing sweeping changes, they move in easy stages, seeking to gain acceptance rather than dominate. They are also more likely to emphasise the educational angle of leadership. This approach too carries its risks. Change may not be quick enough to respond satisfactorily to demands from the external environment (again Fig. 2.1). Consensus itself is hard to achieve, and regular consultation may be interpreted as indecisiveness.

While, therefore, the way how to find leaders in higher education can vary, in most universities in Central and Eastern Europe, rectors are elected by and from their academic staff. In Finland, any runner-up in the election becomes vice-rector. In Estonia, the elected rector appoints other members of his strategic management team, except the secretary-general who has a special status, providing administrative continuity even though the academic leaders may change. This again raises issues about the personality of a good leader. Only a good academic may be accepted as a leader, whether rector, dean or department head. Yet specialist academics and researchers who often test and refine their data alone over long periods, may be not be suited to organisational leadership or management. So the factors that make people popular with electors may not be those making for an effective rector. Furthermore, someone who may later return to colleagues on an equal footing after a temporary period as their boss, may be unwilling to take tough decisions affecting them. Indeed, such decisions may be deferred endlessly if successive temporary leaders refuse to face up to them.

There are counter arguments. Leaders who are appointed (rather than elected) may derive authority from above without being accorded full authority from below, from those they are meant to lead. Leaders from outside may take time to adjust to their new surroundings, or suffer ‘cultural rejection’ when they try to transfer their previous experience to the new context. Alternatively, they may feel uncomfortable on finding out more about their new institution than they learnt at the outset.
Participants in the Budapest test seminar stressed how the expectations of leaders differed, depending on the institution. Large, comprehensive universities in the Humboldtian tradition were not the same as those with a professional and vocational specialisation for which a more directive style might be acceptable. Smaller institutions able to adopt a personal approach would often differ from larger ones where leadership was more widely spread and systematised. Disciplinary allegiance was yet another possible factor. Expectations regarding leadership expressed by teachers of engineering were not always the same as those of lecturers in economics, or education.

Asked about the qualities they expected of their leaders, the views of university staff differed from those of staff in business and industry questioned about their own management. In Table 2.1, the list on the left (column A) was collected in a survey of universities, while the right-hand list (column B) comes from details provided to applicants for commercial and industrial management posts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A (universities)</th>
<th>B (business and industry)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td>Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humour</td>
<td>Energetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisiveness</td>
<td>Ambition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>Intelligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compassion</td>
<td>Creativity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imagination</td>
<td>Forcefulness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foresight</td>
<td>Business-orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calmness</td>
<td>Self-confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedication</td>
<td>Good communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity</td>
<td>An analytical mind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patience</td>
<td>Decisiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stamina</td>
<td>Persuasiveness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1 ‘Desirable’ leadership characteristics
Returning, however, to the basic role of leaders, three main tasks may be added to the inspiration/education/organization triangle of Fig. 2.2.

**A leader should:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Set goals to establish</th>
<th>vision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build commitment through</td>
<td>communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>negotiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>inspiration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide support to</td>
<td>resource and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reward change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following is a longer list of challenges:

- Search for opportunities
- Strengthen others
- Experiment and take risks
- Set an example
- Consider the future
- Plan small wins
- Enlist others
- Recognise individual contributions
- Foster collaboration
- Celebrate accomplishments

**Do you, and your leaders, do all these, particularly in the second group related to recognising, resourcing and rewarding others?** Leaders, or those affected by their decisions, should ask whether they (or their leaders) perform all these roles, and particularly those listed immediately above which are more concerned with recognising, resourcing and rewarding others. Leaders need followers, but followers need to get something out of the relationship too. Leaders who neglect them may find they are alone.
Leadership and management

Although “leadership” and “management” are closely related concepts, it may be helpful to separate them. Four key contrasts may be represented in each of two angles of the Fig. 2.2 triangle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership</th>
<th>Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>Complexity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision and direction</td>
<td>Planning and budgeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aligning people</td>
<td>Organising and staffing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivating and inspiring</td>
<td>Controlling and problem-solving</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to this representation, leadership tends to affect the way people think and feel, where management is about action and what they do. Leaders have plans (sometimes grand plans) whereas managers have to get them organized.

Writers on leadership may sometimes be over-negative towards managers in order to emphasise the distinction. Often, ‘creative maintenance’, or doing things better without doing them very differently is highly preferable to disruptive change. University leaders have often failed by submitting to pressures for change from politicians who, for political rather than educational reasons, want to be remembered for something spectacular.

The following five levels of management are suggested within a general definition of “getting things done through other people”:

1. Basic task - doing it;
2. Supervision - making sure it is done;
3. Troubleshooting - coping with problems that stop it being done;
4. Integration - linking several things together;
5. Innovation - doing new things.

Higher orders of activity involve elements of leadership. One key difficulty encountered in our work with university leaders and managers has been getting them to concentrate on these higher order elements. In one university, the executive team led on policy, but also wanted to control implementation and headed several administrative units. Instead of being delegated, the supervision and troubleshooting involved in the third activity drove out the time needed to construct a vision and listen to the views of others. This issue is raised to highlight the distinction between
leadership and management, and to help leaders consider whether they are doing things that reduce the effort invested in leadership!

The following suggested requirements of a good manager have been drawn mainly from observation of higher education, and particularly administrative and service unit management.

- Experience
- Commitment to excellence
- Efficiency
- Ethical sense
- Empathy
- A sense of equity
- Enthusiasm
- Equanimity

Each of these factors needs a balanced approach. Managers can bring much prior experience to their handling of an issue, but also run the risk of importing solutions that are inappropriate in the new context (for example, U.S. models often fail in eastern Europe because of cultural differences). Experience can also be a platform for resistance (“we tried that fourteen years ago, and it didn’t work”).

Similar questions apply to the other items in the list. Is the efficiency of managers enhanced by delegation to overburdened subordinates? Does empathy risk being too one-sided? Is enthusiasm shared or misplaced, perhaps for technological reasons? If the manager is enthusiastic enough to work late, is it reasonable to expect others to do the same? Excellence needs resources which may not be available and perfectionism can be inefficient. Ethics are essential but should not mean a maze of rules or self-righteous condemnation. Equity does not mean uniformity - people can be treated fairly but differently, too. And equanimity, or calmness, fine at times, may inhibit expression of a justifiable sense of urgency.

So each person will require an approach liable to differ depending on context, or the individual. It is useful to think of managing people in four ways, with various degrees of directiveness and supportiveness as in Fig. 2.3.
Figure 2.3 Approaches to management

The first approach, quadrant A, may consist in testing the collaborator: "go and do this, and this". The risk is that, if this continues and is applied indiscriminately, the atmosphere may become like that of an army or even a prison!

In quadrant B, the training, educative function of managers comes in: "go and do this and this. You might consult this book about the first task; for the second take it in the following steps and be careful about factors x and y. Come to see me if you have problems".

In quadrant C, the supervisor and staff manager become more like counsellors. The initiative about contact moves to staff members as they become clearer about what they should do and confident about doing it. They take more responsibility and seek support when they need it.

There are some who claim that quadrant D represents maturity in management - the need for supervision, monitoring, control has disappeared because collaborators can manage themselves. Perhaps. But there will be times when they need guidance (quadrant C) and when, with new duties, or changes in operations, such as using IT for teaching, they will need further training (quadrant B). There is also a risk in quadrant D that the manager will abdicate responsibility and, perhaps to be an absentee or reclusive manager, claim that the staff member should be mature enough to self-manage.
The best academic managers are not like that. This treatment of management concludes with the following list of expectations staff have of their heads of department:

- concern for individual and collective staff interests;
- establishment of a smooth operational framework;
- establishment of standards and controls;
- management of the financial position of department, the means for its survival;
- decisiveness, flexibility and consultation;
- knowledge and understanding of staff activities;
- confidence and competence in performing their role;
- ability to give balanced considered advice;
- accessibility;
- ability to ensure communication flow;
- ability to ensure an equitable distribution of duties.

Issues of styles and strategies for leadership and management will be considered in due course.

**Leadership and planning**

In our work on leadership, “having a vision of the desired future” repeatedly came through as a major characteristic of leaders. However, the vision then has to be made a reality. In this lies the essence of planning. In Central and Eastern Europe, the term may recall five-year plans with negative associations, which are not what is meant here. Planning has been defined as the continuous and collective exercise of foresight in the integrated process of taking informed decisions affecting the future.
The key terms here are the following:

- **continuous**: planning is not just undertaken every five years, though it may be useful to establish such a period for major review. Plans, however, provide a framework for responding to external changes and need, therefore, to be adapted in response to them;

- **collective**: despite the need for an individual leader to have a clear vision, collectivity too is important because a group process brings a diversity of views and adds richness to the perspective of the future. The involvement of others in developing plans also enhances commitment to their delivery;

- **integrated**: many stress how planning should not be something separate, done only by the 'planning officer'. It needs to be linked to current activity, set within budgetary and personnel processes, and accommodate the decisions of many people. Plans in separate areas - programmes, staff, buildings, students - need to be brought together in a unified whole.

- **informed**: an extraordinary number of decisions are based on inadequate information. Sometimes a leap in the dark is indeed necessary in what may be termed "sensible foolishness". Any decisions about the future involve risks inherent in its uncertainties, so it is reasonable to decide now. While in one way this is foolish in the absence of all the data, it makes sense to plan rationally for the future rather than await it passively. Many decisions can be based on better data. A first priority for many universities and national systems is a better supply of data or, in other words, a better management information system to help process data for the purposes of understanding and building management models.

Finally, the internal versus external pressures on leaders are reconsidered. Fig. 2.4 (below) represents a phased approach to strategic analysis and planning, and the progression from outside to inside the institution. It has proved useful in working with staff
in Central and Eastern Europe, and elsewhere. This work suggests that too little time is spent on the processes in the upper half of the figure, because of the pressure to reach design and delivery decisions. More time spent on analysis will arguably improve the quality of subsequent decisions, and the actions and activities flowing from them. Later chapters of this *Handbook* will thus emphasise strategic rather than operational aspects.

**Figure 2.4 Strategic Activity Planning in Higher Education**
3. The external analysis

To measure the role of political, economic, social and technological change (the four PEST categories of the introduction) on institutional development, universities might invite a small group of their staff experts in social sciences, science and technology to analyse the situation provocatively. However, the four categories must be thought of as interdependent. For example, IT has an impact on many jobs (as in the case of robotics in car manufacture) and, therefore, on unemployment levels. It has also led to a quicker flow of international company information across political boundaries, and affected education through use of satellites to deliver in-company training. A political development prompted at the outset by economic considerations, the EU now has an additional social impact through its provisions on social policy, the Social Chapter and the European Court, in the Maastricht Treaty. Its policies on research, education and training will undoubtedly affect new Member States from Central and Eastern Europe once they join the Union. Small institutional expert groups could explore and develop these and other perceptions of the future in greater detail.

The next stage is to examine the impact of external forces on areas of potential change in universities, and particularly the curriculum, access and participation, resources and structures (CARS). A first step might be to brainstorm, with people asked to complete the sentence “In ten years’ time.............” within each of the four PEST categories. Around 10-15 predictions per category might then be selected for further treatment. The chosen responses may recur, merge into a combined statement, or be judged crucial. Improbable predictions may also be included, so that participants can be asked to assess their likelihood. Responses can then be processed using a points or similar system, rating categories from "strongly disagree" to “strongly agree”.

For a set of items drawn from an international group of university staff across Central and Eastern Europe and the former Community of Independent States, see Appendix 1. We used it to test this material on Hungarian participants at the Budapest
seminar, and their responses are given in the Appendix. It includes a mean percentage probability score (M) and, out of 13 respondents, the numbers of those who strongly disagreed (D) (scoring 1-3) or strongly agreed (A) (scoring 8-10). There are items where collective agreement or disagreement was strong, others where there were divisions of opinion, and others where most people clustered round the middle of “maybe” or, perhaps, “don’t know”. While only 13 people were surveyed, a larger sample would probably show similar spreads of opinion. Some of the statements are about not only a trend but the extent of change (30 per cent increase, steep decline), so the scores may reflect caution about this second aspect. What they do, however, is provide a basis for debate and the exchange of information which may have lain behind the opinions (such as birth rate changes accounting for the apparent conflict between 1 and 4 on the Access listing).

The debate on the initial predictions should result in a second round of ratings and, then, consideration of their implications. For example, in Budapest, one group saw an increase in student choice (83%), greater curricular autonomy for institutions (85%) and more modular courses (87%) as pointing to issues of registration, student records, time-tabling and group organization. The content of the list of items attracted comment too. Some respondents said that all subject areas – not just a few – should be included in the speculative questions on enrolment trends. It seems clear that items will always vary depending on circumstances and the colleagues questioned. Once a list is drawn up, the probability of possible key developments should be assessed. Several possible outcomes – not just one – may then be developed and considered, along with their potential implications for your university.

Of course, how far a university can control its own destiny remains a key issue. In Central and Eastern Europe, central government control over many institutional activities, including the curriculum, staff appointments, student numbers and above all, finance, is still strong despite the signs of change suggested by the CARS analysis. Three prominent forces in the planning of higher education systems, namely State authority, academic
oligarchy and market interaction may be represented in a triangle, like the earlier leadership attributes.

![Figure 3.1](attachment:image.png)

According to this representation, State authority acts both **politically**, through laws and ministerial pronouncements, and **administratively** to control operations via regulations, monitoring, data collection and similar activities. Typical market elements might be student demand for which universities may compete, the demand among employers for graduates, and the job market for academic and other staff, for whom colleges and universities compete with other sectors. The private sector of educational provision in Romania is an example close to this particular angle of the triangle.

No country in Central and Eastern Europe seems close to the academic oligarchy angle, though Czech academics exert a strong influence over legislation, the exclusion of private competitors, and greater curricular autonomy.

Naturally, there is middle ground on all sides. The Ukrainian private sector of higher education gets significant funding for student fees and other facilities from the State, here acting as a customer rather than a controller in the market place. The State may also regulate the private market, making government accreditation of institutions a precondition for their offering courses. The nature of real provision differs in the different countries.
The academic oligarchy also links into market interaction, including private research funding and in-house experience offered by employers to students. Employer representatives may also be members of governing councils or advisory committees. The low salaries of academics in a competitive job market mean that universities allow them to take other jobs or kinds of payment, in order to keep their staff. Many lecturers work in State institutions to secure their pensions, but also in private institutions to earn extra income.

The State and the academic oligarchy also have varied relationships. In some countries, government ministers are recruited from among senior university staff. In the Ukraine, the current minister is on secondment from his post as rector while, in Romania, a former rector is now President of the Republic! Academics on State bodies may advise on science policy and research funding. Quality assurance processes might be organized collectively by higher education institutions themselves, as in the Netherlands. Such arrangements are not always successful. In Poland, there have been complaints about the conservative attitudes of the State Central Council for Higher Education whose members are mainly elected academics.

It seems useful for staff to plot the movement of their State systems among the three corner elements of the triangle. The current situation may be compared with that of 5-10 years ago, and a similar period projected into the future. Institutions can ask how things have changed, how this is apparent, and consider the implications of change.

Five main scenarios from within the triangle of Fig. 3.1, for the planning of educational provision, student numbers and the spending of funds, are as follows:

A. **Government planning**: government is responsible, its control is extensive and institutional autonomy limited.

B. **Intermediate organisations**: responsibility is shouldered by one or shared between several relatively independent intermediate organisations. Their influence is extensive while government control and institutional autonomy are limited.
C. **Governance by incentive**: government uses incentives to steer institutional policy, but bears limited responsibility. Institutional autonomy is considerable.

D. **Increased institutional autonomy**: higher education institutions possess considerable autonomy and prime responsibility. Government oversight is limited to output, quality and cases of extreme inefficiency.

E. **Multi-income and competition model**: independent and publicly-available assessments of teaching and research quality stimulate competition among autonomous institutions. Government assesses output, but is only one of several parties involved in funding higher education.

The apparent general tendency is from A to E, with diverse funding streams reducing the power of any one sponsor, even government, and allowing institutional leaders to develop relationships with many to reduce overall fluctuations. Several institutions now find that income generated in the market place is more secure and stable over the medium-term than government funding. This reduced dependency on government and the need to diversify external relations have significant implications for the role of institutional leaders and managers.

Finally, similar questions arise over the extent of autonomy and where decisions are taken within institutions. In many countries, strong faculties exercise little power at broad institutional level. In such cases, institutional plans may become an appropriate amalgamation of faculty plans within a ‘federal’ system. Internal roles, structures and related processes, therefore, need examination in order to function with optimal impact.
4. The mission and markets of universities

Role and identity

There is no single concept of a university. Throughout the world, universities range from large open institutions based on distance teaching methods and reaching over 100,000 students to small, campus-based establishments. While some will have an international reputation and student body, others will focus on serving their region or municipality. The relative emphasis on research and teaching will vary enormously, as will the academic focus on humanities, sciences or even narrower branches or subjects, such as agriculture, medicine or technology. A key question in the strategic management and planning of an institution is its view of its own identity – its purpose, its relation with society and its style.

How does your own university see itself and its relation with society? What is its purpose and what kind of institution does it want to be?

For example, the Catholic University of Leuven in Belgium states that its activity is conditioned by four central considerations: it is research-led, Catholic, Flemish and international. These elements correspond to a given academic culture, underlying moral values, a bastion of Flemish culture and student opportunity in a bilingual country, and an international outlook.

Although a major activity, teaching is not mentioned but defined in relation to the other four factors. Anglia Polytechnic University in the U.K. says its mission is linked to teaching and student-centred work relevant to professional/applied areas, regional development in East England, and international links in a Europe of the regions.

Four concepts of scholarship useful to universities in considering their self-identity come from the U.S. Carnegie Commission. They are the scholarships of, respectively, discovery (research), transmission (teaching), application (nation-building) and integration.
The record and prospects of universities in these areas are worth considering. As far as research in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe is concerned, there is a history of separate organisations, the Academies. It might thus be asked whether they and the universities should be integrated. Japanese universities which have never been very active in research belie the claim that (university) research is essential to national competitiveness in international markets. The link with private companies is generally significant but varied. While the role of university activity may be threatened by in-company R & D (research and development), there is often a counter-trend of outsourcing by companies to university departments as well. In some countries too - Russia is one – both basic research and R & D have been threatened following acute economic difficulties, pressure on defence R & D, and research that is increasingly marketed.

Furthermore, if research is to solve problems in the real world, it has to be interdisciplinary. Yet universities are often organized into single-discipline departments or chairs, which research groups have had to work across – one reason for the growth of graduate schools with cross-university or cross-faculty structures.

Other trends now lessening this difficulty are linked to the second area noted above, the scholarship of transmission. They include undergraduate joint degrees and multi-subject combinations, not to mention modular systems which were given a very high probability rating by Hungarian participants in the Budapest seminar. The possible threat from such systems is their fragmentation of knowledge – albeit often multidisciplinary knowledge – into small units. In some countries, students choose their modular-based menu without any guidance or curricular device for integrating their acquired knowledge, skills or experience. The continuity of group learning is also disrupted when students working together, break up their team by choosing different modules for their later options.

The other main recent development in the scholarship of transmission is independent off-campus study. When students can receive their basic learning material by post and supplement it through, for example, computerised access to extensive library
resources, the traditional role of teachers and teaching is naturally called into question.

Employers seeking application (the third category of scholarship), may wish to be more involved in defining and delivering the curriculum. Where they are already so involved, their work with employees may be accredited by academic and professional bodies, and many employers are involved in accreditation for professional recognition. Here, once again, universities need to reconsider their identity. In countries with binary systems, or a well-defined technological university sector, one set of institutions may concentrate on a theoretical approach and basic research, the other on practice and problem-solving research. But in Germany and Italy, for example, the first ‘theoretical’ group are under pressure to enhance their relevance.

A key issue for those involved in strategic planning at both institutional and national level, is how to maintain diversity, and to ensure equity of treatment among different concepts of “university” or “higher education”.

In many places, the system of incentives and rewards pushes universities towards a single planning and management model familiar to those in positions of authority. However, it risks imposing provision of higher education suitable for an élite on systems now moving towards mass provision.

**Market fit**

Agreement on the identity and role of a university should be followed by **a review of its internal strengths and weaknesses** related, also, to market threats and opportunities. Weaknesses might concern the age profile of the teaching group, a poor research record, outdated teaching methods, lack of student demand, resistance to change and so on.

The **CARS exercise** in the previous chapter gave some probability ratings for trends and developments, and can also analyse opportunities and threats for the so-called **SWOT analysis** to be discussed in due course.
Naturally, identification of weaknesses is a delicate matter. Many will not be open about potential weaknesses, fearing to ‘betray’ their university. Despite the desirability of presenting a positive image to outsiders, strategic decisions on future investment or responses to hostile funding policies should rely on a more rounded picture. A helpful statistical approach may be developed from a matrix frame to guide decisions based on market analysis and capacity to respond.

Subject area attractiveness (opportunities) are plotted against strengths in the subject area within the university to develop a nine-box matrix of demand and supply.

Examples of factors in each are the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attractiveness/opportunities</th>
<th>University strengths</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Market size</td>
<td>Size of department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market growth rate</td>
<td>Market share</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market diversity</td>
<td>Market position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive structure</td>
<td>Number of applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost structure</td>
<td>Quality of student intake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimal department size</td>
<td>Graduate employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographic trends</td>
<td>Cost per full-time equivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific importance</td>
<td>Reputation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technological trends</td>
<td>Quality and age of staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/political and economic trends</td>
<td>Research record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government attitudes</td>
<td>Research capability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment prospects</td>
<td>Public image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural importance</td>
<td>Publications record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resources: availability and mobility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The final matrix, plotting one column against the other, leads to indicative strategic decisions, as shown in Fig. 4.1 below.
The decisions are not automatic, and may include other factors, such as the cost of withdrawal, political pressure and so on. The quantitative ratings implied by the matrix need to be balanced against qualitative assessments and judgements drawing on other considerations. This approach assumes a fair degree of autonomy within the institution in decision-making, a fairly free market and good data!

If you haven’t got good data, what do you need to know, and how do you find out? The development of such market research has been seen as a major priority with many groups from Central and Eastern Europe. The matrix of Fig. 4.1 reflects a concern for units within institutions and their broad subject area, the main strategy being responsiveness to external changes. In Fig. 4.2, the starting point is internal, looking out to the market.
**Activities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>New</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Client groups</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consolidation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Innovation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extension</strong></td>
<td><strong>Diversification</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.2: Developing the education enterprise

It is normal to suggest that risk increases in this model as you move from top left to bottom right. However, there are also risks in the top left, in “carrying on as we are”.

**What are the main risks, and how might you secure a position within such a strategy?**

The main risks are that the existing client base will change, while the ‘products’ on offer will not. So elements of both extension and innovation may be needed even within this option. Furthermore, competition from others will have to be countered by leadership on either quality or price. Besides being a financial issue, this is also related to the academic ‘price’ for entry (the level of qualifications needed), and the social price (the sacrifices required of students in the light of university demands) and how the university can reduce it. Finally, one can compete by being distinctive from competitors, offering something different or ‘extra’, such as computing facilities, a language option or guaranteed in-company placements, to enhance the ‘product’ in the eyes of students.

The **SWOT matrix** (Strong, Weak, Opportunity, Threat) in Fig. 4.3 also begs some questions.
Figure 4.3: SWOT Analysis

One needs to judge whether a boom period of demand will last, and for how long. If, on the contrary, the signs point to 'bust' (i.e. closure), the importance of this area to the university's identity will have to be assessed? Much the same applies to an area of university service to the region, and judgement as to whether external conditions will improve.

In expanding provision, there may be new demands on staff. Developing graduate work for an existing market of first-degree students will need new skills. The approaches to teaching expected by former students now in mid-career and looking for professional updating are very different from those they accepted as undergraduates. They may also expect more comfortable surroundings.

The following check-list is a useful guide in deciding whether to introduce new activities in universities - a course, for instance.

The four main headings are as follows:

1. **marketability**: Can the new course fit into current delivery systems, and does it imply change in the system? How attractive is it in relation to similar courses in other institutions? Will it draw people away from another course (or courses) already offered by the university, perhaps risking the future of both because neither attracts enough
support, although there would be sufficient demand for one alone? Does it fit coherently into current offerings and make the whole set more attractive?

2. **growth potential.** What are the expectations regarding future demand? Will other universities move to offer similar courses and compete? Will the demand be enough to allow two or three suppliers?

3. **durability.** Is the market stable? If not, can the course be designed to withstand fluctuations? If it is offered only in alternate years, is there another course for staff to work on in the period in-between? Does it appeal only to a core group of students, or can it attract others on a wider base?

4. **productive ability.** Are the resources needed to develop and deliver the course already available? Can specialists be recruited, or existing staff be retrained? Can resources be used from declining areas so that fewer extra resources are needed? How efficient is the cost ratio between development costs, delivery costs and income from delivery? Is the demand sufficient to cover high development costs if delivery leads to economies of scale?

“Competition”, “products”, “price” may be novel terms in higher education, but they are here to stay. Others will compete with low price products and seek to offer something special. If you don’t, you could be in the ‘bust’ quadrant of the SWOT matrix!

**Networking**

Working in a market involves not only competition but strategic collaboration with partners in joint ventures. Universities are no longer ivory towers, if they ever were. They are increasingly open to the communities with which, and within which, they work. Staff have contacts in a range of other organisations and may pursue work jointly with people employed by them. Those responsible for strategic leadership and management may wish to establish a framework for such activity. This can be with other universities in strategic planning for local or regional provision; or international activity to promote curriculum or research development, staff exchange, or study periods abroad; or collaboration with
employers on work placements or joint curriculum planning; or as research sponsors.

Our past work on such different kinds of partnership suggests that the following **factors are essential to network success:**

**Clear mutual benefit:** both partners need to gain something, preferably of equal value, to ensure continuing commitment.

**Good relations, communication, commitment:** there will be progress if the key people like one another, communicate regularly, and have support from someone with authority to get things done.

**Clarity of roles and controls:** it needs to be clear who is doing what and under what conditions.

**Criteria for evaluation, particularly regarding value for money:** the initiative needs resources and should be regularly reviewed against swiftly established criteria related to the aims of the partnership project. The project, in turn, should relate to established policy and plans.

Too many arrangements do not stand up to rigorous cost benefit analysis. Few institutions gained advantage from partnerships because they were confined to individuals or particular units. There was no spread of information, or contact beyond those immediately involved. So, an academic in biology visiting a foreign university, could have no idea of the strong links already existing between his home engineering department and the one abroad. The institutional dimension is often missing.

Five different starting points are suggested for a policy on international relations, depending on the needs defined by institutional policy. Each is a point of access with potential development along the directions of the arrow shown in Fig. 4.4. In cases 1-3, exchange of information may lead to definition of ‘action’ projects, probably with a subset of the original group of members. In Case 4, information from a broad-based student exchange scheme may lead to more intense co-operation among a small group of institutions. Conversely, in Case 5, a small joint project may attract attention from others and lead to a group of peers setting up an association, like the group of European
business schools which recently decided to run a bench-marking quality network.

Figure 4.4: International Networks

Such partnerships are probably best developed ‘bottom-up’ so that progression in, say, research would proceed through stages such as:

- individual encounter;
- exchange of information;
- staff visits/exchanges;
- joint paper(s);
- joint project(s);
• joint proposals for funds;
• joint planning by research groups or departments;
• lateral spread of contacts.

For industrial links there may be similar progression moving, for example, from (information) links with (large) chambers of commerce, industrial associations or professional bodies, to active engagement with a smaller number. Much of this will depend on an entrepreneurial approach by staff, which will need institutional change.

How might your institution need to change, in order to move from a traditional approach to an entrepreneurial one? Our work suggests three key conditions in relation to structures and processes. Institutions must:

• focus on clients and community contracts;
• support staff in a climate of trust;
• empower people to release their entrepreneurial energy.

In our view, such partnerships - and entrepreneurial approaches to clients who become partners - are inevitable and will become a normal part of higher education. If so, strategic leaders must build that inevitability into strategic plans, so that a sense of purpose will not be weakened in what might be termed "mission drift", as partners influence decisions. Clear structures and processes will be the established platform for staff members to pursue their ideas, as they work beyond the university with the outside world.

In terms of the triangle back in Fig 3.1, this represents a move towards a market model. The next chapter will return to this development in its examination of changes to internal cultures.
5. The Internal Inheritance

Four Cultures

We now consider the university as an organization, examining how decisions are taken and managers manage. It makes use of a model based on the degree of central control within a university over policy development and practice - the implementation of policy. From this emerge the four ‘cultures’ shown in Fig. 5.1.

![Diagram of Models of Education Organisations]

This internal model may be related to the earlier treatment of the external context based on the triangle in chapter 3. External expectations may condition the way universities organize themselves to respond.

- collegium/academic oligarchy: here, lecturers or professors in subject-based departments will probably see their main external point of reference as other academics in their subject. Their main influence will be in decisions on research and the
curriculum. They will bring to the debate input from recent publications, or knowledge gained at academic conferences, or ideas from similar departments elsewhere.

- **bureaucracy/state administration**: staff in university administrative offices will be very conscious of matters such as legal requirements, well-defined financial accounting procedures, or the cost formula for cleaning each square metre of floor space! Knowledge of course regulations, or the assessment requirements of validating bodies, will be an important contribution to their relations with collegium academic staff, while their external contacts will include government civil servants.

- **in the corporation**, senior staff, especially the rector, will be sensitive to external policy developments and the views of politicians and opinion leaders in the development of State policy. They may try to influence colleagues by reference to their conversations with such people, and similarly influence others responsible for drafting new laws.

- **the enterprise** will also look outward and be tuned to changes in the **market**, the views of students, or preferences on the part of student or research sponsors. The first two may often be supported by survey research which the academic entrepreneur will exploit in debates on development priorities.

### Management styles and tactics

In each of the four cultures, the context suggests appropriate styles of management. Through a dominant culture, people's relationship with the organization creates expectations as to how leaders and managers will behave. Of course, the 'transformational' leaders discussed in chapter 2 may wish to challenge the prevailing orthodoxy. If not, they may try to achieve their aims by using the expectations of others about leadership.

The **collegial style** epitomises transactional leadership. It assumes staff have an intrinsic commitment to their work and the university. Managers can build on this to establish trust. Individuals are happy for the head of department to decide until they dissent, at which point they want collective decision-making.
The style of managers here entails "walking about" listening, or working informally on a one-to-one or small group basis to gain consensus to be confirmed in a more formal meeting. Their acceptance and legitimacy depend on 'bottom-up' designation – often by election - which is usually the result of their personal academic status. Their recognition as academic leaders allows them to become organisational leaders. They will retain acceptance through good interpersonal skills, accessibility and open-mindedness. Readiness to compromise will be combined with persistence in seeking the best solution. At meetings they will not normally be dominant if they have done their informal work well beforehand.

In the bureaucracy, different skills are needed for meetings. This is a meetings culture, often with a hierarchy of committees meeting in a regular cycle and proceeding sedately through standard business. It is not good in crises! Proceedings are paper-based so the manager needs paper skills, as well as interpersonal skills and knowledge of procedures and precedents. Heads of department will need to prepare papers to convince departmental staff and, perhaps, a different set of documents for faculty or higher levels. Committees also tend to be data-oriented, so good use of available data and control of the information flow are crucial. The same applies to negotiation with the gatekeepers to committee processes - the chairman and the secretary - so that they are briefed and, as far as possible, supportive. Even the choice of where to sit is tactical, if not strategic.

Timing is also important not only within a committee agenda, but in enabling the committee cycle both to digest a proposal and deliver a decision. Are your supporters those who will stay to the end, while your opponents leave? If so, a later placing will be helpful; if the reverse, get in early! The models in chapter 7 on managing change will help identify those whose support may have to be negotiated. (You may need to agree to something they want, in order to get what you want.) Finally, two-stage decisions may be advisable, involving an ‘in principle’ agreement followed by details in a second round. It is harder to resist a definitive proposal after initial agreement, especially if opponents lack the time or determination to prepare an alternative.
Groups, committees and their meetings should not be decried since they can often reach better decisions than individuals. Committees can ensure representative democracy and equitable treatment of all interests. They can, however, try to please everybody, losing time in fruitless debate, or be unable to cut through opposition from well-organized competing sub-groups within their membership. Committees can also be used to avoid, delay or keep back issues from more public debate.

Corporate style managers often prefer to transfer issues from formal committees to small groups of their own designated members. This may be easier if they chair key committees following election or, as is increasingly the case, designation as ex-officio chairperson from within the rectorate. Senior staff in this quadrant are political and tend, therefore, to use:

- patronage
- sanctions
- rewards
- bargaining
- resource control
- manipulation

They are often transformational, charismatic and evangelistic, and tend to keep up a constant momentum of proposals. One Rector known to us was quite happy to have some of his proposals turned down in Senate. He would bring several to each meeting and expect to win some. Those he lost would re-appear several meetings later and, again, some would be approved the second time around so that, eventually, the whole package got through. He was willing to bide his time whilst never losing sight of his long-term goals.

Top managers using corporate approaches have three key advantages as follows:

- they control resource allocation;
- they are involved in key staff appointments;
- they have a major role in interpreting the policy environment.

As a result, they may be able to apply pressures from their power base, suggesting that matters are worse than they are, in order to promote acceptance of crisis measures.
One of the elements bureaucracy and the enterprise culture have in common is the use of data. In bureaucracies, it tends to be general and large-scale; in enterprises, it is focused and particular. There is usually a link to the corporate culture, too, in terms of energetic leadership, and to the collegium via a softer, more personal approach to bargaining than in the corporation.

Managers here tend to work on a record of achievement - of innovation, satisfied clients, income generation and conformity with the mission and image of the university. They will often have a loyal team who inspire confidence through their evident ability and achievement. Also important are presentation skills based on good information from a network of contacts who may be called upon to support proposals, sometimes from outside. Given that rapid decisions are often crucial, there must be trust rather than the slow democracy of the bureaucracy or the politics of the corporation. Trust has to be capable of surviving an occasional disaster in a risk culture in which a long record of success can be undermined by a single error.

Roles and cultures

Besides their link with styles of leadership and management, the four cultures can also relate to a different allocation of tasks, and the interpretation of roles and functions of key personnel. By this is meant the tasks which are part of their job description and the expectations of those who affect – or are affected by - the interpretation of their role.

In the collegium, the Rector tends to be an academic leader concerned mainly with research and teaching, gently guiding other leading academics whilst giving them autonomy in their fields. Often bordering on benevolent paternalism, this is a relaxed role invariably supported by one or more pro-rectors who chair key committees or represent staff members, although the rector may sometimes act as trouble-shooter.

In departments strong in this culture, faculty deans are frequently low-key, acting as co-ordinators rather than controllers. Often, they have a basic role in routines and ceremonials, in chairing
committees, or linking between departments and the rectorate, though strong heads of department may by-pass them.

The secretary-general is also low-key, working behind the scenes, a servant of the community, managing resources and regulations and acting as chief-of-staff to the rector. The administration will be unitary, or at most binary (distinguishing between academic issues and resources management).

In the bureaucracy, the rector becomes a negotiator of consensus, still mainly looking inward, leading policy development through chairmanship of major committees. The pro-rectors may be allocated key policy areas where they will exercise oversight and give advice but only as advisors/policy leaders, not line managers. They will also be ex-officio members of committees outside their core brief, with consequently less time to devote to academic activities.

The deans are similarly likely to be more active with the increase in the role of committees and formal procedures. Although still elected, they will be more pro-active in setting a policy agenda, becoming advocates and mediators on behalf of their faculties. The rise of committees will also boost the committee-related roles of the secretariat. Administrators tend to be more permanent than academics elected to fixed-term office, acquiring a knowledge on which the academics may come to depend. Administrators also write the committee papers, thus conditioning the presentation of policy, the interpretation of situations, and the range of decisions considered.

In the corporation, rectors become chief executives on a model closer to those in commerce and industry. They give internal policy guidance, but are more externally oriented in their role as ambassadors to various community and political interests, particularly as fund-raisers. Their internal interests may be strongly focused on resources - investment, efficiency, cost-benefits - in a broad policy framework. Policy details will be the job of the pro-rectors who may assume line-management responsibility for administrative staff in specialist support units for research, marketing, international links and so forth. Deans may now be appointed, not elected, since they have major budget management responsibilities. They lead and implement sectorial
strategic planning and policy development initiatives. As possible members of any senior management team, they may develop more identity with and accountability to the university as a whole, rather than their faculty.

Administrators may have to be less objective, with the risk of becoming subordinate to the corporate executive. Increasingly, resource administrators achieve equal status to those linked to academic functions. With the development of specialist offices employing highly-paid senior managers, experts will be increasingly recruited from outside higher education, in marketing, finance or public relations - a trend that could lead to clashes of values and approaches as different cultures collide.

A Belarus university recruited a high-flying MBA graduate as a financial specialist who was the second highest-paid staff member. However, he saw his main career elsewhere and developed no loyalty to the university, a risk in such situations. The question for the selection panel is to judge whether the gain from a short-term period with an expert is worth the investment and the resultant organization costs.

In the enterprise culture, the chief executive role of the rector becomes more pronounced. Externally, funding is a main focus, whereas internally, staffing issues may be prominent in terms of promoting quality, innovation, closure of some areas and development of others. The pro-rectors are likely to have more personal executive authority, reporting to committees, not accountable to them. Their job description will be well-defined and developmental, so project leadership is as important as policy leadership in the strategic balance. Deans reflect the rector as mini-chief-executives, running the faculty as a company within a conglomerate chaired by him. They have budget control as a major function, while academic planning reverts to heads of department somewhat like product range managers. For administrators, client service should become prominent. Clients will be both internal and external, so agreed contracts for service delivery may be developed between the finance office and departments, estate management and user/occupiers of space, or computer services and users, and so on. Accurate costing and control of usage are therefore necessary. No university known to us in Europe has achieved this.
Role priorities

It may be useful to ask people who hold governing functions to identify their key priorities, or others to describe their expectations. If so, the comparison can lead to a useful debate about role priorities.

Post holders and others should first identify the activities involved in the job. In contractual terms, these can be operational tasks (“managing the budget”), or concern people (“deciding on promotion recommendations”), policy (“developing longer-term plans”), general climate (“encouraging innovative approaches”, “raising morale”), or quality issues (“dealing with under-performing staff”, “managing problem students”). In terms of approaches, they can be longer term, or facilitative, or involve monitoring or handling problems or crises. For any post, about 30 items may be collected. (See Appendix 2)

Post-holders and others may then be asked to select only 10 items as priorities and put them in order. Comparing the different perceptions leads to useful debate. The lists of 10 can also be used to explore: “is that what you really do? If not, why not?” “Which do you think you do well?” “How do others rate you?”

Questions such as these can then provide a basis for development of the staff involved.

Even where people have the same role, such as dean, or head of department, individuals can differ in the emphases they impart. The emphases demanded by circumstances may also vary. Furthermore, there may be differences in balance between the following:

- internal versus external focus;
- innovation versus maintenance of activities;
- dealing with people versus systems and procedures;
- academic activity and resource issues versus administrative control versus looser co-ordination;
• longer versus shorter term thinking;
• development versus disciplinary approaches to staff and students;
• constantly coping with crisis versus creating a climate for delegation;
• leading versus managing.

The key issues are whether the emphasis is appropriate to circumstances, agreed with others, and explained to staff in the unit, so that they know why someone like a dean acts as (s)he does.

Role problems
The foregoing dilemmas are compounded if other role problems overlie them, such as the following:

• confusion about role boundaries and centres of authority. Many teachers in higher education are uncertain about the limits within which they work and feel insecure when up against them. Clarity here would help confidence and effectiveness because, without them, staff tend to confine what they do to less than might be encouraged.

• overload: too much is expected too often. If people did all the things listed, they would be superhuman or exhausted, and quality would suffer. The latter is more likely. How then are the other functions carried out, and by whom?

• overlap: in testing this material in Budapest, overlap appeared on the lists for rectorates, deans and heads of department. Although this may be justified in that, for example, all develop longer-term plans, their collective roles must be clear. If not, they may be duplicating effort, or better employed doing work elsewhere.

• conflict: there are two elements to this. In the Budapest seminar, again, one group thought that deans should develop plans while heads of department implement them. However, some heads of department assumed both roles, as did some deans, raising the likelihood of demarcation disputes. A
second element concerns dual role designation. For example, in some universities, a faculty dean may also be responsible for, say, university research policy. If faculty staff then bid for research funds, the dean himself would present the case at university level. In our view, this is not, therefore, a recommended structure.

- **control:** who determines what you do? It may well be that the priorities defined in the exercise with the lists at the end of the chapter, are those that should be developed, rather than those that actually operate.

To what extent is what you do initiated and controlled by ‘them’, as distinct from yourself? At a later stage, you may control something initiated by someone else, or you may initiate something that others then control. But how far are you determining your own role? Is this why (in the lists prepared earlier) what you actually do is different from what you should do?

The preceding issue leads to a second set of questions about the balance of activities:

**How far is what you do urgent and important?** If you are constantly doing unimportant things, is this as a result of your choice or that of others? Some periods of lesser intensity may be needed. But if there are too many, are you yourself choosing them, avoiding big issues through lack of confidence or perceived competence, or as a result of stress? If you are constantly doing urgent things, is this because others have given you short notice, because you manage your time badly, or because you have too much to do (overload) and so constantly have deadlines looming? Do you find time for longer-term priorities that are important but not yet urgent? If you are constantly in the important/urgent quadrant, is this good management, doing things just in time as needed? Or are you building up stress?

If any of these apply, then there is a final question. What are you going to do? In our view, you need to be aware of how you do spend your time by analysing a diary kept over a given period. Those causes you have identified can then be properly attacked.
Consent, conflict, conditioning and corruption

Three final points need to be made regarding the model of management cultures. The first is about democratic decision-making and the distribution of power. In the collegium, there is consent until individuals demand a say. In the bureaucracy, there is collective decision-making and representation. In both, power is shared and distributed, whereas in the corporation it is concentrated and centralised. In the enterprise, it is delegated to teams as agents of the corporate enterprise, who pursue specific projects.

There is conflict across the diagonals of the model. The freedoms associated with, say, research, do not fit well with corporate directiveness; nor does the speed of decision required to deal with different clients fit well with the standard operating procedures of the bureaucracy.

Each quadrant, therefore, has to be conditioned by its neighbours to avoid the corruption of a single culture. Although staff in the collegium risk enclosure in an elitist ivory tower, the enterprise should keep them closer to the outside world, and the bureaucracy remind them that they should observe collective rules aimed at promoting equity.

Those in the bureaucracy who risk becoming too tied to systems and standardisation, need to accept that they exist to serve the different activities conducted in the collegium. They also need to recognise the strategic differentials that are built into corporate strategy.

Staff in the corporation who risk isolation need to comply with the democratic process in the committees of the bureaucracy, and act within the environment served by different entrepreneurs. They should not keep to a select band of contacts.

The entrepreneurs who risk ‘mission drift’ should, when taking decisions, recognise the importance of a corporate strategy framework. As they also risk ‘quality drift’, they should not ignore the standards set in the collegium or the new knowledge and understanding created there.
Culture shift

All four cultures discussed above exist in most institutions, although their relative dominance and balance will vary. As each may be appropriate for a different sub-set of activities, all **should** definitely coexist.

In extreme cases, each culture prevails in different areas, with its own separate organisational activities. In one university, research was done in its graduate school centres, while its teaching was done in departments and administered bureaucratically. A university company handled entrepreneurial activities with the rectorate as corporate headquarters of a holding company with three branches. At the Warsaw School of Economics, following the 1990 Higher Education Act, faculties were abolished. Previously, their boards had the legal right to control educational programmes. The Senate took central control of teaching and set up research and staff development units called collegia.

What is the balance in your institution’s culture, and is it changing? The following exercise is suggested to get a sense of the dynamic involved as experience in Central and Eastern Europe has usually been of a shift from corporate bureaucracy towards both enterprise and collegium.

Ask a range of people to allocate 10 points across the four cultures to show the relative weightings of each as they perceive them in their institution. If this is done for three periods, now, five years ago (or before the watershed of change) and their anticipation for five years in the future, the movement observed will probably reflect a rise in the enterprise culture.

This was done during the Budapest test seminar with people from Hungary, Bulgaria and Poland, using a ten-year gap to go back beyond 1989 (though four participants could not, because they were not in their present institutions). The percentage scores were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1987</th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collegium</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporation</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 5.2: Shifts in university management culture**

These are, of course, averages, and some universities tend to have different patterns of change. ‘Traditional’ and ‘technical’ universities might have different initial profiles. The general pattern of increase in the enterprise culture was, however, common. Differences were mainly in the shifting balance of the other three.

**The enterprise culture**

You may wish to consider what the nature of culture implies for structures and processes. You can’t operate as an enterprise if the dominant culture is bureaucratic, so what must change? Is such a model necessarily good?

Participants in the Budapest seminar were asked for ideas on desirable changes. On their list of suggestions, which can be expanded, were the following:

- devolved decision-making;
- market information;
- integrated, well-structured and coded data;
- regional industrial links;
- external members in university decision-making bodies;
- greater involvement of client organisations;
- specialist offices with professional administrators for activities such as marketing and technology transfer;
- new products, including short courses and distance education;
• more students with fewer teachers.

Gains and risks are developing with the growth of market-centred entrepreneurial attitudes in universities. **The gains include the following:**

- **Clients** assume greater prominence, as normally in the case of service industry professionals. As private self-funded students, more of them pay directly for services, bringing maturity and experience to their role as learners in courses for professional updating.

- **Complacency** among academics is challenged - for some not a moment too soon. The same applies to administrators whose specialist knowledge becomes so normal to them that they communicate badly with those to whom it is unfamiliar.

- **Change** may be stimulated by monitoring practical changes to reflect new values and culture, thus deepening the transformation effect. Care is needed so that, in practice, changes are examined rigorously, and either match values and culture, or are accepted as contributions to yet more profound change.

- **Community** links **may** be enhanced, notwithstanding possible selectivity about which sectors of the community are to be targeted.

- **Criticism** about irrelevance may thus be countered or preempted, and **credibility** (re)gained. Entrepreneurial universities are **not** ivory towers;

- **Costs** become the universal concern, which is legitimate in a sector spending public money. Good costing data - a deficiency in many universities - is therefore essential.

There are also **possible risks**, as follows:

- **Curriculum distortion:** an example of this might be sponsored work in international or commercial law, rather than family or administrative law. While this might give an obvious development impetus, it could also lead to differentiated withdrawal in times of cutback.
• **Downgrading of core business**: there have been cases where undergraduate classes were cancelled because rooms were needed to generate income from short courses, or because a lecturer was diverted into teaching for profit. Other real cases have included allocation of inappropriate rooms to mainstream courses to free prestige rooms for priority customers.

• **Compromised standards**: if customers are paying to achieve qualifications which are refused, pressure can be applied by those involved in evaluating lecturers - one cause of grade inflation in the USA. Evidence from the U.K. is that pressure to step up PhD completion rates, from a research council funding studentships, has indeed improved rates but, arguably, at the expense of research quality.

• **Curiosity** is reined in by the need to meet deadlines, so that projects are defined to match them. Instrumental objectives tend to be valued at the expense of expansive exploration.

• **Curtailment of freedom**: despite altruistic statements from sponsors, partnership ventures will lead to conditioned research ambitions and controls over curricular activity. Commercial secrecy regarding published research results can replace the free exchange of knowledge, the traditional hallmark of the academic community.

• **Loss of continuity**: the constant search for new clients may mean that novelty supersedes quality. Present activities may be neglected and time diverted towards the future (as in short-term research funding). If quality is to be achieved, the ratio of planning time to delivery time will be inefficient. No in-depth development is possible where there is constant chopping and changing.

• **Constant change** produces stress and eventual collapse.

• **Control** is dispersed so that the **coherence** of activity may be lost. Potential links may be neglected as competition for funds reduces internal collaboration across unit boundaries.

• **Competition** will be inefficient if many people spend time preparing unsuccessful bids for funds.
6. Policy and planning

Stages in policy development

One message dominates this chapter and the next. The processes of policy development, planning, and management of consequent change need to involve all the constituencies affected. There is normal progression through the successive stages of discussion, decision and delivery. Attempts to accelerate the process endanger the whole effort, as all links are necessary to the chain. The following key questions in strategic planning relate to stages in the development process:

- **Review** - where are we now?
- **Values** - what do we want to be?
- **Goals** - where do we want to go?
- **Strategy** - how do we get there?
- **Targets/tactics** - what do we do next?
- **Monitoring** - who is going to check progress?
- **Evaluation** - what performance measures do we set?

Fig. 6.1 (see below) acts as a reminder of the need for a continuous, informed, decision-making process. Many problems, when ‘solved’, give rise to further problems. The skill lies in making each successive one smaller. Furthermore, many problems are about symptoms, not causes. To deal really effectively with an issue, there is a need to get beyond the background and identify the real problem.

Responsibility

Many policies are developed by different individuals, formal committees and less formal working groups. The list in Fig. 6.2 has been used with senior managers and administrators to explore who is responsible for each stage of policy-making, and who needs to be involved at each stage.
The relationship between statutory committees such as senate and its sub-committees, executive officers such as the rector, and service officers such as the secretary-general is clarified by such considerations. The formal position stated in official documents may not reflect practical reality.
1. Identification - of a need.
2. Exploration/clarification - of issues involved.
3. Collation - of ideas.
4. Preparation - of options.
5. Presentation - of proposal.
6. Determination - of action
7. Communication - of decisions.
8. Interpretation - of intentions/decisions.

Figure 6.2: Stages in the policy-making process and the level of responsibility

Integrated planning
The importance of links between levels in the organization can be illustrated from two examples. The first draws on research work on international policies in universities and particularly networking - activity funded by the European Commission. The research showed that the international contacts developed by individual staff, and the activities they pursued with partners abroad bore little relationship to their university’s stated policy, if there was one. Within most institutions, there was weak vertical integration between policy, plans and practices. Those involved in the last rarely spoke to those involved in the first, and were not often consulted about policy. Where plans existed, there was usually little description or justification of activity contained in them. As a rule, links were not forged into a coherent whole at corporate level or used to transmit general policy guidelines to operational levels. The result was often confusion, with frequent conflict between what was done and statements of what should
be done. Poor lateral links meant that contacts made by one department did not lead to others between the same institutions in different departments.

A second example taken from supervisory activities conducted for one university senior executive team may explain this. Observation of its work and a review of its decisions over a two-year period pointed clearly to the lack of a policy framework to set criteria for decisions in particular cases, such as international twinning with other universities. Although the pro-rector said there was a policy, it remained inoperative as the institutional leadership would not let others take decisions within that framework. Moreover, when the executive team discussed proposals, it ignored the policy, treating each case as if there were no case law.

In the same institution, the secretary-general gave another reason for the gap between policy and practice, namely “the rector’s office sees itself as the policy-maker and deans as those who implement it. If, however, the deans do not speak in favour of the policy in senate, or fail to attend, they refuse to push for its implementation at faculty level”.

For any policy review, therefore, the following questions should be asked:

**Policy:**
- is commitment real?
- is it just rhetoric?
- is it robust?
- is it regulated?

**Plans:**
- are they realistic?
- are they given resources?
- are they related and, if so, vertically or laterally?

**Practice:**
- is it rigorous?
- is it relevant?
- is it regulated?
- is it related?

And, finally, is there any common, collective commitment, consent, or conflict?
Note that a decision is either:
- a commandment, a ban or a permission
- for specific action, toleration or omission
- which is selected out of at least two alternatives.

Also note that decisions are characterised by the fact that they serve:
- to determine individual or common interests and / or assessments and
- to satisfy interests and / or assessments, that are more important for the decision-making person or group than other interests or assessments.

Planning failures
The following factors may explain why plans fail, or why policy does not necessarily become practice. These affect either the policy decision stage (A) or the implementation (B).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Policy decision stage</th>
<th>B. Policy implementation stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Insufficient consideration of wider issues.</em></td>
<td><em>Staff too busy.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Policy lacks clarity.</em></td>
<td><em>Too many issues to handle.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Implementation strategy absent.</em></td>
<td><em>Structures lagging behind decisions.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Differing interpretations by managers.</em></td>
<td><em>Poor communications.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lax implementation and monitoring.</em></td>
<td><em>Lack of status/power.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Policy implementation on-the-run following a review.</em></td>
<td><em>Lack of consultation.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Inconsistency.</em></td>
<td><em>Lack of clear targets for evaluation.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this respect, universities are not unique. Pitfalls in corporate planning in commerce and industry may similarly compromise strategic effectiveness in ways such as the following:
• top managers/leaders may assume they need not be involved in planning can be delegated to a ‘planner’;
• top managers/leaders spend too much time on the demands of the day, neglect longer-term planning and so downgrade it in the perceptions of other staff;
• there is no development of agreed goals as a basis for plans;
• leaders do not involve the managers of major units in collective planning;
• plans, where they exist, are not used to set standards and targets for managers who implement them;
• corporate comprehensive planning is separated from ongoing management;
• the planning process is so formal that it lacks flexibility, restraining staff creativity and innovation;
• plans at departmental level are not reviewed by top managers/leaders, so there is little ‘bottom-up’ input;
• top managers persist in making intuitive decisions which conflict with, or do not reflect, the official, formally agreed plan.

Several of these lessons will be further encountered in the next chapter on managing change. The process of change benefits if policy development has been collaborative and consultative, in a climate conducive to planning and change at various institutional levels.
7. Managing change

Key elements for change
While the purpose of developing policy is to introduce change, however marginal, there are many instances in which attempts to do so have failed. Such failures point to the need for classification of roles among leaders, managers, and those who implement, even where one person may be responsible for all three functions. In our view, when initiating and implementing change:

- leaders make it wanted,
- managers make it happen, and
- academics and ancillary staff make it work.

The latter part of this chapter will return to earlier discussion of the stages required in the life of an institution, to secure the commitment to change needed to bring it about. We start, though, with a story, based on Fig. 7.1

![Figure 7.1: Key elements in change.](image)
A rector in western Europe decided that his university needed to become more entrepreneurial in order to compete within the changing context of higher education and, in particular, to counteract the steady reduction in baseline funding from government. He decided that the way forward was to devolve responsibility for budgets to departmental level so that each department became a mini-business. Although this went well for the first year with a surplus of $400,000, two years later the total deficit exceeded $8 million. Fig. 7.1 helps explain why.

While the strategy may have been right in principle, there was no strategy for implementation along the lines of the list in the previous chapter.

The systems supposed to provide good data on expenditure to heads of department, in their new role as budget managers, were deficient. They recorded invoices received and paid, but not the commitments entered into. Towards the end of the financial year, therefore, they gave an over-optimistic picture of how much money was left to spend, with consequent overspending by heads.

Staff support was lukewarm. Heads of department saw themselves as academic leaders, not resource managers. They received little training to change their attitudes or enhance their aptitudes. Neither did they receive adequate assistance in their new roles. The central finance office felt particularly offended by its marginalization and reacted by concentrating on the (mainly non-academic) areas left to it, leaving department leaders to find their own way through problems.

The structure of the university involved departments of varying size, from a handful of academic staff to those with over forty. Departmental capacity to administer new financial responsibilities therefore varied considerably. In fact, the location of budget responsibilities at faculty level would have been both more efficient and effective.

The diamond might be used to explore other disasters. For example, a different university failed to introduce modular
structures across all courses. An unrealistic deadline for strategy implementation had been set and rigidly maintained, despite emerging evidence of impending disaster. The systems software for student enrolment had not been developed in time so that, at a week’s notice, paper-based processes had to be introduced. Academic staff had not adjusted their approach to teaching to take full account of new curriculum structures, so the ownership of modules in the new structure by units/departments in the old unchanged one confused the situation.

Perhaps, in both cases, a pilot experiment, with systematic support in a selected area, might have been a better approach.

**Processes of change**

![Diagram](image)

**Figure 7.2: A matrix for development and change**
This model of innovation is based on the idea of a link between policy developments - for instance, international involvement - and their organisational form and support.

In quadrant A, levels of activity are low and mainly personal. The issue in question is not high on the institution’s agenda, or a major element in its mission, and there are few, if any, incentives to development. No central expertise or experience exists. Data on trends, opportunities, and existing activities is lacking, and any work done is handled as an exception to a norm with few, if any, specific procedures.

In quadrant B, levels of activity may still be low, but work is well organized and co-ordinated. ‘Niche marketing’ is usual, and is based on a selection of areas for concentrated development appropriate to both institutional objectives and existing staff strengths or potential. Partnership agreements are meaningful: quality is preferred to quantity (many universities have agreements with other institutions which are, at best, dormant and often sterile). Supporting procedures are clear and appropriate.

In quadrant C, there may be lots of activity but it is disjointed. It has developed piecemeal and is of variable quality. It does not relate to any guidance on priorities. Conflict may occur between central units and departments and their staff, as each develops contacts and expects the other to share in delivering on commitments. There may be no linkage, even at a local or devolved level, between initiatives related to matters such as research partnerships and student exchanges in an undergraduate teaching programme.

In quadrant D, the issue has become part of the university’s self-definition, its core identity, and underlies much of its work. There is a good database, regularly updated by a central office well experienced in supporting successful bids and projects, and identifying opportunities relevant to staff interests in good time. Quality, relevance and momentum are maintained by committed investment of staff time and development funds, as well as regular monitoring and review.

Several important points related to this matrix apply both to other developments and internationalisation, as follows:
• although analytically the quadrants are self-contained, in practice, some blurring which does not negate the usefulness of the framework is inevitable;

• it is not claimed that universities ought to be in any particular quadrant. Where they are will depend, amongst other factors, on the strength of external pressures to generate money, the leadership style and priorities of the rector and key internationalists on the staff;

• universities should be able (honestly) to identify their appropriate position on the matrix and derive appropriate conclusions for action;

• most universities will start their international activity in quadrant A. Strong external pressures towards an international entrepreneurial spirit and shaky finances will invariably lead to speedy development, resulting in frequent cutting of corners. Movement to quadrant C is then to be expected;

• where this occurs, universities may remain in C for some time before perhaps moving into quadrant D in which some stability may develop, often as a result of firm leadership;

• if external circumstances are reasonably favourable, movement from A to B is more likely, so that systems may be put in place before planned expansion into D. This is probably a preferred route in an ideal world, but not always possible;

• besides identifying their position in terms of A, B, C or D, universities should also ask where they want to be, and plan the move accordingly;

• because of internal culture, universities may be unable to move out of A or C, while seeming to cope with the ambiguity. Yet whether this coping is apparent at all institutional levels is open to doubt;

• quadrants B and D should not be viewed as an invitation to become rigid or bureaucratic, since this would kill creativity, inspiration and opportunism. A framework should be sought to encourage and channel enterprise and innovation. Systematisation must provide such a framework to sustain
creativity and entrepreneurship, but should stop endless creation of one-off procedures to meet every eventuality. Problem-solving capability is thus a strong element in B and D.

If CARS and SWOT in chapters 3 and 4 convince you of the need for change, the following questions are relevant:

- What needs changing and why?
- What can be changed?
- What can’t be changed?
- What can/should be changed now?
- What should not be changed yet?
- What can I change by myself, within my authority and competence?
- What changes need to involve others?
- How do I get them involved?

The message here is to set priorities. Not everything can be changed at once, and some changes need to be kept on hold.

It is important to know what you should not change because you cannot, or because it works well, or is not urgent.

People subject to change need to be reassured about what will continue. They may then be more willing to explore possibilities where change is considered urgent. University leaders have sometimes given in to external political pressure to change, when deciding to resist would have proved wiser.

The manager who has gone through these processes should then be able to identify strategic objectives for a reasonable planning period: some might be achieved in six months, others over two years or even longer, though with first measures required now. For instance, curricular change may take four or five years to affect graduates, while shifting the age profile of academic staff will require continuous effort over several years.

Change, moreover, has its own momentum. The following four key phases of decision-making in changes of policy echo points made in chapter 6:

1. identification and clarification of the issue;
2. consultation and negotiation over solutions;
3. persuasion and legitimation over proposals;
4. implementation and the subsequent development of routines.

Cases can be cited where rectors have repeatedly tried to go from 1 to 4 too quickly and met resistance. Afterwards, they accepted the need for progression through each of the phases. By then, however, they had wasted time and raised hostility to the proposed change so that each of the phases took longer to complete satisfactorily.

When proposals for change are introduced from the top, it seems advisable to co-opt into the process ‘key opinion leaders’ seen more as part of the general staff than the strategic management team. They act as mediators among the various parties, while seemingly remaining independent of them.

People are the key to change, though there will be other factors, such as the re-design of buildings to accommodate small group teaching; or investment in IT to promote new approaches to learning. Fig. 7.3 shows a simple model. For any change, identify and assess the strength of those forces/people who stand for and against the proposals, Then, try to reduce the forces against and increase those in favour.

![Diagram of pressures for and against change](image)

**Figure 7.3**

How might this be done? It depends on circumstances, but it is possible to suggest which approaches and situations are compatible:
## Table 7.1: Approaches to promoting change

As already suggested, **any change creates insecurity** so there is a limit to how much change people can tolerate. A core of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Situations</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Drawbacks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education + communication</td>
<td>Where there is a lack of information or inaccurate information and analysis</td>
<td>Once persuaded, people will often help with the implementation of the change</td>
<td>Can be very time-consuming if lots of people are involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation + involvement</td>
<td>Where the initiators do not have all the information they need to design the change and where others have considerable power to resist</td>
<td>People who participate will be committed to implementing change, and any relevant information they have will be integrated into the change plan</td>
<td>Can be very time-consuming if participators design an inappropriate change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitation + support</td>
<td>Where people are resisting because of adjustment problems</td>
<td>No other approach work as well with adjustment problems</td>
<td>Can be time-consuming, expensive and still fail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation + agreement</td>
<td>Where someone or some group will clearly lose out in a change, and where that group has considerable power to resist</td>
<td>Sometimes it is a relatively easy way to avoid major resistance</td>
<td>Can be too expensive in many cases if it alerts others to negotiate for compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manipulation + co-optation</td>
<td>Where other tactics will not work, or are too expensive</td>
<td>It can be a relatively quick and inexpensive solution to resistance problems</td>
<td>Can lead to future problems if people fell manipulated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit + implicit coercion</td>
<td>Where speed is essential and the initiators of change possess considerable power</td>
<td>It is speedy, and can overcome any kind of resistance</td>
<td>Can be risky if it leaves people angry with the initiators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As already suggested, **any change creates insecurity** so there is a limit to how much change people can tolerate. A core of
continuity in their work is needed to give them basic security, which then allows them to explore changes in a tolerable margin. If work is part of our identity, changes at work mean abandoning part of ourselves.

External environment

Staff may, therefore, need a counselling approach by their managers to help them move from a secure past to exploring a new future in which things formerly taken for granted have disappeared.

From analysis to action

Anyone who has worked actively with the text up to this point should now be able to identify aspects of likely scenarios of change in their environment and also identify aspects of university activity that need to change in response to them.
This section encourages you to work through an issue concerning change. Out of all the ideas gained from the preceding chapters, we invite you to choose just one proposal for change, and then set objectives corresponding to smaller changes that will contribute to your overall aim.

Each objective will be associated with people liable to be affected by it, or with the power to influence decisions. They can be categorised in two ways as follows:

1) the extent to which they are committed to the proposed change;
2) their influence in the decisions necessary to achieve it.

Those who are strongly positive in both respects are key allies, whereas those who are negative on the first and strong on the second are key targets to try and influence. A list will help you identify gains and losses for them as individuals when exposed to the proposed change, and will form the basis for negotiation. There may also be collective gains (and losses) to highlight in discussions with them as members of the community.

This implies an ‘exchange’ approach to influence. However, there are others. Analysis questionnaires can be used to recognise your preferred style. In that case, the preferences of those you are trying to influence should also be recognised. Each of the attitudes listed below may be appropriate with different people at different times, but each has its dangers:

- **assertiveness** - clarity and firmness in stating your expectations can border on aggression if requirements are repeated or progress checked too frequently. Such an approach can be taken as lack of trust, and might provoke resentment;
- **friendliness** can weaken formal communication of a sense of priority or urgency;
- **reasoning**, despite its benefits, can tend to discount political or emotional factors or, indeed, a rational argument against the proposal. Although the academic world thrives on disputation, it is sometimes resolved over a period much longer than the time available for strategic decision-making;
• **coalition-based pressure** is often useful when trying to influence higher authorities. A collective voice is more likely to command attention, provided it does not appear conspiratorial;

• **sanctions** may sometimes be necessary, though they should be balanced with recognition and rewards. Emphasising the negative may create a climate of anxiety over punishment, reducing creativity and legitimate experimentation - which normally involve risks;

• **bargaining** is fine as long as each partner has what the other wants. It should not lead partners to expect something in exchange for their normal professional activity. Moreover, the counters or currency needed to bargain may not be equally distributed on all sides;

• **upward referral** may be necessary when a person’s authority is limited. Constant use of hierarchy, however, may be interpreted as weakness or inability to exercise such authority as exists.

A decision to change, or to innovate, may require changing people who, again, can be helpfully categorised in two ways, namely the extent to which they are 1) committed to change and 2) capable of it (they may be willing but unable, or vice versa). Again, approaches to influencing people may be relevant. If you are their manager you may be able to use various forms of power, such as those shown below.

- Reward power
- Coercive power
- Legitimate power
- Personal power
- Expert power
- Information power
- Connection power

The meaning of most is obvious. Coercive power is that of the bully, the power to make life miserable for those who do not conform. If exercised by those with legitimate power, through their formally recognised position in a hierarchy, it may prevent their legitimacy being accepted by their subordinates. Expert power is associated with someone acknowledged in the field, whereas information power is more local to institutions and the data needed to influence a decision (like the demand for a particular
course). Naturally, such information may be possessed by administrative experts whose profession is not biology or literature but, for example, marketing in higher education. Connection power is held by gatekeepers to networks of influential decision-makers.

Finally, collective, cultural and personal issues, may have to be dealt with. Changing an organization means more than just changing its people. The concept of the “learning organization” furthers understanding of how change for some organisations will be easier and more productive. The characteristics of such organisations include the following:

- Openness to ideas
- Creative tolerance of dissent
- Recognition of weaknesses
- Support to individual learning
- Willingness to take risks
- Systematic institutional audit
- Rewards for innovation

The pro-forma in Appendix 3 helps you assess these features. A total score of 150 for the 21 questions would, we suggest, be a good ‘pass’ score. In our use of this questionnaire with groups from single universities, only one institution has achieved this, though individual perceptions differ and some people’s scores for the university of their experience would be high, even with a low average.
Success and failure factors

Participants in the Budapest test seminar were asked to think about attempts at change they had experienced, whether successful or unsuccessful. They then reflected on why they had succeeded or not, and shared their analysis of specific real experiences. The reasons they gave for some failures included the following:

- **planning**
  - lack of good preparation;
  - lack of clear roles/tasks;
  - fuzzy objectives;
  - insufficient resources (a constant problem!);
  - slow legislation;

- **resistance**
  - entrenched power of academics who stopped restructuring;
  - lack of staff mobility;
  - resistance from the top preventing decentralisation;
  - inertia because of attachment to the past;
  - abuse of administrative power;

- **motivation**
  - no real expectation that change would succeed;
  - no attempt to motivate those who had to implement proposals;
  - use of instrumental incentives, without mobilising intrinsic commitment;
  - unrealistic expectations regarding speed of change.

In thinking of successful change, and its causal factors, they identified:

- **planning**
  - good analysis, including costs and benefits;
  - filling obvious policy gaps;
- openness about background information and financial constraints;
- identifying good examples as benchmarks to emulate;
- defining the rules for implementation and operational behaviour;

- **process targets**
  - a positive attitude, demonstrating that targets are within reach and not emphasising obstacles;
  - a strong commitment from leaders at the top;
  - keeping up momentum and motivation throughout the process.

- **people**
  - finding the self-motivated and supporting them;
  - working with younger people looking to their own future.

On the strength of the foregoing analysis of the principles and values that underlie the identity of the university, the perceptions of the future, the present position, possible developments, the priorities to pursue and the processes to follow, it is hoped that readers will be prepared to act strategically.
8. Quality management

What is quality?
This chapter of the Handbook focuses on the management of quality, and on how to ensure that performance in all areas discussed up to now becomes increasingly better over time.

The test seminar for the Handbook debated definitions of quality, concluding that it had three main elements:

• the relevance of activities to the social, personal and economic needs that an institution aims to meet. This is sometimes referred to as “fitness for purpose”, and includes not only what is done, but how it is done: for example, is the approach to teaching and learning the best to achieve the desired outcomes?

• the rigour of standards applied to staff work and student performance;

• the use of adequate resources to ensure optimum value for money for those providing funds.

The changing context
Over the past decade, there has been increasing political concern about quality in higher education. When education at this level was restricted to relatively few people, essentially to renew the cadre of leaders in an élite system, spending on higher education was still an act of faith. Investment in it was felt to be intrinsically positive. Even in meritocratic societies, investment in the development of ‘human capital’ went relatively unchallenged. The situation today is very different.

With increases in student numbers, total costs have risen. In the face of limited State funding, competition for money among different social services has grown. Higher education is just one of several claimants which has to make its case for public funding on the weight of its relevance, vigour, and efficiency.
Some employers complain, however, about the quality of graduates. The introduction of new subjects raises questions as to whether they are appropriate to higher education. The diversity of students attracts people who, while possibly unsuited to traditional approaches, may challenge the quality of provision on the basis of rights to higher education. The government may be concerned whether standards can be maintained at lower unit costs (expenditure per student), particularly when more people have experienced other systems at a time of greater international mobility.

Pressures for openness and accountability, and the rapid changes that have occurred in higher education, also raise questions about control. The main concerns here are the extent to which it can be exercised, by whom, at what level in the system and with what checks and balances. Any sharing of responsibility implies trust on the part of other stakeholders in the task. In the Netherlands, for example, most higher education quality assurance processes are conducted on behalf of the government by the association of universities. This collective ‘club’ monitors its members and reports to its funding source. Its reports constitute a level of accountability and control acceptable to government. Some may prefer a body whose members, collectively, are more independent of both government and universities, or represent a balance of all interested parties.

Finally, quality needs to be maintained during periods of rapid change. Review and innovation mechanisms need to have a quality of their own to cope with this.

Among the purposes which may be postulated for such systems and mechanisms are the following:

- ensuring accountability for the use of public funds;
- improvement in the quality of higher education provision;
- stimulation of competitiveness between institutions;
- checking the quality of new institutions;
- conferment of institutional status, especially in diversified systems;
- transfer of authority from the State to institutions;
• enabling international comparisons.

The balance differs according to national circumstances and priorities, with most agencies emphasising two or three purposes on the list. The precise purposes of quality assurance agencies may also be unclear, since they reflect sometimes deliberate differences of outlook among government representatives, institutional managers, academic staff and the agencies themselves.

It is still debatable whether quality assurance is feeding into planning or funding decisions. Central and Eastern European delegates to a meeting in Bucharest in 1994 emphasised the likelihood of fierce resistance if quality assurance procedures were seen as a tool for renewed centralised control when universities were defending new-found autonomy. If the processes of institutions themselves impart confidence, their autonomy is probably safer.

**Self-assessment**

The same delegates stressed the importance of self-assessment in any quality review. A pilot scheme in Romania had developed a framework of 300 indicators used in such a process which had stimulated a sense of self-knowledge and solidarity. Delegates from the Ukraine, the Russian Federation and Hungary agreed, on condition there was wide staff, student and, where appropriate, community participation in the processes.

Institutional leaders should ask what data and other evidence can be provided to demonstrate how they deliver quality in areas such as the following:

• rigorous standards for students;
• teaching material relevant to social, economic and personal needs;
• value for money in use of resources;
• appropriateness of curriculum design and delivery methods to learning objectives and student learning styles;
• responsiveness to student challenges, changes or developments in subject matter, complaints and crises;
• constant renewal of staff abilities;
• resources outside the classroom for student support;
• the physical environment for learning and the life of the learning community;
• research productivity and quality;
• efficiency and equity in administration;
• review mechanisms for all of these.

In discussing quality, the following four-part classification can be used:

quality assessment – the scrutiny of activities and outputs against benchmarks, or agreed standards, such as acceptance of research in refereed journals, or teaching and learning (measured in terms of tangible student attainment);

quality assurance - the existence of internal processes for scrutinising the consistent and rigorous conduct of quality assessment, so as to maintain the confidence of external stakeholders;

quality audit - a check on the processes for quality assurance, usually involving external representatives or perhaps fully external bodies, including government agencies (but note the above-mentioned procedures in the Netherlands).

accreditation - formal granting of recognition by professional associations, government licensing agencies or similar bodies, once they are satisfied about assessment and assurance standards.

Quality management can be reviewed in answering four strategic questions:
• What is your institution trying to do?
• How is your institution trying to do it?
• How does your institution know that it works?
• How does your institution change in order to improve?

At times, there may be a focus on particular aspects of activity, or on stages in the education process such as the following:

input this may include quality/qualifications of staff, curriculum design, the students recruited, or resources for books, computing, equipment and materials;

processes comprise approaches to teaching, integration of teaching and assessment, student involvement and feedback;

output qualifications of students, employment rates, staff publications.

Most approaches may use all three, besides looking at the context of learning, the resource support available, and the management of quality assurance processes. This will often be true when reviewing a unit such as a department and its full range of activities.

There may also be refinements, particularly on output. A value-added approach, for example, might look at absolute levels of achievement against input levels, concluding that staff did well with students without appropriate entry qualifications or enough textbooks for them.

In some cases, quantitative data, such as exam pass rates, citation levels for research articles or cost per graduate may be available. In others, there may be collected evidence like survey data from students or employers. In many instances, however, qualitative judgements will rely on more subjective data involving, perhaps, consideration of what constitutes a good lecture, or whether bad planning can be outweighed by good presentation by a lively personality. The more criteria command consensus, even without devices such as scoring scales, the better
evaluation will be. But statistical performance indicators should inform judgement, not replace it.

The focus adopted will depend on the purpose of the process. It may be useful to refer back to the list of purposes on p.???? and apply it at institutional level. Similarly, procedures and participants will vary. Although peer review is very widely accepted by academic staff, it is questionable whether staff inside an institution from other subject areas can validly criticise courses. Where staff from other institutions are involved, their objectivity may be suspect when competing (for students or research funds) with those they are appraising. As to experts from abroad, they may not always appreciate and accept the culture of foreign institutions, or the given national norms and policy context of the country to which they are invited.

In considering the introduction or extension of quality assurance, the models in chapters 6 and 7 on planning and managing change may help to structure thinking. One set of possible steps can be summarised as follows:

1. Define the purpose. 6. Monitor performance through the process.
2. Agree on the focus. 7. Give feed-back.
3. Set the standards. 8. Review the process and revise (loop back to 1-5).
4. Define the process. 9. Seek improvement (loop back to 3-9).
5. Introduce the process.

In our view, it is crucial to achieve key characteristics of the process, such as the following:

**simplicity** not too many regulations, data requirements or stages in the process. Some systems impose limits on the length of self-assessment documents (30 pages seems reasonable). Too many external bodies with differing requirements can also be confusing and time-absorbing;
clarity regarding criteria, how they will be judged and by whom? The responsibilities of people and the findings to be published, should also be known;

consensus a maximum of consensus among those involved, on process and criteria. Though the final judgement may not be fully palatable, it is more likely to be accepted with consensus on those two aspects;

accountability this is two-way in that those higher in the system should be ready to account for their opinions and decisions, so that academics, for their part, can recognise that they serve communities and clients who pay for their work;

an open climate helps honesty on both sides, so that weaknesses, as well as strengths, are acknowledged. This helps commit people to developing for the future, rather than dwelling on past problems or looking for scapegoats;

visibility of the processes decisions taken in secret diminish confidence;

communication people have to be clear about what is happening, what will happen, and what is expected of them at all stages;

integration into the normality of operational life, the strategic thinking of leaders of activities, and the planning of linked areas. For instance, if curriculum assessment suggests smaller group work, or intensive use of IT, those who plan buildings and purchasing need to know.

As with most areas of management, people are important. Regular staff appraisal is used in many places to contribute to quality improvement. If this is seen as developmental, not disciplinary, it can lead to agreements between individuals on
their needs, wishes and commitments to the institutions, with a manager (usually a head of department) as negotiator and mediator. Such managers need to:

- establish expectations;
- encourage performance improvement (for example by praising staff, offering them opportunities for development and, where possible, material reward for good work);
- provide examples of good practice, either through their own work or that of ‘benchmark’ peers;
- evaluate achievement and improvement;
- establish new expectations.

None of this is easy. This chapter and chapter 7 about managing change may have suggested some positive approaches.
9. Resources

Despite the importance of resources issues, extensive treatment of them is impossible for many. Numerous aspects of finance and resource allocation are determined by national policy and so vary from country to country, as do resources such as staff, buildings and equipment. Degrees of control also vary. Government funding to institutions, for example, depends on the role of the State, recalling the five scenarios outlined in chapter 3, pp 26-27. However, support can be given in the following ways:

- in a block, with local freedom of internal allocation;
- in parcels related to activity - teaching/research;
- to subject areas of varied specific definition and detail;
- to phases - recruitment, course delivery, retention or graduation;
- to accounting items such as staff, capital, materials.

These will influence how resources are allocated internally. Private funding may also be attached to particular activities. Student fees may go to support current teaching directly, or there may be separate elements, for general administration, research or curriculum development. These variations limit treatment of common considerations which are few in number. Here, therefore, no more than three broad issues will be examined briefly, namely internal allocation of funds, responses to constraint and possibilities for income generation.

Within an institution, there may be no more than four main fund allocation models, as follows:

1. **historic** - marginal adjustment to a status quo;
2. **formula-related** - based on specified factors of known impact, such as student numbers, with students in science, perhaps, attracting more money than those in social sciences, and with an agreed
conversion of part-time numbers to full-time equivalents;

3. **strategic** - related to desired behaviour induced by supplements earmarked to core funding for investment, by incentives (like recruitment of engineering students by means of a premium) or rewards (such as for quality);

4. **project-based** - based on bids with activity-related costing.

The first model is straightforward in a stable situation. It is probably defensible and likely to be accepted since it avoids uncomfortable decisions. In a situation of radical change, however, when history is called into question, its implied status quo will be increasingly challenged.

The second model focuses debate on the formula and judgements underlying them. There is the advantage of openness - the sums allocated can be calculated by anyone familiar with the basic data. However, where such a system operates, sums justified by the formula are defended and transfer of money to activities not included in it are resisted (as in the case of new courses prior to student recruitment to them, or pump-priming funds for new research). In such instances, this model can become almost as static as the historic approach. It is also hard to devise formulas that cover all aspects of activity, while their administration can be very time-consuming.

Model three tends to concentrate marginal funds, used for investment or incentive, at the centre. This allows for a dynamic approach but raises issues of democracy in decisions on strategic priorities. Do all who have contributed to a development fund by having their formula funding ‘top-sliced’ have a right to contribute to decisions on use of its resources? Such an approach can operate where budgets are devolved, with strategic freedom at both the centre prior to allocation of funds, and the budget unit following their receipt.

The final model creates pressure for accurate costings, in the same way as the formula-related approach. Consequently, it can lead to efficiencies in the use of money and help sponsor
developments at the heart of the university’s mission. However, it entails the following three main risks:

- destructive internal competition for funds where aggressive or good presenters gain at the expense of those who are more modest or less effective politically, even though their projects are good;

- short-term allocation without longer-term security since renewal of funding may also be competitive;

- use of false information from a defective data-base.

Our own preference is for a core of funds distributed in accordance with broad formulas that leave a margin available for sponsoring either institutional priorities or individual proposals, or a mix of both.

**Responses to resource reduction**

Although universities have always hoped for increased resources, they have recently experienced sometimes severe reductions on previous allocations, particularly from government funds.

A first response has usually been to look for **efficiency** savings, with staff working harder to maintain previous activity levels. There may also be controls on the use of materials and supplies, so that learning is forced back to the basics, with students just listening to lecturers. We know of universities where even chalk was in short supply! As they retire, staff may not be replaced, leaving areas of the curriculum without expert coverage, or key elements of support services without operators. Those remaining take on more duties and muddle through. At the edges, there may be part-time appointments where previously full-time staff did the job. Staffing is a major budgetary element, and many universities in Central and Eastern Europe were previously overstaffed, with academic staff/student ratios of 1:6 in some subjects. Given the natural sensitivity surrounding any attempt to dismiss staff, staff reduction will clearly take time. Dismissals may also follow patterns of withdrawal that do not fit set priorities.

Where resources are cut back, there is a further tendency to distribute cuts evenly in a policy of ‘equal misery for all’
particularly common in bureaucratic cultures. In our view, a
selective approach is preferable. In conducting efficiency audits
with several universities, certain units have stood out as both
expensive and adding little value. When money is tight, its optimal
allocation is essential.

In many cases, “the way we have always done things” may be
outdated. Even a tiny margin of funds to promote innovation can
courage different, better, cheaper ways of doing things.
Applied selectively, this can create funds for further new
investments. While IT is an obvious example, its use implies high
up-front costs followed by rapid redundancy of technology,
hardware and software. Using students to lead peer learning, or
to mentor other students in the early stages of their courses, is a
successful tactic in some institutions.

Finally, universities have to look increasingly to income
generation. In some countries, State institutions still have no
incentives in this respect, since any independent income goes
towards reducing the State subvention. Yet this is now less
frequently the case. We have been impressed by the imagination
that some universities and their staffs have shown in fund-raising:
classics departments have organized study tours for the general
public to sites of older civilisations; computer centres have
become cyber-cafés for local communities, offering e-mail and
internet access; in some places, campus accommodation is
available for tourists outside study periods. Other areas, such as
technical assistance, or translation are more obvious but also
rewarding revenue-raising activities.

Any university strategy developed in this area must include
details of incentives and entitlements.

Do staff gain from their work when bringing in money? Do
the departments that generate new funds keep them, or do
those with more market opportunities put income into a
general fund for wider use? Does a separate trading
comp any need to be established for such activity? If so,
what is its relationship with the ‘core’ university, and what
are the contract implications for staff who work for both?

Here, there are many issues of legal and personnel management
requiring country-by-country expertise beyond the general
framework provided in this document.
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2.1 Journals

Eight journals cover issues of higher education policy and management from a multi-national perspective. The eighth is a journal of abstracts.

**CRE Action** is the pan-European journal of the Association of European Universities, with French and English as working languages. It includes both commentaries and academic articles, and is supplemented by *ad hoc* papers published under the title of *CRE Doc* (CRE, Geneva, bi-annual).

The **European Journal of Education** focuses regularly on higher education, frequently from a comparative angle at the level of national systems. Volume 31 (1) discussed “Educational Reforms in Central and Eastern Europe” (European Institute of Education and Social Policy, Paris, quarterly).

**Higher Education** publishes overviews, comparative studies and analyses of problems, mainly at policy level (Kluwer, Dordrecht, quarterly)

**Higher Education in Europe** contains substantial material on Central and Eastern Europe, again mainly at policy and system level (UNESCO European Centre for Higher Education – CEPES, Bucharest, quarterly).

**Higher Education Management** includes relevant thematic conference-based articles. Published in English and French, its contents mix contributions on systems of provision and problems of institutional management (Programme on Institutional Management in Higher Education, OECD, Paris, 3 times a year).

**Higher Education Policy** shares information, experience and ideas, increasingly linked to policy analysis, on the role of higher education today. It is published in English and French for an international academic audience (International Association of Universities, Paris, quarterly).

**Tertiary Education and Management** focuses mainly on institutional problems, with a predominantly but not exclusively European emphasis (European Association for Institutional Research).
Research into Higher Education Abstracts provides summaries of articles on higher education from over 60 other journals concentrating mainly on Europe and the British Commonwealth. It also serves as a guide to specialist journals in the field (Centre for Higher Education Management, Anglia Polytechnic University, Chelmsford, ad hoc)

2.2 Books

a. Higher Education Systems and the Nature of the University


This collection covers several themes from the present *Handbook*, with a focus on Poland, Hungary, Slovakia, the Czech Republic and the former German Democratic Republic. Student and course-related issues are also examined.


A major contribution to the analysis of higher education, with a novel discussion of “four scholarships”.


Although mainly western in its coverage, this book contains an interesting comparative analysis of Central and Eastern Europe by Wolfgang Mitter including detailed reference to changing features of higher education in the region and treatment of current issues.


Both are definitive works with a multinational stance, despite a western bias. The first discusses fundamental issues linked to the nature of knowledge, academic structures and processes, politics, power and change. The second views higher education from the
standpoint of different disciplines, including history, anthropology, economics, politics and organization theory.

Goedegebuure L.C.J., et al. (eds. 1994), Higher Education Policy. An international comparative perspective, Oxford, Pergamon. Analysis of principles, structural features and modes of work of different higher education policies operating in eleven countries, as well as their commonalities and differences in the light of both general international trends and country-specific factors.


b. Leadership and management


Birnbaum, R. (1988), *How colleges work. The cybernetics of academic organization and leadership*, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass. The cybernetic approach is applied to describe and analyse the tasks and functions of leaders in academic institutions.


*Making sense of administrative leadership. The "L" word in higher education*, ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report no. 1, Washington DC, School of Education and Human Development, George Washington University. Although U.S. oriented, interesting for its combination of theoretical approaches to leadership, management and organisation theory and practical applications.

A British study based on research in older universities, with an entertaining review of why university leaders resist any training input to their work.


An original treatment of unit-based management in higher education, covering finance, personnel, estates, student issues and services, public relations, committees, teaching and research.

c. Finance


A comparative analysis of budgetary pressures on higher education and their impact on expectations, with separate chapters on the two eastern European countries.


A comparative study of national systems in the EU, reflecting frequent lack of reliable data and the impossibility of transnational comparisons.


Recent publication on the changes in the resource dependencies between government and higher education institutions, with explicit attention to finance.


With a dominant U.K. focus, this book identifies economic and political factors tending to induce change and greater competition for resources in higher education, sometimes arguably to the detriment of its planning and provision.
d. Co-operation, partnerships and community service

Dubet, F et al. (1994) *Universités et Villes*, Paris, l'Harmattan. This French-language study examines the impact of universities on their surrounding communities from an economic, social and territorial standpoint.

Webster, A (ed) (1996) *Building New Bases for Innovation: the transformation of the R & D system in post-socialist states*, Cambridge, APU. A focus on academic-industry relations, use of know-how and technology transfer, including chapters on Bulgaria, the former German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Romania, the Czech Republic, Poland and Croatia.


Blok, P (ed) (1995) *Policy and Policy Implementation in the Internationalisation of Higher Education*, Amsterdam, EAIE. The first of these two thematically related books from the same publisher describes national and institutional arrangements for international co-operation in the EU, Australia, Canada and the USA. The second provides models to help plan an institutional strategy concerned with change and innovation, and research specific to international activity.

e. Staffing

Altbach, Ph. G. (ed. 1996), *The international academic profession. Portraits of fourteen countries*, Princeton, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Based on a large-scale survey, results are presented concerning the opinions, views and values of academics in fourteen countries.


Blumenthal et al. (eds) (1996) *Academic Mobility in a Changing World*, London, Jessica Kingsley. A series of essays examining themes linked to global regionalization, with contributions on East/West European exchanges, mobility within Russia and Hungarian work with western Europe and the USA.
Several chapters based on UK law contrast with others devoted to universal issues, such as communication, incentives and staff development.

f. Information technology

The outcome of an OECD study to investigate the 'state of the art' in IT in European higher education, its impact on provision, potential for the future, and management and decision-making issues.

Dillemans, R et al. (1997) Investing in Knowledge: the integration of technology in European education, Brussels, European Round Table of Industrialists (ERT).
This free publication covers all stages of education, and contains some useful material, including checklists and case study vignettes.


A short introduction to the use of new technologies in student learning for academics keen to encourage their adoption by other colleagues.

OECD (1995), Redefining the place to learn, Paris, OECD.


U.S. oriented, but strongly focusing on application.

g. Central / Eastern Europe


Appendix 1

Strategic analysis of higher education policy environment

Hungary: 13 responses. M = mean/average probability %, D = numbers at < 30%, A = numbers at > 80%

Think of 2006 AD. Score your views on each of the items below on a scale of 1 (highly unlikely) to 10 (highly likely) to show whether you think they will happen in the next 10 years.

**Access and participation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. There will be an increase in total student numbers of more than 30 per cent. 61 3 3
2. The number of full-time students will decline. 48 4 3
3. Numbers of postgraduate students will increase at a much faster rate than first degree students. 66 - 5
4. There will be more competition to enter higher education so that entry standards will be higher. 37 8 2
5. The number of foreign students will increase by more than 50 per cent. 37 9 2
6. Students will have more choice about what they study. 83 - 10
7. Part-time will out-number full-time students. 50 1 1
8. Study off-campus - at home or at work - will be commonplace 55 2 1
9. Growth in student numbers will be very high in: social work 63 1 5, languages 75 - 7, business studies 89 1 12, law 78 - 9, tourism 78 - 9, computing & informatics 79 - 8
10. There will be a steep decline in student numbers in: maths 60 2 5, physics 66 - 5, chemistry 54 2 3, engineering 61 - 3
11. Mid-career retraining courses will be a major part of an institution’s activities. 55 1 2

**Curriculum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Courses will be much less academic and more linked to labour market needs.  
   66 - 4
2. Academic grades will be given for work experiences.  
   47 5 2
3. There will be more independent learning by students and reduced teacher input.  
   66 - 5
4. In contact time, formal lectures will almost disappear with a lot more interaction between teachers and students.  
   58 2 2
5. New communications technology will bring courses to students from all over the world.  
   75 1 8
6. Modular courses based on credit accumulation with a lot of student choice will be the main form of course organization.  
   87 - 10
7. Students will play a prominent role in course evaluation.  
   59 2 4
8. Core skills will be as important as subject knowledge in curriculum planning and student assessment.  
   70 - 5
9. Employers will have a significant input to decisions on curriculum content and course design.  
   58 1 2
10. Many courses will be taught in English or German.  
    59 1 2
11. There will be a standard national curriculum in many subjects.  
    45 5 2
12. Research will be done less in universities or institutes and more in enterprises themselves.  
    35 6 -
13. Libraries and computer centres will be major bases for learning, displacing classroom teaching.  
    72 1 7
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structures, processes and governance</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Institutions will have more autonomy to control their own: curriculum resources.</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. There will be national councils with strong quality control on behalf of government over content and standards of courses.</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Many new institutions will be created.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. There will be lots of mergers between existing institutions.</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The role of local and regional authorities in planning and funding higher education will increase.</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Democracy within universities will increase considerably.</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Units such as graduate schools, and enterprise units will become prominent, and traditional department structures will be changed.</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Research and teaching will be integrated in single units so the role of departments will be enhanced.</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. There will be many more joint operations with international partners.</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Strong, formal links will develop with local municipalities and employers whose representatives will join in governing institutions.</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. With the expansion of the European Union to the East more control will be exercised over higher education by supranational bodies.</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. State funding for higher education will decline sharply</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Students will pay more of the costs of their own education.</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. More employers will sponsor postgraduate students to pursue relevant applied research projects.</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. University teachers' salaries will not rise as quickly as those of other professionals.</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Numbers of teachers will reduce as students learn from technological media.</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. University companies will:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- own and exploit patents, software and other intellectual property;</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- organize consultancy to generate income;</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- develop contacts with employers for 'whole organization' learning provision.</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. University buildings will be used for wider community purposes - at a charge.</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Alumni organizations (of former students) will be developed to raise money.</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Departments will become budget centres able to keep some of the extra money they generate.</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The State will invest very selectively, mainly in:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- capital expenditure for buildings for activities of outstanding quality;</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- student support in subject areas of priority national need;</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not much else.</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2

Functions of key post holders - Rector

From the items below, select the 12 you consider are the most important elements of the rector’s role. Then put them in rank order of importance. Identify any others that are definitely not part of that role. Ask two colleagues to do the same; compare your lists and consider why there are differences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Rank Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Implementing longer range plans</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Developing longer range plans</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Maintaining morale among all staff</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Selecting senior staff</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Raising funds outside the university</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Negotiating with government and its agencies</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Maintaining personal academic activity</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Evaluating senior staff performance</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Dealing with inadequate staff performance</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Improving communications within the university</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Deciding on staff promotion recommendations</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Chairing key committees</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Ensuring student number targets are met</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Giving feedback on the University’s performance and standing</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Celebrating staff and student achievement</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Encouraging innovation</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Encouraging debate and disputation</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Developing an enterprise ethos</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Ensuring senior staff are held accountable for their actions</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Developing a shared vision among staff of the university and its objectives</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Keeping all staff ‘in the picture’ on what is happening</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Developing a coherent philosophy about the role and purpose of the university</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Linking parts of the university together</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Providing for rapid decisions when needed</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Resolving conflicts among units of the university</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Liaising with other executive members</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Dealing with problem students</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Liaising with the students’ union</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Negotiating with trades unions on staff employment conditions</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Being an ambassador outside the university</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Encouraging and supporting colleagues</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Encouraging external income generation</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Promoting co-operation with other universities</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Developing external contacts</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Monitoring student satisfaction</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Heads of Department

From the items below, select the 12 you consider are the most important elements of the Head of Department’s role. Then put them in rank order of importance. Identify any others that are definitely not part of that role. Ask two colleagues to do the same; compare your lists and consider why there are differences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Rank Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpreting university policy in a local context</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting university values and priorities in a local context</td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serving as an advocate for the department within the university</td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulating research and publications</td>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging innovation</td>
<td>5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filtering information from top management and central units</td>
<td>6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with students’ problems</td>
<td>7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring student number targets are met</td>
<td>8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging external income generation</td>
<td>9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing external contacts</td>
<td>10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging good quality teaching</td>
<td>11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving communications within the department</td>
<td>12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deciding on staff promotion recommendations</td>
<td>13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairing department committees</td>
<td>14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiating for resources within the university</td>
<td>15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining personal academic activity</td>
<td>16.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating staff performance</td>
<td>17.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with problem students</td>
<td>18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with inadequate staff performance</td>
<td>19.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring student satisfaction</td>
<td>20.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing the department budget</td>
<td>21.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting staff development</td>
<td>22.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing support staff</td>
<td>23.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing conflict among staff within the department</td>
<td>24.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressing department correspondence</td>
<td>25.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing longer range plans</td>
<td>26.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing longer range plans</td>
<td>27.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining morale among staff in the department</td>
<td>28.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selecting staff</td>
<td>29.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting academic staff from involvement in administration and management to free them for teaching and research</td>
<td>30.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3

### Facing the future: planning for change

#### Able to adapt to a new future

**Characteristics of a Learning Organization**

This questionnaire seeks to highlight areas for attention in making institutions responsive and developmental. Please score your institution against the 21 questions with 10 as excellent, 1 as 'a lot to learn'.

**Institution: ______________________________________________**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Score out of 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. It encourages people to ask questions and make suggestions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. It rewards good suggestions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. It allows people to challenge received truths and established behaviour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. It converts dissent into diversity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. It explores options for actions with an open mind</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. It experiments with new approaches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. It takes risks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. It is open about what it does and why: its processes and decisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. It acknowledges weaknesses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. It admits mistakes without excessive blame, guilt, penalty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. It uses mistakes to learn from</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Complaints are used as a free evaluation feedback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. People talk about their learning and share it with others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. It encourages people to learn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. It builds the learning needed to do a job into job work load calculations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Managers/supervisors see themselves also as tutors/trainers of their staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Senior staff are willing to learn from subordinates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. It reflects on and reviews its activities regularly and rigorously</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. It audits learning by individuals and units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. It takes responsibility for organizational learning in a structured, systematic way</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. It links management and committee decisions to learning inputs and outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**

Give your name/position if you wish
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