M

Jeroen Huisman
Attila Pausits
(Eds.)

Higher Education Management and Development

Compendium for Managers

WAXMANN

Higher Education Management and Development
Compendium for Managers

Jeroen Huisman, Attila Pausits (Eds.)

Higher Education Management and Development

Compendium for Managers

Education and Culture DG

Lifelong Learning Programme

Contents

Preface

European higher education has undergone major changes over the past few years. This is especially true in the case of higher education institutions and systems in the eastern and central European regions, since the so-called two-cycle system has not been established there as a result of an organic development. As a consequence of various developments, institutional management has also changed. It is gratifying to see that higher education management is becoming increasingly popular in the countries of our region, as indicated by the prestigious conferences, seminars and excellent books on this topic in recent years. Professional research into higher education management is essential. However, because it is imperative to emphasize implementation as well, educational and training programmes need to include technical subjects related to higher education management.

The major changes across the landscape of higher education certainly have an impact on the academic and research activities, the management and also the domestic and international relations of universities. Areas such as strategic planning, professional management, human resources management, marketing communications and the high-level application of electronic devices related to core activities (e.g., e-learning) as well as management (e.g., management information system, financial controlling) – that might have been considered of minor importance earlier or even dismissed as belonging to the sphere of the corporation – have all been playing an increased role recently.

Today as never before, it is imperative that leaders of universities possess the knowledge and the competencies associated with modern HEI management. By applying the means at their disposal in a conscious and professional manner, they must govern their universities such that these institutions can form strong partnership with and even emerge as rivals to the most prestigious universities in Europe and around the world.

The Danube Rectors' Conference (DRC) provides an excellent opportunity for higher education institutions in eastern and central Europe to share best practices, exchange experiences and discuss problems with a view to establishing a high-quality operating model. The publication of this volume is the result of many months of intensive and fruitful cooperation, also with DRC members. As President of the Danube Rectors' Conference and rector of Eötvös Loránd University in Budapest, Hungary, I heartily recommend this volume to readers, as it touches upon every important aspect of higher education management and thus fills a gap in the field.

Ferenc Hudecz

Jeroen Huisman and Attila Pausits

Introduction

1. The project

This book emerged as the product of the European Higher Education Management and Development (EHEMD) project, a European multilateral curriculum development project funded by the European Union in the framework of the Erasmus Lifelong Learning Programme. The EHEMD project ran from January 2007 to November 2009 with Danube Krems University in Austria as the lead partner. Other partners were South-West University "Neofit Rilski" in Blagoevgrad, Bulgaria; Gdañsk University of Technology in Poland; University of Bath in the United Kingdom; Işik University in Istanbul, Turkey; and Dortmund University of Technology in Germany.

One of the outcomes of the EHEMD project was the development of a Master of Science programme in European Higher Education Management and Development, which is designed for professionals in higher education management positions. The degree-granting institution is Danube University Krems, a leading institution for postgraduate education in Europe. The aim of the programme is to provide graduates with the necessary qualifications for attaining (and succeeding at) leading positions in universities and research organizations. This study programme addresses the challenges specific to the European Higher Education Area and trains participants as "multiplicators" within and for regions in central, southern and eastern Europe. A further goal is to promote mobility of academic staff and students between EU member states and candidate countries.

2. Professional management in higher education

Professional management is required for higher education institutions to act as autonomous organizations and to behave entrepreneurially and proactively rather than as subordinate to central governments. Professional management also enables higher education institutions to co-operate more frequently and more effectively with partners ranging from local businesses to international enterprises and other stakeholders. As higher education institutions grow larger and more extensive, the functions demanded of them multiply, and academic administration and management become increasingly complex; the need for skilled management and administrative personnel becomes more acute. The days of rectors performing ceremonial duties as their main task are definitely over, as are the days when deans could do their jobs on a Friday afternoon. Nowadays managers need specific knowledge,

but also specific (analytical) skills and an appropriate attitude. The sustainability of higher education reforms in general, and in the EU candidate countries in particular, will be directly proportional to the level of professionalism in higher education management.

3.   The programme

Can higher education management be taught? We can confidently say "yes!", but the answer needs qualification. The "yes" applies because higher education management is no different from any other subject in the social sciences. The qualification is that a sound pedagogical philosophy and accompanying structure need to underpin such a programme. The basic philosophy of the EHEMD programme is that it is interdisciplinary, that it is practice-oriented and that students learn from each other – but also learn independently. There is a strong emphasis on e-learning in order to reduce the time and costs associated with taking up residence near the university. Also, the geographical distribution of the programme's staff makes it necessary to rely on ICT-based tools for virtual exchange and communication. The programme relies on a blended learning approach in which various forms of e-learning are combined with more traditional forms of instruction such as lectures, workshops, round tables, etc.

Graduates of the programme will be qualified and competent to:
- deal with complex issues both systematically and creatively
- make sound judgments even in the absence of complete data
- communicate their conclusions and decisions clearly to specialist and non-specialist audiences
- demonstrate self-direction and originality in tackling and solving problems
- act autonomously in planning and implementing tasks at a professional level

Furthermore, graduates will be equipped to continue enhancing their knowledge and comprehension and to advance their new skills to a high level.

   Programme content is designed to address the core topics of higher education management in a three-stage curriculum. Six topics are covered at the certificate level: financial management, human resources management, quality management, project management, knowledge and information management, and marketing and public relations. At the postgraduate diploma level, the following topics are addressed: organizational change and development, leadership and governance, strategic planning, management and development of research/teaching/lifelong learning, finance and accountability, and funding in higher education. At the master's level three topics/modules are added to: higher education and society; globalization, internationalization and Europeanisation; and the master's thesis.

4.   The compendium

Objectives, learning outcomes, module descriptions, syllabi etc. can provide considerable insight in the contents of a programme, but ultimately education is a hands-on type of good. To give better insight into such an experience, it was deemed worthwhile to prepare this compendium. The objective was to bring the contributors to the programme (and their colleagues) together. To that end, we, as the editors of this booklet, invited 24 experts from 12 European countries to support our initiative and prepare theoretical perspectives as well as case studies coming mostly from central, southern and eastern Europe. Contributors were asked to highlight, explore and explain the key themes of their modules and to invite a co-author to present a relevant case. To avoid the risk of ending up with interesting but very long texts and eventually an overly weighty tome, we set limits for the word count of each chapter. We are pleased that almost all of the modules of the programme are represented. During the preparation of this book we got a deeper understanding for the amount of diversity among higher education institutions in the region. But we also discovered many similarities in the challenges facing higher education managers today. Last but not least, we hope the volume gives a flavor of what participants who enroll in the programme can expect.

It is our hope that the compendium as a summary of the key elements and approaches of today's higher education management in Europe will be broadly useful and applicable to reflective practitioners as well as to potential programme participants. Questions formulated by the authors in the chapters will guide readers to reflect on their daily business. In addition to serving our students as the major guide throughout the programme, we hope that this compendium will help interested readers understand the WHYs, WHATs, HOWs of their daily tasks and that such understanding will stimulate further institutional developments.

We thank all the contributors for their efforts and their patience. Also a word of thanks to those who were very supportive to the project: the European Commission for the funds that made possible the development of the programme and preparation of this publication, all of our partner universities and members of the core project team for supporting the idea to develop a new master's programme in higher education management and for affirming the need and importance of such a programme on the way to more professional management of our universities. We do not have space here to mention all the names of people who contributed to the enormous involvement and commitment required to bring this project to fruition during the last two years, so we will thank the entire group and highlight a few names. During the project our external advisors László Frenyó and Michael Daxner gave important recommendations that we used to improve our programme design as well as this publication. Our colleagues Katharina Prager and Lil Reif at Danube University Krems did a wonderful job managing the project in a very professional way. Our colleague Florian Reisky provided essential support to the editors and contributors.

He managed the communication and exchange with all the authors and helped us to prepare this compendium by taking care of *everything*. Special thanks also to Eva Ciabattoni, who put in a great effort on the language issue and helped us make the publication more enjoyable for an international audience.

Michael Daxner

Understanding Higher Education Management

1. Introduction

Wherever you are in the world, you always recognise a university at first glance. While it is not true that someone who knows one university will know them all, the main features are alike. You will find students, professors, lecture rooms and libraries. Message boards will advertise classes and contact hours and feature postings concerning examinations and deadlines. Being familiar with the structure of a university, you will soon discover that there are deans, heads of departments and institutes; there will be an office of admissions and a registrar. Of course, there are many more elements that you will recognise. And there are always elements that you will not find because they exist in your university but not at another one. In short, you have learned how to read the signs of a university.

This introduction anticipates some of the contents of chapter 3, *Higher Education and Society*, but also seeks to motivate you to expand your thinking in other directions. In a way, understanding the university has to do with learning about yourself not just as an employee or a manager, but as a member of the institution. This learning process can begin and end with some assertions. The last sentence of this introduction will be: You don't start at zero. And at the outset we will assert that the journey itself will be worth it.

Among the many basic institutions of society, the university displays relatively little variety in its functions. This does not mean that all universities are alike. Many are not considered to be "true" universities, and there are heavy fights about the typology and classification of institutions of higher education. The institutions that we recognize today are the result of a process of differentiation that dates back at least to Bologna (1088) and medieval universities, but in fact, its roots are even older. This process has led to much diversity in form, but not function.

When people speak of research universities, you immediately know that they do not mean comprehensive universities or undergraduate colleges. As members of European universities, you will be familiar with the different functions of presidents, rectors, vice-chancellors or deans; you will know that most universities have a governing body called a senate or university council while others may have a board.

It is a worthwhile exercise to reflect on how you acquired your expertise. Having been hired as an accountant, a media specialist or a professional procurement expert, how did you learn what you know, i.e., how did you become expert in your field? The more you feel that your activities are in an expert league, the more you will be confronted with competition and challenges from other experts who claim

your field for themselves. This is normal; it happens whenever a new professional field emerges. However, one of the aims of this introduction and of the entire course is to encourage you to examine the question of how you have attained your knowledge, skills and proficiency. You did not become experts entirely through hands-on experience, nor was it decreed by law or ordered by your superiors. And, if there is an answer to this question, then why should you enrol in our EHEMD programme? Here's the short answer: EHEMD offers professional upgrading of your expertise and better understanding about the functions and impact of higher education management.

2.   Terminology matters

Higher education is a large topic within a field called education and training. Its name suggests that it placed above elementary or secondary education. Some organisations prefer to use the term tertiary education, but this also implies that there is a built-in hierarchy within education systems. Higher education is not better or more important than primary and secondary education; its name refers to a different characteristic. If we consider education a public good and if we agree that elementary and large parts of secondary education are compulsory (and necessary) rites of passage for all members of a society, then we must draw the line at higher education because these beliefs no longer hold true at that level. There are many reasons why admission to higher education is not an entitlement; there are many reasons why more and more people seek admission to HEIs and why there is a permanent dispute about the conditions for admission. Many systems raise fees for higher education while others refrain from doing so. Institutions may be owned by the state or privately; they may enjoy a high degree of autonomy and academic freedom – or not.

However different an individual institution or HE system may be, this does not affect its basic structure. Let us first have a look at the basic functions that HEIs serve for society and individuals and the social, institutional and personal impact of higher education.

3.   The basic divide: Higher education and science

When you ask ordinary people (laypeople, parents, pupils) to define the term university, you may get three kinds of answers:

a) A university is a place where future professionals or socially highly placed persons are being trained
b) A university is place where science is being done
c) A university is place where cultivated people are being educated

None of three answers is entirely wrong and there may be many other assumptions about what universities do and what their internal life is like. As with all institutions, the view from inside is different from the view from outside. People who are members of the institution, i.e. insiders, may answer differently from people on the periphery. But are these views really totally incompatible?

In order to obtain more precise answers, we should look into experience, political and cultural history, and into higher education research. Let us jump from the questions to the results of considerations:

Higher education is:

- A place where qualifications, habitus and values are passed on to new generations of students by a select and legitimate group of teachers (professors)
- A place where degrees are being bestowed onto those deemed capable of entering a market of defined professional positions or of creating their own positions in new or undefined markets
- A place where the education of young adults is being completed (in loco parentis) or refined (continuing education)
- A place of research and the production of different kinds of knowledge
- A place of transforming scientific areas into fields of study and preparing students for doing research

4. Why and how these definitions matter for higher education management

By place we can mean a system or an individual institution. A HEI is always a social place where people communicate and study. It is a place where people are involved in scientific endeavour. It is a cultural place where a special habitus or personality is being developed and kept over long periods of time. What gives the university legitimacy as a place of knowledge transfer? Because a social system, in this case the state, wants to guarantee its citizens a certain standard of quality regarding proficiency attained as a result of a licensed study program. This is partly due to market regulation and partly due to the state's display of monopoly power; both are in service of the creation of certain protective structures for the citizens, so that citizens can trust that a doctor with an MD degree has fulfilled the minimum requirements of treating patients according to current state of the art methods or that a language graduate can speak and write the language at an appropriate level. This kind of basic trust in degrees and titles cannot be bought – even if people have sometimes tried. Thus, protective and authorising policies fall under the jurisdiction of the state.

Another approach would define higher education as a system with a high amount of internal freedom and capacity for self-government. Whether this extends to the freedom to express opinions and advertise methods to the outside (i.e., to society) is a constant debate, in which universities want to expand their authority and others

may try to limit the autonomy of the institution. A second set of definitions filters out of this perspective.

Higher education institutions are characterised by:

- Academic freedom as a necessary element of all its functions, by which is meant academic freedom as more than the freedom of expression, but also the freedom to investigate, teach and display content and methods according to self-imposed standards and to reject all undue interference into this freedom from either the government or particular interest groups.
- Institutional autonomy as a principle, whereby institutions act as enterprises but not as businesses, i.e., they enjoy autonomy to high degree without tight leadership and a chain of command to the government or other powerful stakeholders. (The enterprise concept is a result of the HEI's ability to exercise its own agency instead of being a mere agent of the state or the owner).
- Public ownership. This must be explained: public does not mean state ownership, but rather ownership by the people (i.e., society) for whom its products (qualification, education, personality) are relevant.

5. Why and how these characteristics are relevant and critical to higher education management

As we proceed to more concrete definitions of the higher education system, we can safely say that universities possess as their core qualities:

- Authority
- Freedom
- Autonomy
- Relevance
- Impact
- Effectiveness
- Efficiency

Take a moment to consider your position in the university system and ask yourself whether these qualities can be measured. They can be perceived and assessed; some of them can be even measured. This list could be expanded, but for our purpose we shall try to analyse it as it stands. Before we do that, let us make a strong statement:

A higher education system is different from a science system.

And therefore…

Higher education management is different from science management.

The science system is commonly called science or sometimes research. It is characterised by the legitimate investigation of problems, where legitimate means that scientists abide by agreed-upon rules and conventions that govern scientific methodology. In other words, not all thinking and reflection fall under the rubric science! There are certain qualities that characterise state-of-the-art science. The history of science is closely linked to the history of human perception and thinking, to the ability to analyse and synthesise knowledge, and to formulate theories and make predictions. Science systems are characterised by a differentiated and infinite number of disciplines (subjects, fields of research) and methods. Science systems rely on well-trained researchers who need academic freedom, particularly when it comes to identifying their fields of investigation and the publication of their findings. Normally researchers are accredited by the degrees they have acquired, i.e., they come from systems of higher education. However, the science system, the distribution of power and recognition, and the internal procedures of decision-making are different from higher education. Scientific institutions such as laboratories or industrial research facilities do not need to be folded into universities or other public establishments; while knowledge is considered a public good, the rights to it or the license to profit from it may belong to the owner of the research institution. There is always a certain tension between the science system and higher education: universities participate in science and do their own in-house research but they also depend upon knowledge transfer of research results from outside the institution, while at the same time the science system is completely dependent upon universities as a reservoir for recruitment of researchers.

As entangled, interconnected and sometimes integrated higher education and science systems sometimes are in a single institution, they are different with regard to values, culture and organisation. There are permanent tensions and frictions between the two, and management quite often finds itself at the intersection.

In our EHEMD programme, we will touch on these questions in the more general modules such as *Higher Education and Society* or *Human Resources Management*, where we will discuss the problem of professors being recruited mainly for their research capability, while being needed as teachers and licensing authorities (qualities that do not receive sufficient recognition in the higher education system and that are among the most difficult to assess without seeing them in practice). In the module *Funding*, we will examine the critical role and impact of research. A strong influence on almost all aspects of management is the identity of your institution, e.g., does it consider itself a research university or a teaching university? If the former, then it is likely that it identifies more with the values and culture of the science system, while still retaining the traditional charter of authorising and licensing.

6.   Principles of higher education management

Higher education management is at the core of each institution. No university functions merely on the basis of academic self-governance. This is the first polarity: academic – non-academic. It has become commonplace to classify teaching, learning, study and research as academic, and thus, the administration of examinations, the office of syllabus planning and the degree office as belonging to the academic management realm. Procurement, maintenance, public relations and also the departments of staffing, human resources and finance are generally classified as non-academic, i.e., administrative. But is this justified? Or, to put it another way – is this a natural divide or an artificial one; and perhaps more salient – is this divide useful or desirable?

What does it need to get one course up and running? You need laboratory equipment, audio-visual aids, technical assistance, heating, the procurement of material, stationery, textbooks etc. Who sets the agenda and who is responsible for implementation, who is assessing effectiveness and efficiency? Your might consider whether the delineation academic/non-academic is not mainly political or social and cultural. To manage something in its entirety means that both academic and non-academic segments are inseparably entangled and connected.

The second polarity – institutional‖personal – is more complex. The management of financial resources and budgets and of the activities related to facilities and maintenance is often viewed as separate from the mission of the university and its special features. The institution is treated like an industrial or other commercial establishment, while students and professors are viewed as different and more complex to manage. Students come and go; professors stay for a long time. Students have their own legal rights and aspirations and certainly draw the line between the internal and external agendas of the institution differently from their teachers. You all know from experience that communication with internal counterparts is different from contact with people outside the institution. Whatever your role inside the organisation, your communication with the outside will be shaped by whether you are recognised as member of the expert (academic) culture or of the lay (non-academic) culture and which of the two classes your counterpart identifies with. Most important for you is whether your superiors, i.e., rector, deans, registrars etc. consider themselves your managers or academic peers, and how they define your position relative to theirs.

It is easy to understand why all these aspects are political. The position of management depends on:

- legal norms and directives from both the government/owner and university leadership (rector/board)
- organisational structure as it exists and the leeway for change and corrections
- traditions and unwritten codes of behaviour and habitus
- material support and physical conditions for implementing objectives that are agreed upon as necessary, useful and meaningful

- the qualifications and internal organisation of the management team members
- the relationship between management and the academic hierarchy

All these dependencies can be included in a framework of governance. Since we all know that a university cannot accomplish its goals and duties without effective and efficient management, let us ask what this can mean in concrete detail.

We had defined the main ingredients of higher education as:
- Authority
- Freedom
- Autonomy
- Relevance
- Impact
- Effectiveness
- Efficiency

7. What does that list mean for the management of higher education? And for you?

Authority is probably not an immediate issue for most administrative units. But you can find several interfaces where authority is directly related to what you do, for example, in the area of student administration only very meticulous management of examination schedules and assessment of documents and procedures guarantees the necessary level of confidence (in grading) for both student and professor. More often than not, the quality of academic services is derived from the combined agendas of the academic and non-academic ranks and we can easily find both cooperation and friction between the two. And, of course, the authority of management takes precedence over particular academic wishes when it comes to safety regulations, maintenance and the operation of the infrastructure. Here is an area of huge potential conflict with the science system, for example, in cases where academic staff want flexible working hours, access to facilities granted to non-authorized personnel and services that are not suited to the traditional study routines. But who decides about what is appropriate or not? Quite frequently, the decision is based on unwritten customs and rules, traditions and the imperative of practice. In the EHEMD programme, we will discuss the difference between routine practice and good practice (or even best practices!). The examples in this paragraph serve only an entry point into the debate about what is needed to uphold the authority of the institution.

Freedom Generally speaking, what the management team does is to ensure the conditions that allow academic freedom and the diverse liberties of higher education to flourish. But this definition is too skimpy and abstract. As a right given to individuals, professors, researchers and students, academic freedom means more than freedom of expression and free access to information, otherwise we would not need it. An approximation might be that academic freedom is freedom of expression

and methods plus quality. We have spoken about the quality demands on the science system. Creating new knowledge always implies a critique of existing knowledge and understanding. And such a critique will meet with resistance, often political opposition, even persecution. As an individual right, academic freedom is linked to academic status and in most cases to the scientific aspect of the action. But we understand academic freedom as signifying more than individual freedom. It refers to institutional privilege as well. The entire institution is affected if some research or teaching or methods comes under scrutiny, more so if it is censored, limited or dismissed, hence the existence of codes of conduct, rules governing property rights, rules regarding plagiarism etc[1].

Autonomy There is literally hundreds of books that deal with the range and limits of institutional autonomy. The principle is very simple: universities are institutions that follow the paradigm to set their own agenda, to act autonomously (i.e., in a responsible and rational way) and to take seriously the consequences and liabilities that follow from such activities. This is part of the legacy of European enlightenment and has become a global guideline for higher education policies. But the implications are less simple. Autonomy means that the governance in higher education must respect aims other than those coming from business or government. Neither profit nor the exertion of power can suffice as the ultimate goal for universities. Governance is expressed in the systems of decision-making, the chain of command, quality control and permanent course corrections in the interest of effectiveness and efficiency. Universities suffer if the state (ministries, state agencies etc.) or particular interest groups (professional associations, lobbies, businesses etc.) interfere with governance. And it is most important for management to understand that dutiful accountability to the taxpayer does not give government the right to interfere with the activities that make for a good university.

For many of you, autonomy has a strong internal component. In some systems, faculties are much more powerful than management. In some post-socialist systems, the faculties are legal entities and exercise economic and sometimes legal autonomy. This legacy is determining some of the management structures, i.e., in the area of human resources and in relationships with the faculty. Other internal relationships, e.g., with the rector and staff units handling media, marketing and the reporting to the state and other owners may suffer or become distorted.

Another level where autonomy affects management is in the composition of an institution with regard to its various disciplines. Traditionally, professors have been the stalwarts of administering their disciplines. Again, you brush up against the science system. Disciplines are usually organised according to their research structure and their interface with practical applications. Theory and knowledge development have created relatively stable cultures within different disciplines, where each has acquired special rituals and forms of expression. Higher education is mainly organised according to the requirements of qualifications of study and of a budget regime that is barely process oriented, but mainly envisages cost-effective output in terms of the number of graduates. (We all know that it is not as easy as that, but

---

1   Magna Charta Observatory 2007.

contrary to official rhetoric, the basic models of governance and legislation do not sufficiently respect the cultures of diverse disciplines or the relationship between research and study). While the disciplines are only one element in the university complex, the management of disciplines is a tricky and highly demanding affair. It requires a lot of communication and a reservoir of mutual understanding between academic and non-academic staff.

Relevance and Impact Higher education is relevant to society because study and research are destined to improve the living conditions of people. The unique position of science and scholarship is often reduced to simple dualities, such as "universities serve their clients", "students and employers are customers", and "higher education is an entrepreneurial variety of the training business". These qualifications are neither correct nor do they imply any relevance. Just imagine a world without higher education. We can picture such a world, but it would be less complete and certainly not better than the one we know. Being relevant to society means that higher education contributes to:

• the education and socialisation of people
• the critical perception of reality in order to being able to create alternative options, open new horizons and fight against prejudice and dogmatism
• the development of people and personalities
• the identification and the solution of problems
• the ability of human beings to act in a more considerate way

Of course, higher education is also relevant, because it is:

• a growing economic force (in the US, it already is an industry) and a major employer
• an important structural entity (e.g., the university as an urban establishment, as a community asset, as a place of style and culture)
• a local and regional power

This relevance is not just being generated by the ingenuity of the university's scholars. The institution needs an organisation, it needs a structure, it needs a bureaucracy and an administration, it needs specific ways of communication – in short, it needs ... management.

The relevance and impact of any higher education institution are obviously dependent on the quality of management. There is not much research available on the direct impact of management on the effectiveness of an institution. But, as experts in management, you do know what the impact is; except that your knowledge might not have an immediate effect at the levels where relevance and impact are normally assessed and appraised. This state of affairs has to do with quite a few structural elements and deficiencies in governance.

First, management often is not involved in the determination of goals and methods, or in the implementation and execution of curricula and research programs, or in the discussion of academic issues. The subordinate function of management

in these areas traditionally is perceived as a natural division of labour in a university. Often, a condescending attitude is developed by the academic staff. This effect stems not only from a traditional attitude of superiority and an unquestioned chain of command. The professionalisation of operations in higher education is a consequence of the exponential increases of complexity in the realm of science. Relevance has also been growing at big rates, but this social mega-process has not fully reached the internal structure of higher education. This is a good example of the incongruent integration of science and higher education systems.

Second, academic staff members are not sufficiently aware of the increased sophistication of higher education management. The result is the emergence of two parallel subsystems within one university, which poses a problem with regard to communication and understanding the range of action of the other. The main point is that management must know what the teachers and researchers are doing, and academics must know what management is doing. The category titled '*doing*' is one of the most relevant aspects of your programme and the EHEMD philosophy. Institutional identity, i.e., identification with the results and impact on the institution, is not merely a matter of rhetoric. The main reasons underlying the problem of incongruence are non-communication due to barriers of status (or perceived status) and institutional narrow-mindedness on behalf of both sides. (There are some systems where staff members can shift easily from one side of the house to the other – staff members with this experience are often better scholars and managers!).

If higher education is expected to deliver relevant and meaningful results – good services, good research and good graduates – the hard line between academia and management must become more permeable. This will require mutual respect and understanding, but also taking stock of what universities do, what scholars do, what students do and what is required to let them do it.

Effectiveness and Efficiency These two qualities could not be further apart and yet they are permanently mashed together and allowed to contaminate each other. Effectiveness applies to a structure or an operation that achieves what is expected or potentially possible. Efficiency is a measure of the best deployment of resources for a specific operation or procedure. Effectiveness has to do with goal-orientation, standards and the underlying philosophy; efficiency is an indicator of the value of material or intellectual input achieved at the lowest cost and with the least amount of waste. You can be very effective, but inefficient. However, you cannot be efficient and ineffective, that is, you are not really operating in an efficient way, if you don't produce something useful (but you can pretend).

Effectiveness and efficiency are the basic principles of our program, which seeks to impart the art of discerning one from the other in a series of managerial modules. This endeavour is both intellectual and pragmatic and it will benefit from your collective experience. To speak about management requires an understanding of processes as well as a vision of the goal. Since management is based on the handling of resources, most modules will be based around management of human resources, material resources and symbolic resources.

Human resources include:

- personnel development
- staffing
- diverse organisational chains and linkages
- social relations
- social policy
- conflict resolution

Material resources include:

- the handling of finances
- negotiating budgets
- cost effectiveness and efficiency
- fundraising
- responsible risk management

Symbolic resources are indispensable for any university. Here we will cover credibility, reliability, reputation, social and cultural capital and why your institution needs more than a superficial marketing or public relations strategy.

All three sections are connected by overarching principles, such as:

- ethical concepts
- organisational strategy of higher education institutions
- studies in different cultural approaches
- communication
- supervision

This framework lays the foundation for an integrated approach to quality management.

Ethics Even if we gauge the institution to be free of malpractice, corruption and illegal practices as defined in the laws of the land or bylaws of the HEI, the principles of professional ethics still apply. Just think of investing and divesting endowments and funds; think of yielding to special interests for unethical reasons or motivations; think of immorally selling results and methods to illegitimate recipients or think of a host of other potential areas of abuse. The ethics of serving truth and quality in research and study must be mirrored in management.

Organisation The nature of science and study has led to a very special organisational form. There are some elements that we recognise from business and government. But it should be clear that higher education is neither: not a form of business and not a form of government. Therefore all attempts to include higher education in a neo-liberal unlimited market model or to treat HEIs like any other general administration, business, military or church office – have failed. (Note: You are well advised to learn about the recent history of your national system of higher education and of European and global developments affecting the HEI sector). In order to understand certain features of higher education organisation, it is necessary to