

## **FIRST EAHEP ROUNDTABLE – 25/26 November 2008, Hanoi, Vietnam**

### **“Autonomy, Governance and Management in Higher Education in Asia and Europe”**

#### **SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS**

##### **Pre-Roundtable Welcome Addresses**

Over 90 delegates, with broadly equal numbers from Europe and Asia, attended this first Roundtable. They were welcomed on the eve of the meeting at a reception at the Hanoi University of Technology.

In his welcome, the Rector of Hanoi University of Technology, Professor Dr Nguyen Trong Giang, referred to great support from international friends when his University was established in 1956. Graduates from the University were now welcomed throughout society in Vietnam and worked in a range of sectors.

In his response, Mr Sean Doyle, Head of the EU Commission Delegation in Hanoi, said that the Roundtable was an important event which built on links under the Asia Link programme. Vietnam would benefit from the meeting as it undertook reform of its higher education. Governance was particularly important given the autonomy of the many provinces in Vietnam. New industries were being developed and Vietnam was dependent on technology for exports.

Mr Hoang Xuan Lan, Director, International Cooperation Department, explained that the university had 40,000 students, 14 faculties, and 27 research centres and institutes. It had partnerships with 200 universities in 32 countries. 90% of graduates find jobs within 6 months of graduation. It planned a sandwich programme, which would include international companies. Research would be strengthened.

Professor Dr Pham Quang Minh, Dean, Faculty of International Studies, Vietnam National University, Hanoi said that his University already had much autonomy, except in relation to curricula and academic programmes, which were partly government controlled. Its main problem was finding and recruiting able staff. Its objective was to improve quality to the level of the best elsewhere in the world.

#### **PART I: AUTONOMY – TRENDS IN ASIAN AND EUROPEAN HIGHER EDUCATION, KEYNOTE PRESENTATIONS**

##### **Keynote Presentation: Autonomy – Trends in Asian and European Higher Education**

**Professor Futao Huang, Research Institute for Higher Education, Hiroshima University**

This presentation traced the development of autonomy through four different models from mediaeval times. In the Anglo model, Professor Huang argued that there had been a shift in the 1990s away from control by academics to market governance. In the continental model, a similar development had taken place with state control confined to ‘steering at a glance’. In Asian model 1 (state universities), the concept of a market had been introduced but without retreat of the State. In Asian model 2 (private universities), there had been a shift towards market driven control with more institutions concerned with making a profit.

In Japan, there had been significant changes at institutional level. The executive authority of institutional leaders had been substantially reinforced, with a corresponding loss on the part of Faculty. Executive authority now lay with the President and a Board of Directors. Academic staff could offer their views through Faculty meetings but were not in a position to control developments. Universities were now established as corporations, with an increase in participation on governing bodies by external representatives or individuals. The State retained

significant control of institutions through their responsibility to approve 6 year goals and plans – plans which were subject to evaluation by an external body.

There were three areas to be addressed:

- a) the term autonomy required definition for higher education in a changing world;
- b) higher education institutions needed to respond to new demands, while at the same time maintaining their core strengths;
- c) the national state needed to play a more decisive role in keeping the balance of power between academic and the market in their impact on university governance and management.

In discussion, there was concern about the scope for overlap in responsibilities in Japan. In relation to the definition of autonomy, there was a need for clarity over the extent of desirable autonomy for universities.

### **Keynote Presentation: Autonomy – The Perspective of an Asian University**

**Professor Le Quang Minh, Vice-President, Vietnam National University, HCM City**

Vietnam had been learning from others since the open door policy of the early 1990s. Some education reforms had been implemented in the late 1990s and there had been some response to society's needs. However, the links between universities and industry, business, and society were weak.

In principle, the two national universities had a high level of autonomy, 14 other key universities had medium autonomy, and more than 100 universities had low autonomy. While there was a requirement to respect autonomy and decentralisation, there were in practice widespread central controls. In practice, an ambiguity in the law enabled the Ministry to exercise control through auditing and plans for standardisation. Only 10 universities had university councils to meet accountability concerns. A new University would be functioning under German governance arrangements and this might pave the way for similar arrangements in other universities.

The national universities had the advantage of reporting direct to the Prime Ministers Office. Their budgets were set by this Office rather than by the Ministry. These universities were able to determine their own staffing, other than for professors, new academic programmes and research.

### **Keynote Presentation: Autonomy – The Perspective of European Universities**

**Professor Dr Páll Skúlason, Member Board of Governors, University of Luxembourg, Past President, University of Iceland**

This presentation covered the characteristics of higher education developments in the EU, including recent developments, and some ideas for the future.

In former times, Napoleon set a mission for universities in France to provide for the nation through the training of 'the professional man'. In Germany, the mission was for the advancement of science and the professional management of education. In the UK, Cardinal Newman pressed for universities to provide service for individual students alongside professional management of institutions. Nowadays, Bologna integrated the 3 missions, offering a common degree structure, recognition by others, and a quality assurance process.

Expansion of higher education had led to more autonomy for universities to encourage them to meet the needs of society. There was a move towards linking funding to academic outputs. Contracts with universities would promote accountability both within universities and externally.

There was an issue about whether autonomy stood in the way of 'humanisation' and meeting the needs of society. The State should find a way of promoting 'humanisation' in universities. It

would be helpful to identify 'good' universities rather than just world class universities. In Asia, there was more attention in universities to ethical knowledge.

In discussion, it was argued that universities and not the state should be responsible for promoting ethical issues in universities. Ethical issues were for universities and the critical conscience of society was seen to be important.

## **PART II: SYSTEM GOVERNANCE AND UNIVERSITY AUTONOMY**

### **WORKING GROUP A: GOVERNING AUTONOMOUS UNIVERSITIES: CHALLENGE TO UNIVERSITY LEADERS**

#### **Input: New Higher Education Governance and Management Mechanisms – Global Trends**

##### **Professor Dr José-Ginés Mora, Valencia University of Technology, Spain**

In an introductory text on new governance and management trends in higher education, Professor Dr Mora discussed global trends – the globalisation of labour markets for graduates, the globalisation of knowledge, and the internationalisation of higher education. Knowledge and technology were key elements of economic and social development. Higher education had an increasing value. There was an increasing complexity both in the context for universities and in the universities themselves. Forecasting need and developments had become increasingly difficult. There was a need for less State regulation, more external influence and better internal governance. Professor Mora concluded by demonstrating that recent pronouncements by European bodies were in line with his analysis.

#### **Case Study: Increased Autonomy and its Consequences – The Case of the University of Bielefeld, Germany**

##### **Professor Dr Dieter Timmermann, Rector, University of Bielefeld, Germany**

In the first study, Professor Dr Dieter Timmermann described the substantial changes which had taken place at his University. The principles provided for a reduction in State regulation, maximum institutional autonomy, strengthened competition, strengthened leadership structures, and increased efficiency. Essentially there was a new central power structure, comprising the Rectorate (senior staff), the Rector, the university council (up to 10 members, some external) and the academic senate. The Council concerned itself with strategy while the Rectorate was the operational body. The power of the senate had been reduced. Accountability depended in part on improved accounting and the monitoring of performance indicators. The State's funding arrangements had been simplified – 80% according to the previous years allocation and 20% according to performance indicators. The University was free to seek funding from other sources and was able to set tuition fees up to a maximum of 500 euros per semester. In addition, the University could borrow from banks and establish commercial enterprises, subject to specified rules.

There had been a rapid process of change, fostered by increased competition. One major advantage had been the prompt decision making available to the Rectorate, particularly over the appointment of professors, and over equipment, staffing and salary negotiations. The problems so far were connected mainly with the reluctance of some to accept the changes - with both staff and students seeking to retain their former powers. The University at all levels needs to adapt fully to the new structures. A major need is for more professionalism amongst staff engaged in putting the new arrangements into practice.

## **Case Study: Increased Autonomy and its Consequences – The Case of Gidjah Mada University, Indonesia**

**Professor Sudjarwadi, Rector, Gadjah Mada University, Indonesia**

The second case study was by Professor Sudjarwadi. The structure for university governance followed a similar pattern although there is in addition a Professor Council. Furthermore, there is a balanced relationship between the centre and other units – rather than a top down approach. There was a need for new arrangements in three areas – human resources, financial resources and retirement security. Autonomy had opened up new opportunities. The main problem was a limitation on resources. The University planned to raise additional income through action within the community and entrepreneurship, whilst also seeking greater efficiency within the University.

## **WORKING GROUP B: FROM STATE TO STAKEHOLDERS: MORE AUTONOMY FOR UNIVERSITIES?**

### **Input: The Impact of Different University Bodies on University Governance**

**Professor Dr Pavel Zgaga, Centre for Educational Policy Studies, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia**

There are four main internal levels of university governance:

- a) governing boards
- b) the Rector (Vice-Chancellor, President)
- c) a cascade of internal staff- deans, heads of departments, and academic staff
- d) students or their representative bodies.

Increasingly, governing boards include representatives external to the University. Their presence is designed to protect institutional integrity as well as to strengthen institutional accountability. The role of the Rector has moved away from being solely the peak representative of academic self-governance to chief executive for the institution. There is however substantial delegation of certain responsibilities to others in the institution. Students are playing a role in governance in a number of countries.

Some 10-15 years ago, the key approach in Europe was to harmonise higher education systems. That has been replaced to-day by emphasis of the need for diversity – reflecting the diversity of need amongst students as higher education has expanded.

### **Case Study: The Power Balance between Internal and External Stakeholders**

**Professor Dzulkifli Abdul Razak, Vice-Chancellor, University Sains Malaysia, Malaysia**

Professor Razak gave a full account of Malaysia's national plan for education. There were 20 public universities with over 400,000 students and 32 private universities, 4 foreign campuses, and 483 private colleges with some 390,000 students. Malaysia's economy had transformed from being agriculture based to industry based. The national plan responded to that change. The national target was for 40% higher education participation for young people by 2010, with a 60% target for science and technology so as to upgrade science and technology capability. 30% of students would progress into postgraduate studies. In planning for top class universities within the region, a limited number of APEX/research universities would be selected as autonomous but accountable.

External stakeholders were important in implementing the national plan and setting up the APEX universities. The balance between internal and external stakeholders was crucial. There would be external representatives on University Councils who could influence the University's plans. The University's staff would retain academic freedom and responsibility for setting values, ethics and recognition.

## **Case Study: The Balance between Responding to Stakeholders and Maintaining Academic Freedom**

**Professor Luc Weber, former Vice-President, International Association of Universities and former Chair, CDESR, Council of Europe**

Professor Luc Weber explained that academic freedom appears on two levels: a) institutional freedom (institutional autonomy) as the right to determine all academic and organizational matters and b) individual academic freedom in terms of teaching and research. Institutions need to respond to the needs of society. They also need to be responsible by taking advantage of their unique position. However since the world of today has become so complex, universities need to engage – as long as academic freedoms are respected and institutions are both responsive and responsible.

The freedom of research is subject to many influences:

a) national research or EU framework programmes – acceptable, recognising the danger of researchers being diverted from other research more relevant to the interest of the academic department.

b) The influence of refereed journals – acceptable, recognising the risk of delaying other interesting results.

c) Other less acceptable influences such as the effect of contract research or religious bans on certain kinds of work.

The academic freedoms must be guaranteed by Governments and respected by business and churches. However, institutions should be responsive, responsible, and accountable – requiring strong leadership, responsible academic and non-academic staff, a rigorous internal quality culture, and strong ethical committees.

## **WORKING GROUP C: ASIA-EUROPE COOPERATION IN THE CONTEXT OF A GLOBALISED WORLD**

### **Input: Internationalisation in Higher Education**

**Ms Mario Kelo, Senior officer, Academic Cooperation Association, Belgium**

Internationalisation has been defined as the process of integrating an international dimension into the research, teaching and services function of higher education. Until the mid-1980s, internationalisation was mainly achieved through the mobility of students. Since then, Erasmus and other EU programmes had offered other avenues for internationalisation, including curricular internationalisation. More recently, the Bologna Process had brought internationalisation to the core of institutional policy. Transnational education and other collaborative provision have been introduced. There has also been marketing and promotion of mobility opportunities in particular countries.

The trend is towards mobility outside Europe. Recognition is seen as important for facilitating mobility. There has been a significant increase in English-taught programmes - 700 in 2002 to 2400 in 2007 in Europe. Joint degrees are more readily set up but the numbers involved remain small.

### **Case Study: The Strategic Internationalisation of the University of the Philippines**

**Professor Dr Emerlinda Roman, President, University of the Philippines Diliman**

Professor Dr Roman saw internationalisation as augmenting national capacity. Strategic internationalisation for the University of the Philippines (UP) encouraged cross border education and internationalising the curriculum. However, constraints on UP required priority to be given to Philippine nationals for students and regulations impede the internationalisation of staff. The aim at present was for faculty to improve the country's international competitiveness.

### **Case Study: Enhancing Asia-Europe Cooperation: Credit Transfer and Procedures for Student Mobility between EU and ASEAN**

**Professor Dr-Ing Axel Hunger, Head of the Chair Computer Engineering, University Duisburg-Essen, Germany**

Professor Dr-Ing Hunger outlined a case study for EU-Asian cooperation involving four universities in Germany, Malaysia, Indonesia and Italy. The objectives were to support student mobility and implement joint programmes, to enhance mutual understanding, and enhance transparency for quality assurance policies. The main project focussed on defining rules for mobility and on the conceptualisation of a quality culture to promote mutual trust. The relevance of the case study for partner institutions is that it promotes internationalism and focuses on quality assurance and culture. The relevance for students is that it defines added value of studying abroad and facilitates the organisation of such study.

The problem of the brain drain through mobility programmes was discussed. Experience in Indonesia suggested that returning graduates were not given sufficient status and this deterred others from returning. Much depended on the commitment of the Governments involved to work towards fair arrangements. More autonomy for the home institution ought to assist.

### **OUTLOOK: AUTONOMOUS UNIVERISTIES IN THE YEAR 2020**

**Mr Tony Clark, Higher Education Consultant and former Director of Higher Education, Ministry of Education and Science, United Kingdom**

There are four developments likely to have a significant effect on the future. First the recent massive expansion of higher education may reverse as demographic trends reverse. Secondly, the reduction in public spending per student in many European countries is likely to continue in the aftermath of the current financial crisis, leading to pressure for new or increased payments by students. Thirdly, the Bologna Agreement in Europe opens the way for increased diversity for students after a Bachelors degree – with students either entering the labour market, a one or two year postgraduate course to enhance specialist knowledge prior to employment, or continuing their studies towards a postgraduate research degree and, for some students, a doctorate. Given the broadening demands from society, it will be important to ensure that the scope for diversity is realised. Fourthly, there is the competition which has developed for international students, in part because this brings access to high quality staff ( following graduation of students) and students. Universities which compete successfully for both domestic and international students tend to feature in high positions in world league tables. For success in competition, two assets are crucial – autonomy and resources.

The important areas for autonomy are:

- The selection and admission of students
- The employment of academic and non-academic staff, including levels of pay
- The appointment and remuneration of the rector

- All matters concerning the curriculum and the development of new academic programmes or avenues for research
- The ownership, sale and purchase of all property, including land and buildings
- Maximising income and the ability to borrow

By 2020, universities, with the support of governments, can be expected to move in the following directions:

- Greater diversity in terms of the range of subjects and of the curriculum for both undergraduate and postgraduate qualifications
- A trend towards a unitary sector of higher education, to foster competition
- Greater overt competition in recruiting home and international students - competition intensified by the projected fall in the number of home students in many countries
- More intense competition for research funds
- New or higher fees or payments from both home and international students

The trend towards more autonomy for universities will continue:

- Residual powers adopted by some Governments will gradually be abandoned
- Higher payments by students will limit the scope for Government influence through public funding
- Accountability for universities will be achieved by governing bodies, with a majority of external members - and appointments a matter for the governing bodies
- Small Executive Boards will become more prevalent in managing universities, with suitable arrangements to continue for consulting academic staff.

## **PART III: INSTITUTIONAL GOVERNANCE AND MANAGEMENT**

### **PANEL DISCUSSION: 'DIFFERENT MODELS OF INSTITUTIONAL GOVERNANCE AND MANAGEMENT'**

#### **Chair:**

**Professor Dr Peter Mayer**

Former Vice-President and Dean, University of Applied Sciences Osnabrueck, Germany

#### **Panelists:**

**Dr Intan Ahmad Indonesia**

Dean of the School of Life Science and Technology, Bandung Institute of Technology, Indonesia

**Dr Ir Muhammad Anis, M.Met**

Vice Rector for Academic and Student Affairs, University of Indonesia, Indonesia

**Professor Dr Aleksa Bjelis**

Rector, University of Zagreb, Croatia

**Ms Ton Nu Thi Ninh**

President, Founding Committee, Tri Viet University Project, Former Vice Chair, Foreign Affairs Committee, National Assembly, Vietnam

**Professor Dr S.C. Saxena**

Director, Indian Institute of Technology Roorkee, India

In their initial statements, Dr Anis referred to the need for a long term strategy focussing on new management structures, relevance and quality in teaching and research, and social equality. Professor Bjelis said that in the 1990s there had been close political control of the University of Zagreb, including at faculty level. To-day, there was autonomy. There was also a small private sector, mainly offering vocational studies.

Ms Ton Nu Thi Ninh said that the Government in Vietnam encouraged private sector universities. There were now substantial numbers of 2 year and 4 year private institutions. There was a regulatory framework for these universities and some assistance was available for needy students. Licensing arrangements provided administrative control. The reputation of these private institutions was not high and the licensing of new institutions was held up. Professor Saxena, India explained that governance and management of universities was broadly based on the British model. In the public sector, there was full public funding. Currently 12% of young people participated, with a planned increase to 20% in the next 15 years. The principle of governance was that autonomy must be accompanied by accountability. There were 425 universities and 20,000 institutes, offering centres of excellence in a range of subjects.

Dr Ahmad said that in Indonesia there was a need to develop a model for collaboration with industry, including joint funded research and contract research. Students also needed to engage with industry, through internships.

The Chairman, Professor Mayer, enquired whether private institutions operating for profit represented a problem. In Croatia, the problem was primarily about quality. In Vietnam, there were problems where substantial profits were being realised. On a separate issue, Professor Saxena expressed the view that in India there was sufficient autonomy for universities.

## **WORKING GROUP D: STRIKING THE BALANCE BETWEEN CENTRALISATION AND DECENTRALISATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION**

### **Input: Centralization and Decentralization in Higher Education – Opportunities and Challenges**

#### **Professor Maria Helena Nazaré, Rector, University of Aveiro, Portugal**

There is a further expectation from society to-day, namely that universities should diversify their funding sources, and improve their leadership and governance. They should not only respond to the fast changing environment but also lead the change. In many European universities, the principle of shared governance remains in place. This often means many bodies with overlapping competences and no scope for implementing significant change. In centralised systems, the Rector and senior colleagues take operational decisions. Leadership by the Rector with appropriate consultation enables necessary change to be introduced. In a specific example, the University of Aveiro was created 35 years ago, sandwiched between two ancient universities. In order to respond rapidly to challenges and changes, the university established a flat management structure with Departments (alone), an interdisciplinary approach, and a strongly co-ordinated matrix model. The governing body (Board) comprises 19 members, including external members as well as student and staff members. The Rector is the Chief Executive and is elected by the Board in a secret ballot. There is a Management Council comprising the Rector and senior colleagues. All research and degree programmes are owned by the University and must involve two or more departments to ensure interdisciplinarity.

#### **Case Study: The Case of King Monkut University of technology**

##### **Professor Dr Krissanapong Kirtikara, former President, King Monkut University of Technology, Thonburi and former Secretary General, Commission on Higher Education, Thailand**

Professor Dr Kirtikara explained that there were 150 public and private universities and colleges in Thailand reporting to the Commission of Higher Education. There had been a gradual delegation of authority to university councils and Presidents, starting with new universities. The transition had been more difficult than expected and the first attempt for 16 universities in 1992 had been unsuccessful. Universities found it difficult to adapt their administrative units, and handle appointments for academic staff. Furthermore, there were problems in handling a consolidated budget and in establishing a personnel management system. There was a need also for improved internal information about the level of autonomy and the measures needed to put it into effect.

At the second attempt, all of these issues were addressed and 11 universities had successfully completed the transition by 2007/08. There was confidence that the road to autonomy could now be extended.

### **Case Study: The Case of the University of the Philippines**

#### **Professor Dr Emerlinda Roman, President, University of the Philippines Diliman**

Professor Dr Roman explained that there is a University of the Philippines (UP) system set up in 1972 which has oversight of 7 universities. The principle is that individual universities, each led by a Chancellor, operate independently of each other but contribute to the overall performance of UP. There is a shared mission to uphold the standards and reputation of UP as a whole. The UP and its President are responsible for strategic decisions whilst the chancellors deal with operational matters within their own universities. The UP is also responsible for budget negotiations, tuition, fund-raising and external relations. Expansion of the work of the President has led to more delegation to the 7 universities. Decentralisation of this kind has enabled the different campuses to develop at their own pace.

### **WORKING GROUP E:**

#### **THE ENTREPRENEURIAL UNIVERSITY – MODEL OF THE FUTURE?**

#### **Input: Entrepreneurship and Public Access to New Knowledge – Innovative Models to Ease the Tension**

#### **Dr Magnus Gulbrandsen, Head, Research and Innovation Policy Department, Norwegian Institute for Studies in Innovation, Norway**

There were different perspectives about entrepreneurial universities. Entrepreneurship could be defined as linkages to industry and knowledge/ technology transfer. But it is also about education, and organisation and management issues. The optimistic view was that every university could become entrepreneurial. The pessimistic view was that only universities with scientific excellence on a global scale can become entrepreneurial. While some see entrepreneurship as a response to demands from policymakers, others see it as something to which the university itself is strongly committed at all levels. Innovative models may ease these tensions.

#### **Case Study: The Entrepreneurial Faculty – The Case of the Bandung Institute of Technology, Indonesia**

#### **Dr Intan Ahmad, Dean of the School of Life Science and Technology, Bandung Institute of Technology, Indonesia**

Dr Ahmad believed that autonomous universities could develop models of collaboration with industry. There were communication problems, different interests, and different cultures. Nevertheless there were a range of possibilities – joint funded research, contract research, internship for students, faculty interaction with business. The challenge for universities was to know when to take risks, to identify conflicts between knowledge and technology transfer, and to change the promotion culture to recognise enterprise. The way forward was to start on a small scale and build from there.

### **Case Study: The Entrepreneurial University – The Case of Bangor University, Wales**

**Professor Siân Hope, Pro Vice-Chancellor for Knowledge Transfer & Enterprise, Bangor University, Wales**

Professor Hope said that creativity and enterprise should be a central theme for universities. Her University promoted not only independence of thought and the values of the institution but also helped individuals to be entrepreneurial. One objective of the University was to contribute to the economy, health and culture of a sustainable Wales. Responsible partnering was important, preferably demand led from industry and with access for students. Mutual respect was vital. Risk taking cannot be taught but can be encouraged. Performance review for staff should reward on the basis of enterprise as well as teaching and research. Autonomy and leadership within the University was essential. Rectors elected by the staff did not promote an entrepreneurial university. As in teaching and research, success depends on excellence.

### **WORKING GROUP F:**

#### **CAPACITY BUILDING FOR INSTITUTIONAL GOVERNANCE AND UNIVERSITY MANAGEMENT – PRACTICE-ORIENTATED AND INTERNATIONAL**

### **Input: The Do's and Don't's of Capacity Building for University Management**

**Professor Peter Mayer (by proxy, based on the presentation by Mrs Michaela Martin, Programme Specialist, UNESCO-IIEP, Paris)**

There were four main requirements for capacity development – being coherent, being focussed on organisational development, being flexible and action-oriented, and managing capacity development for the individual. The new skills required for management at all levels included strategic management, marketing, controlling, finance and internationalisation. Capacity building is the process by which these and other skills are developed. Consortia arrangements and the use of external experts for the training could often be beneficial.

### **Case Study: Capacity Building for Asian Deans – Asian and European Institutions Working Together**

**Dr Supra Wimbarti, Director of Human Ressource Development, Gadjah Mada University, Indonesia**

Dr Wimbarti described an International Deans' Course for South East Asia, funded by the German Ministry of Economic Cooperation and Development. This embraced modules covering the changing nature of university governance, strategies for faculty management, leadership, the importance of networking, quality management, financial management and soft-skills. It had led to significant improvements for Gadjah Mada University, Indonesia by promoting a commitment to and alignment with the Strategic Plans set by Top Management.

A University Leadership programme had also been set up in Indonesia, initiated by alumni of Unistaff and the British Council. It had so far been followed by 200 state and private university rectors. The programme covered institutional quality assurance, leadership, and case studies on functional management. There was an opportunity to transfer the training to others through a cascading process.

### **Case Study: Capacity Building for University Management – Perspective from Thailand** **Dr Pinit Ratananukul, Deputy Secretary-General, Commission of Higher Education, Thailand**

Dr Ratananukul explained the structure of management in Thai universities. Experience in Thailand pointed to the following problems in university management:

- Limited in fields of expertise
- Unprepared for managerial role
- Lack of understanding in principles and philosophy of university management
- Lack of knowledge and experience in management
- Applied past experiences in management
- Insufficiently forward looking
- Insufficient focus on academic management

There was a need to strengthen the University Council, to enhance the management capacity of executives, to enhance the capability of supporting staff, and to enhance the capability of executives in newly established universities.

## **PART IV: HOW CAN UNIVERSITIES IN ASIA AND EUROPE LEARN FROM EACH OTHER?**

### **OUTLOOK EAHEP: PROSPECTS FOR INTER-REGIONAL AND INTRA-REGIONAL COOPERATION IN ASIA AND EUROPE**

#### **Prospects for Further Cooperation in the Framework of the Global Dimension of the Bologna Process**

**Professor Maria Helena Nazaré, Rector, University of Aveiro, Portugal, Representative, IEP, European University Association**

In the context of the Bologna Agreement, Professor Nazaré raised 3 concerns – research and doctoral education, quality assurance, and mobility. Climate change, poverty, infectious disease, sustainability of energy, food and water supply, security, and the digital divide highlight the need for effective global science and technology co-operation to promote sustainable development. Doctoral programmes are central to this. International co-operation is a key to success.

The key factor for quality enhancement is not the assurance processes. Rather, it is the strong leadership required to ensure that the necessary resources are available to implement required changes.

Nearly 3 million students study abroad, mainly from Asian countries and mainly in English speaking countries – USA, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and the UK. Graduates, including those studying in Asia, are highly mobile. This can lead to an increase in the gap between the very rich and the very poor. In discussion, no immediate solutions were offered, although it was mentioned that a substantial number of those graduating away from their home country do return home at some stage: it was important that home countries take steps to encourage that practice.

## **Regional and Global Cooperation in Asia – The ASEAN University Network**

**Professor Dr Piniti Ratananukul, former Executive Director, ASEAN University Network**

The objective for ASEAN members was diversity rather than commonality. Education had a crucial role to play. By 2015, there would be a single community. Although the ASEAN EU University network Programme had terminated, the European Engineering and Intellectual Property Rights programmes were ongoing. The agreed aim of ASEAN-EU co-operation was to facilitate exchange and co-operation of academic staff at all levels, to enhance research co-operation, and to introduce an ASEAN-EU PhD programme.

The main problem for co-operation was the imbalance of exchanges of staff and students, the problem of the brain drain and the unequal role of ASEAN and the EU. There was a case for giving outgoing ASEAN students incentives to return. More ASEAN co-operation would need to be considered at the ASEAN political level.

## **Official Closing of EAHEP Roundtable**

**Mr Willy Vandenberghe, Head, Cooperation Section, European Commission Delegation Hanoi**

In closing the Roundtable, Mr Willy Vandenberghe pointed out that higher education was now even higher on the EU agenda. The Roundtable was particularly timely. There was a diversity of ideas and mushrooming of initiatives discussed over the two days. There would be a further opportunity for dialogue at the ASEM Education ministers meeting in May 2009 in Vietnam.

Tony Clark      24/01/09