

Call for Abstracts

APIKS Conference Vilnius, Lithuania – 20th-21st August, 2020

APIKS Early career Pre-conference, Vilnius, Lithuania -19 August, 2020

Management and Governance of Higher Education

The changing governance of higher education has been discussed extensively in the literature in the past decades stemming largely from the triangle of coordination proposed by Burton Clark in 1983 and later developed especially in the context of New Public Management reforms of higher education governance (de Boer, Enders & Schimank, 2007a; Krücken, Engwall, & De Corte, 2018). The previous CAP study has shown a divergent picture across emergent and mature higher education systems when it comes to changing management structures and governance of higher education (Locke, Cummings & Fisher, 2011; Teichler, Arimoto, & Cummings 2013). The tensions between academic beliefs and drivers for change were more evident in certain national systems than in others, and within each system, the tension raises particular issues. This is in line with previous comparative studies that have shown the differences in starting points for managerial reforms, different path-dependencies, cultures and pace of reforms across different countries that lead various degrees of tensions for academics (Broucker et al. 2017; Paradeise, Reale, Bleiklie, & Ferlie, 2009; Musselin, 2013).

In the past decades, the network and shared governance approaches have increasingly gained prominence at universities (Broucker, De Wit, Verhoeven, Leisyte 2019; Stensaker and Vabø. 2013) whereby approaches underlining the Public Value of universities have been increasingly underscored. A range of models of governance has been developed by higher education studies drawing on sociological, public administration and political sciences theories (De Boer, Enders, Leisyte 2007b; Jungblud & Dobbins, 2019). These models, including, for example, the five dimensions of governance that comprise the governance equalizer of higher education (de Boer et al., 2007a) or the three way typology by Dobbins, Knill & Vögtle (2011) have increasingly emphasized notions of multi-level and multi-actor governance and the increasing importance of shared governance to achieve transformative change in higher education institutions.

Overall, higher education institutions have become organizational actors with strengthened managerial capacities (Hüther and Krücken, 2018). In this context the importance of management at universities has increased alongside with the tools that support accountability and control, such as performance-based pay, time accounting, performance reviews, explicit and transparent criteria for promotion to name a few (Leisyte & Dee, 2012; Welppe, Wollersheim, Ringelham & Osterloh, 2015; Pinheiro, Geschwind, Hansen, & Pulkkinen, 2019).

Thus, the key increased management imperatives in higher education include (1) pressure to perform, show visible results and increased competition for promotion (Carvahlo, 2018;), (2) interference in daily work through time management and other forms of control, such as filling forms and writing performance reports which may translate into the reduction of professional autonomy and possibly academic freedom (Leisyte & Zeeman 2019; Pinheiro, Geschwind, Hansen, & Pulkkinen, 2019), (3) meeting sometimes conflicting demands for quality and relevance of teaching and research, (4) reduced collegial self-governance and academic power, i.e. academics' influence within their institutions and beyond and (5) the impact on the academic identity and satisfaction with work in the academia (Bleiklie, Enders & Lepori 2017; Locke et al. 2011; Krücken, Engwall, & De Corte. 2018; Broucker et al. 2019; Welpé et al. 2016). However, even though these trends are extremely important for the academic profession and its future, they have been seldomly explored in a systematic longitudinal comparative way across countries, disciplines, seniority levels and institutional types in higher education.

In order to create an understanding of differences and similarities regarding the latest trends in the governance and management of the academic profession across the world, the APIKS conference in Vilnius, Lithuania, will address some of the above issues especially dealing with the views of academics in response to questions of the APIKS survey Part F: Governance and Management as well as other survey questions that are related to this topic. The following questions will be interesting to investigate across countries, types of institutions, different disciplines as well as different career levels:

- F1 How influential are you in helping to shape key academic policies at your institution?
- F2 By whom is your teaching, research, and external activities regularly evaluated?
- F3 At your institution, there is...
- F4 To what extent does your institution emphasize the following practices?
- C3 Does your institution/unit set quantitative load targets or regulatory expectations for individual faculty for the following?
- D5 To what extent do you consider yourself to be exposed to the following expectations by your institution?

These developments have been by no means the same in different types of higher education institutions, different academic ranks or disciplines (within and across countries). The earlier CAP study (Locke, Cummings & Fisher, 2011) has already shown that country (higher education system), academic rank (senior versus junior academics), type of higher education institution, or academic function (teaching or research), may be playing a decisive role in how managerial imperatives are perceived and experienced by academics and what impact they have on academic work and profession in general. Further, the discipline may be a strong mediating factor as some of the criteria used by performance management systems have been strongly influenced by STEM fields. This may serve as a disadvantage for the social sciences and humanities, which function in a different mode of knowledge production (de Rijcke et al.,

APIKS Conference Vilnius, Lithuania, 2020

2016; Guetzkow, Lamont and Mallard, 2004). Country differences and similarities are highly pertinent given that the Anglo-Saxon countries have been at the forefront of managerial reforms compared to the Continental European higher education systems (Leisyte and Dee, 2012).

The conference organizers (the Lithuanian APIKS team) look forward to the submission of abstracts addressing the perceptions of changing management and governance of higher education systems based on the APIKS survey data. Papers with a comparative focus across time (e.g. comparisons with CAP study results in some countries that participated in CAP), or across countries, disciplines, type of higher education institutions, academic rank and gender are particularly welcome.

The deadline for abstract submissions is **22 December, 2019**. Please send the abstracts (max 300 words) by email to liudvika.leisyte@tu-dortmund.de. The notifications of acceptance will be sent by 15 January. The online registration for the conference will be available online from 15 January.

Before the conference, we plan an early career pre-conference where we will offer professional development workshops as well as provide space for collaborative working on the APIKS data. The aim is to support our early career researchers from APIKS in publishing efforts based on the project and provide a space for networking and productive exchange. We invite interested colleagues (doctoral students, postdoctoral researchers) to register for the pre-conference alongside the main conference registration.

We look forward to your abstract submissions and to welcoming you in Vilnius!

Should you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact Prof. Liudvika Leisyte at liudvika.leisyte@tu-dortmund.de

Yours sincerely,

The APIKS Lithuania conference organizational team

Prof. Liudvika Leišytė

Prof. Rimantas Želvys

Sude Peksen

Anna-Lena Rose

Ruta Bružienė

References

- Bleiklie, L., Enders, J. & Lepori, B. (2017). *Managing Universities Policy and Organizational Change from a Western European Comparative Perspective*. Basigstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Broucker, B., De Wit, K., & Verhoeven, J. C. (2017). Higher Education Research: Looking Beyond New Public Management. In J. Huisman & M. Tight (Eds.), *Theory and method in higher education research* (pp. 21-38). Bingley: Emerald Publishing Limited.
- Broucker, B., De Wit, K., Verhoeven, J. C., & Leisyte, L. (2019). Higher education system reform: An international comparison after twenty years of Bologna. Leiden: Brill Sense.
- Carvalho T. (2018). Academic Perception of Governance and Management. In P. Teixeira & J. Shin (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of International Higher Education Systems and Institutions*. Springer, Dordrecht.
- Clark, B. R. (1983). *The higher education system: Academic organization in cross-national perspective*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- de Boer, H., Enders, J., & Schimank U. (2007a). On the Way towards New Public Management? The Governance of University Systems in England, the Netherlands, Austria, and Germany. In D. Jansen (Eds.), *New Forms of Governance in Research Organizations* (pp. 137-152). Dordrecht: Springer.
- de Boer, H., Enders, J., & Leisyte, L. (2007b). Public sector reform in Dutch higher education: The organizational transformation of the university. *Public Administration*, 85(1), 27-46. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9299.2007.00632.x>.
- de Rijcke, S., Wouters, P. F., Rushforth, A. D., Franssen, T. P., & Hammarfelt, B. (2016). Evaluation practices and effects of indicator use—a literature review. *Research Evaluation*, 25(2), 161-169.
- Dobbins, M., Knill, C. & Vögtle, E.M. (2011). An analytical framework for the cross-country comparison of higher education governance. *Higher Education*, 62(5), 665-683.
- Guetzkow, J., Lamont, M., & Mallard, G. (2004). What is Originality in the Humanities and the Social Sciences? *American Sociological Review*, 69(2), 190–212.
- Hüther, O., & Krücken, G. (2018). *Higher education in Germany: Recent developments in an international perspective, vol. 49*. Cham, Switzerland: Springer.
- Jungblut, J. & Dobbins, M. (2019). Higher Education Governance. In A. Hynds, A. (Ed.), *Oxford bibliographies in education*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Leisyte, L. & Zeeman, N. (2019). Higher education faculty characteristics and trends in the United States and Europe. In A. Hynds (Ed.), *Oxford bibliographies in education*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Leisyte, L. & Dee, J. (2012). Understanding academic work in a changing institutional environment: Faculty autonomy, productivity and identity in Europe and the United States. In J. C. Smart & M. Paulsen (Eds.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research (Vol. 27)* (pp. 123-206). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Locke, W., Cummings, W. K. & Fisher, D. (2011). *Changing Governance and Management in Higher Education: The Perspectives of the Academy* (The Changing Academy Vol. 2). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.

Krücken, G., L. Engwall, & De Corte, E. (2018). Introduction to the special issue on 'university governance and creativity'. *European Review*, 26(1), S1–S5.

Musselin, C. (2013). Redefinition of the relationships between academics and their university. *Higher Education*, 65(1), 25–37.

Stensaker, B., and A. Vabø. 2013. Re-inventing shared governance: Implications for organisational culture and institutional leadership. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 67(3), 256–274.

Paradeise, C. Reale, E. Bleiklie, I. & Ferlie, E. (2009). *University governance: Western European perspectives*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.

Pinheiro, R., Geschwind, L., Hansen, H. & Pulkkinen, K. (2019). *Reforms, Organizational Change and Performance in Higher Education*. Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave MacMillan

Welpe, I. M., Wollersheim, J., Ringelhan, S., Osterloh, M. (2015). *Incentives and Performance. Governance of Research Organizations*. Cham, Switzerland: Springer.