

AN ANALYSIS OF GOVERNANCE MODELS OF RESEARCH UNIVERSITIES IN SELECTED COUNTRIES: LESSONS LEARNED

HONG YING XIAO

Tsinghua University, China

TAK CHEUNG CHAN

Kennesaw State University, U.S.A.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this paper is to identify the special features of the governance structures of research universities in four western countries: the United States, Germany, the United Kingdom and France. Conceptual framework was laid out as groundwork of the paper. Scholarly work of known authors in higher education governance was reviewed with major features of the governance of the research universities of these countries identified and discussed with reflection of the conceptual framework. It was found in common that major research universities have (1) governance structure with responsibilities of components specifically defined; (2) distinct separation of business affairs and academic work; (3) good collaboration among the entities of their governance structure; and (4) great respect for academic freedom and independence.

INTRODUCTION

Research universities worldwide are operated under different structures of governance. Many models of governance are reflective of the culture and tradition of their own countries. Their systems of governance are also established around the significance and the essence of the political needs of their countries. As a result of these considerations, modern research universities of different countries have displayed specific features of their own which could serve as excellent examples for other countries to learn. Bleiklie and Kogan (2007) claimed that research universities started early in Europe and North America with well-established structures of governance. The historical tradition and subsequent development of the governance of these universities offer much pioneering experiences to be shared. Therefore, in this paper, the governance structures of research universities in four western countries (the United States, Germany, the United Kingdom and France) are identified and the essence of their governance is examined through reviewing the work of known higher education scholars on governance structure. The special features of the governance structure of research universities in each of the countries are recognized. The conceptual framework provides a background of the philosophical and theoretical concepts that support the review. The significant results of the review are reported with analytical summaries of research universities in each of the four countries. Implications and discussions are made with the major features of the governance of research universities as a reflection of the conceptual framework. The paper concludes with highlighting the lessons learned from the research university governance of the four countries.

PURPOSE OF THE ANALYSIS

This paper involves a discussion of the systems of governance in research universities in four selected western countries: the United States, Germany, the United Kingdom and France. The purpose of this paper is to examine the special features of the governance systems of research universities in these

four countries. Among these special features, some common characteristics can be drawn. It is hope that the review and analysis of materials provided in this study could be helpful to other developing and/or existing research universities to plan for their structures of governance.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Philosophical Concepts

Searching for knowledge and serving politics

The mission for the development of higher education has been argued for a long time. The scholastic point of view seems to lean toward the priority of searching for the advancement of knowledge in different academic fields. Thus, all the faculty members of the universities are required to demonstrate their scholarly performance in addition to their capability to assume their teaching duties (Braxton, 1996). However, some researchers in higher education have argued that there exists another even more significant mission of higher education to serve the political purpose of a country. They claim that institutes of higher education have been developed to satisfy the basic human resource needs of a country by preparing manpower of all levels to keep the country moving (Council of Europe, 2007; Gibson, 1976). A more comprehensive concept of the development of higher education was presented by Brubacher (1982) who asserted that higher education institutes were established obviously for searching to achieve higher levels of knowledge. He also supplemented in support of the legitimate application of advanced knowledge to serve in the improvement of livelihood of people in the country. He clarified that program development, redesign or expansion in higher education was actually reflections of the changing social needs of a country.

Academic freedom and professionalism

Professors in higher education are hired for their distinguished scholarship and professional experiences in the field. They are the specialists in their areas of expertise and should be well respected in their decisions on program development and instructional approach to the best benefit of the students. They should be given a free hand to conduct the student admission process, student evaluation and the academic requirements for program completion. (Brubacher, 1982). In his book entitled, "Concepts of Universities", Jasper (1946) clearly uttered that academic freedom in universities should be enjoyed by professors who teach and research on subjects of his/her free will and students who can freely choose to study subjects of their own interest. However, academic freedom cannot be exercised without limitations when it comes in confrontation with university administration. As Brubacher (1982) declared that to achieve a high degree of efficiency and effectiveness of university operation, some kinds of division of work are needed between school business and academic work. Academic staff and business staff can work collaboratively to keep a balance in achieving the university goals.

Liberal education and specialized education

Newman (1852) described the basic education offered at the undergraduate level as "liberal education" which is aimed at preparing the younger generation to be rational and humanistic individuals with a heart of love for human beings. The purpose of "liberal education" is to provide appropriate nurturing for students to appreciate the excellence of citizenship. "Liberal education" is different from "specialized education" offered at the graduate level which is developed to reflect the social workforce needs. Specialized education is focused on preparing students with advanced level knowledge and skills to assume leadership in identified trades in society. Newman (1852) also recognized that liberal education at the undergraduate level has served as the foundation of

specialized education at the graduate level. All the prominent research universities have strong supportive undergraduate liberal education programs as the basis of academic development.

Theoretical Concepts

University governance

In the discussion of the governance of an organization, Wa (2014) claimed that any system of governance would involve two dimensions: the governor and the one to be governed. When the two groups work together in an organization, they would like to plan their collaborative work together in such a way that a high degree of efficiency and effectiveness is achieved in the organizational operation. A system called governance needs to be created to generate specific guidelines as to how complicated encounters can be turned out to positive outcomes. Yu (2014) also supported that for any organizational governance to work, attention needed to be drawn to the detailed technicalities of the governance mechanism. He emphasized that work division and shared responsibilities had to be specifically spelled out so that both the governor and the one to be governed knew exactly what to expect. In case of unavoidable conflicting situations between the two parties, Jessop (1998) stated that all the stakeholders of the governance had to communicate with open minds to lay everything on the table to get things resolved for the best benefit of the organization. The governing group should play a leading role in resolving any confrontations that could possibly occur. Jessop (1998) further urged that such a system of governance has proved to work in many university systems in which the structures of authorities are multi-levelled.

Stakeholder theory

The stakeholder theory was first initiated by R. Edward Freeman (1984) in his book entitled, “Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach” in which he stressed the existence of the value of concern and the equity of exchanges within an organization. He and his colleagues further elaborated the stakeholder theory in detail in the follow-up book, “Stakeholder Theory: The State of the Art” (2010). Freeman intended to change people’s mindset of organizational management from the traditional paradigm of “shareholders first” to “stakeholders first”. He further explained that shareholders of an organization were only interested in profit making as a result of the operation of the organization. However, stakeholders of an organization, in addition to the shareholders, include all members of the working team who plan and work hard together to meet the goals established by the organization. Therefore, stakeholders are the actual workforce within the organization to make all the big and small wheels moving. However, stakeholders may also be from outside of the organization. These outside stakeholders contribute to the success of the organization by offering monetary and material support in addition to personal time and effort. All the stakeholders of an organization have an invested interest in the organization itself and they see that they are benefitted from the organizational success. Freeman (1984) reiterates that since the stakeholders hold different positions and play different roles in the operation of the organization, they will not be receiving equal amount of the shared benefits of the organization. The stakeholder theory first started from the business community with great success and is now employed by many organizations as an approach to define work responsibilities and assessment for accountability. A university is a multi-levelled organization with complexed structures of authorities. The stakeholder theory has become a good match for what the university governance needs.

Organizational behavior

In his theory of positive organizational behavior, Luthans (2002) claimed that the best components of a successful organization consisted of quality human resources and positive mindset of its members.

He emphasized that the strengths of the members in an organization needed to be followed by the lead of positive psychological capacities. Luthans believed that when all organizational members turned their minds in the same positive direction, then, the organization could make best use of its human talents to achieve the best for the organization. The theory of positive organization behavior is adaptable to human resource training and development and capable of contributing to improvement in organizational performance. Furthermore, Robbins and Judge (2008) elaborated that the study of organizational behavior was focused on the relationship of individual behaviors, group behaviors and the system behaviors within the organization and how they could interactively impact the developmental activities of the organization. It is obvious that in a university setting, the mission of the university draws upon the enthusiasm of the most talented minds in different academic fields on campus. Motivating the most positive psychological spirit of the university is the most powerful strategy to contribute to the best of university success by making best use of its human resources.

GOVERNANCE MODELS OF RESEARCH UNIVERSITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

Most research universities in the United States are operated under a three-level governance system: the university, the college and the department. The president of the university serves as the head administrator of the university with the supreme authority for decision making while working at the same time under the directions of the Board of Directors who are the representatives of the state boards and the communities. The chief officer under the president is the provost who is responsible for all academic affairs including program designs and assignment of program resources. Other vice-presidents are assigned with their supporting business responsibilities, such as policy, finance, personnel, maintenance, security, and student services. The colleges and the departments are established by academic discipline and are majoring in the development of academic programs to meet the need of the communities the university serves. The deans of colleges and department heads report to the provost and the president. Faculty members can be self-elected to the university level faculty council which serves to oversee all academic affairs of various programs in the university (Ehrenberg, 2005). However, as the university business gets more and more universal and technologically advanced, consideration needs to be given to more details of work division and collaboration and possibly governance restructure (Trakman, 2008).

The governance of U.S. research universities may differ from university to university. However, in general, the special features the governance of U.S. research universities can be identified as follows (El-Khawas, 2002):

(1) The provost.

The role of the provost as chief supervisor of academic affairs in U.S. research universities is unique. The position is created to assist the president in managing the most significant task of a research university, knowledge advancement. The provost, serving as an important channel of communication between the president representing the university level and the deans and faculty at the college and department levels, works in support of academic program development, recruitment of quality faculty members, significance of student research and academic resource allocations.

(2) The deans.

The deans of colleges in U.S. research universities are given full authorities to independently decide on college operation issues in collaboration with faculty committees. The deans who are former faculty members understand the needs and

concerns of the faculty members most and are now in a good leadership position to do their best in support of faculty members to face present and future challenges. The deans also exercise the authorities vested in them to explore and seek for the most advantageous resources leading to achieving the greatest honor for his/her college.

(3) The department heads and faculty.

The department heads and the faculty members in the departments work in their areas of special interest under the directions of the deans of the colleges. Faculty members in U.S. research universities are not simply followers. They are given full opportunities of participation in the advancement of their research specialties. They are also strongly encouraged to serve in department, college, university and state level committees to impact on import academic decisions and make professional recommendations for improvement.

GOVERNANCE MODELS OF RESEARCH UNIVERSITIES IN GERMANY

Most of the research universities in Germany are established by the state and supported by state revenues. However, in Germany, it has been the traditional belief that state universities should maintain their integrity free from political interference. As stated by Wilhelm von Humboldt of Humboldt University of Berlin (cited in Hung, 2010), a university in Germany should respect its independence, academic freedom and teaching and research collaboration.

Some of universities in Germany today still are under the traditional four level governance system: university, fachbereich (division), institut (college) and lehrstuhl (chair professorship). All the administrative and business operation of the entire university are managed at the university level. A fachbereich is simply a division by academic discipline which does not have much assigned authority. The real operational power of the university is actually in the hands of the institut. The lehrstuhls are sub-divisions of the institut involving in special research projects. The head of a lehrstuhl will also serve as the head of the institutes on a two-year term by rotation. Committees of academic affairs joined by faculty members are established at the institute and the lehrstuhl levels to help the heads of institutes and lehrstuhls with the decision- making processes (Ma, Li & Liu, 2002).

Today in Germany, most of the research university systems are operated under a modern governance to consist of the university, the college and the department/research center levels (Bauer, Bormann, Kummer, Niedlich, & Rieckmann, 2018). Like in the traditional system, the university level administrators are in charge of all the business and external affairs of the university leaving the academic matters to be managed by the colleges and the departments/research centers. The administrative work at the university level is assisted by faculty members who voluntarily serve on faculty councils and special committees to make recommendations. The department heads take turns to serve as the heads of the colleges in a cycle of two-year term. Research centers with the support of special research grants are headed by chair professors in the respective colleges. All the academic affairs within the colleges and the departments/research centers are managed by professors who form committees of various functions and responsibilities (Ma, Li & Liu, 2002).

The system of governance in research universities in Germany is unique. The present governance though closely aligns with the modern governance in other western countries still maintains some of the basic features of the traditional governance (Bauer, Bormann, Kummer, Niedlich, & Rieckmann, 2018).

First, the academic freedom of professors and students are well respected under the university

governance. Professors are free to research on topics of their own interests and are given much authorities in decision making of academic affairs. Chair professors with research grants are authorized to organize their own academic teams and staff and decide on the directions of their research focus. Students are free to study in their areas of choice even across colleges.

Second, the administrative work and the academic work of the university are clearly divided up to give specific responsibilities to individual groups who would focus on their unique assignments. This division of work seems to work out fine with the administrative work mostly handled at the university level. The faculty at the college and department/research center levels could focus their attention on the development of academics.

Third, in the present governance, department heads are required to serve as heads of the college by rotation. The system has drawn the work of the college and the work of the departments more closely together. The department heads now understand more of the challenges of the college office and are more willing to cooperate with the college heads in performing their academic duties. On the other hand, college heads who are department heads themselves are more open to solicit faculty input in all academic decision-making procedures.

Fourth, the governance system of chair professorship has offered opportunities for top scholars to well establish themselves in their areas of research expertise. They are authorized to set up their research centers for the advancement of knowledge in needed areas. However, it has been seen in some cases, that after the establishment of chair professorship for a while, the governance structure with basic set up of personnel and work practices would become stereotyped with little changes. The chair professor system could be improved by generating mechanisms of opening doors to accommodate inflow of new blood with fresh ideas.

GOVERNANCE MODELS OF RESEARCH UNIVERSITIES IN THE UNITED KINGDOM

The governance of universities in the United Kingdom has inherited from long years of tradition starting from Oxford University, Cambridge University and the University of London. The structure of modern university governance in the United Kingdom consists of four levels: the university, the faculty, the school and the department (Trakman, 2008). The university level is in charge of all university administrative affairs including external relations. This aspect of the system helps save many duplication efforts in handling daily business leaving time for the faculty, the school and the departments to focus on academic affairs. The faculties headed by the deans are divided by academic discipline. The deans of faculties who are responsible to the university president are assigned with the supervisory role of overseeing the development of academic programs under their leadership. Schools of different academic interests are established under the respective faculties. The heads of schools report to their respective deans for matters of program development, personnel affairs and school finance. In fact, schools in the universities of the United Kingdom are pretty much independent entities. They have the authority to design programs, to hire and replace professors and academic staff, and to seek for sources of program support funding. In addition, the heads of schools are authorized to set up new departments or research centers under their schools to reflect the needs of the community. Departments and research centers are created when grants or special funding become available. Such proposals for new departments or centers with full justifications will need to go through the faculty and the university level for formal approval. Professors and academic staff of a university enjoy full opportunities of expressing their opinions through participation in the university level and/or faculty level councils of professors which are scheduled to meet at least once per semester. They can also be elected or voluntarily offer to serve on the many committees or

special taskforces at the faculty or school level to contribute to the operation of the university (Deng & Wu, 1996; Zheng, 2011).

The governance of research universities in the United Kingdom has followed the British tradition but has been modernized to meet the challenges of global competitiveness (Trakman, 2008). The system is unique with the following identified features:

First, the governance system of university, faculty, school and department/research center has clearly specified roles and responsibilities of each of the governance components. However, the system is designed in such a way to place heavy emphasis on the academic capacity of the schools and the departments/research centers. The university upholds the academic freedom and the independent authorities of the schools and the departments/research centers.

Second, the governance system is set up to allow great opportunities of collaboration between the faculty, the school and the departments/research centers. Not only is there a good outline of division of work among the units, but, the flow of work process among the units has also been well established to facilitate high efficiency and effectiveness.

Third, the deans' offices of the faculties in the universities have established a positive environment for the professors and academic staff to share and contribute their best to uphold the honors of the universities they serve. This openness of administrative style has gained the supportive responses of the professors and academic staff who are willing to go extra miles to work for the success of the universities they are proud of.

GOVERNANCE MODELS OF RESEARCH UNIVERSITIES IN FRANCE

The governance of research universities in France is impacted by two significant legislatures of higher education in recent years. The University Independence and Accountability Law of 2007 upheld the authorities of the presidents at the university level of governance. Under the law, the presidents with his/her special committees oversaw all administrative and academic affairs of the universities. However, the Higher Education and Research Capacity Law (2013) has confirmed the change of university governance with the transfer of major academic authorities from the university to the colleges and teaching and research units (Zhou, 2015). Most research universities in France today do follow the directions of the Higher Education and Research Capacity Law (2013). The present governance consists of three levels: the university, the college and the teaching and research units. The university level takes care of most of the administrative business leaving the academic affairs to the colleges and the teaching and research units. The colleges are divided by academic discipline and are coordinating the teaching and research work of all the units under them. The heads of the colleges are elected from among the professors and academic staff within the college to serve a five-year term. The teaching units are offering the bachelor, master's and doctoral programs to meet the labor market needs. The units are also serving as the developing grounds for advanced level learners who plan to pursue a scholarly career. The research units, sometimes called research laboratories, are operated independently with its own unique research interest and source of funding. The research units continue to depend on large government and/or external grants for support. Sometimes, a research unit is divided into several sub-units to indicate their specific research directions (Wang, 2015).

The modern governance of research universities in France follow very closely with the governance of other western countries. The governance of French universities though having much to be expected (Gee, 2016) carries the following identified special features:

First, the governance of research universities follows a college model consisting of teaching and research units as the foundation of academic structure. All the colleges are operated with a high degree of independence. They design their own programs and by-laws for governance. They recruit their own professors and staff with largely external funding support.

Second, the heads of the colleges work with specially assigned committees to manage all matters relating to programs, standards, personnel and finance. All the professors and academic staff of the teaching and research units are invited to serve on any of the committees to which they feel they could contribute. Unique external stakeholders of the teaching and research units are also invited to serve on these committees to provide their professional perspectives. The high involvement of professors and academic staff and external professionals in college operation provide the stakeholders a strong sense of ownership.

COMMON CHARACTERISTICS OF GOVERNANCE MODELS OF RESEARCH UNIVERSITIES IN EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

This paper has focused on reviewing the development of governance models of research universities in four major countries in the western world: the United States, Germany, the United Kingdom and France. Some countries have had a long tradition of governance which has now been modernized to reflect the community needs and grant application pre-qualifications (Bleiklie & Kogan, 2007). Some of the common characteristics of governance models of research universities in the western world are presented in the following:

(1) The structure.

Most of the research universities in these four countries are operated under a three-level structure of governance: the university, the college and the departments (or teaching units and research laboratories). To reflect the nature of research universities, most universities have placed much of the focus on the development of the colleges and all the teaching and research units under them. A few universities are operated under a four-level governance: the university, the faculty, the college and the departments. However, to eliminate any administrative duplication, the three-level governance structure is most popularly adopted.

(2) Administration and academics.

Most research universities in this review have clearly indicated a separation of administrative duties from academic responsibilities. While most of the internal and external businesses are managed at the university level, much time and effort are provided for colleges and departments (or teaching and research units) to focus on the academic fields. The teaching units are assigned with the degree programs to develop human resources to meet the local and global challenges. The research units are emphasized on the development of advanced knowledge of new inventions for the improvement of human lives.

(3) College and unit independence.

The governance of most universities is designed in a way to support the independence of colleges and teaching and research units. Since the colleges are divided by academic discipline, the universities have placed trust on the colleges and the teaching and research units to be independently operating by their own with support from the university level from time to time. The trust is grounded on the belief that experts of their fields know the best what to do with the developmental directions they are

heading. This proves to be very successful in respecting scholarly judgements with professional experiences.

(4) Academic freedom.

Academic freedom is fully respected and exercised in the research universities of the western world. Professors and academic staff are given the opportunities to teach and research on the academic subjects of their preference while students have the total freedom to choose to study subjects of their choice even across colleges. Professors and academic staff will provide evidence of justifications of their positions in their areas of expertise. Students are under class advisement of professors in pursuing in their courses of study.

(5) College and department collaboration.

Work collaboration between the colleges and the departments (or teaching and research units) in research universities of the western world is a special feature of their university governance systems. The heads of colleges are open to suggestions of professors and academic staff. They even personally invite professors of special expertise to take the lead on special committees or taskforces. Professors and academic staff voluntarily choose to serve on these committees or taskforces to offer professional services. Through these collaborative efforts, the colleges and the departments (teaching and research units) draw their relationships close together to achieving the university goals.

(6) Financial support.

All the university programs of the western world receive some kinds of government funding appropriation as operational funds as indicated in the government legislatures. However, the appropriation is always limited and insufficient. The colleges and the departments (or teaching and research units) are encouraged to apply for external grants in support of their programs. As a matter of fact, many research laboratories are established because the grant applications become successful. Research laboratories have full authorities in the management of the grant money in support of the grant purposes.

IMPLICATIONS/DISCUSSION

After a review of the governance systems of the major research universities in the western countries, the author is able to reflect on some of the philosophical and theoretical concepts cited earlier in this paper. It is clear that these concepts initiated by previous philosophers and theorists make good sense and have been applied to practical use in the governance systems of major research universities.

Brubacher (1982) asserted that higher education institutes were established obviously for searching to attain higher levels of learning and, at the same time, for preparing knowledgeable and skillful people to meet the social demands. He clarified that program development, redesign or expansion in higher education were necessary because the university programs need to align with changing realities of a country. In modern research universities, the governance has placed much focus on the development of colleges and their departments which are divided into teaching units and research units. The teaching units are preparing students to meet social needs while scholars in the research units work hard to explore in the advancement of knowledge.

In the discussion about academic freedom, Jasper (1946) uttered that academic freedom in universities

should be enjoyed by professors who teach and research on subjects of his/her free will and students who can freely choose to study subjects of their own interest. Brubacher (1982) also declared that division of work is needed to allow some university entities to take care of school business while freeing the professors and academic staff to pursue their academic work. These managing concepts are fully reflected in the governance of research universities today. All the research universities in the reviewed countries highly respect the academic freedom of the professors and the students. They have consolidated the administrative responsibilities at the university level so that professors and academic staff at the college and department levels can concentrate on scholarship development.

As early as 1852, Newman identified the purpose of “liberal education” to provide appropriate preparation of students to become respectful citizens. He claimed that specialized education was focused on developing students’ advanced knowledge and skills to assume leadership in society. Modern research universities do organize their academic structure to reflect on Newman’s idea to start with a strong undergraduate liberal program to prepare students for advanced learning in higher education. Graduate schools specialize in developing their master’s, doctoral and research programs in pursuit for scholarly leadership.

The modern research universities have established unique systems of governance to indicate work division and shared responsibilities among the university offices, the colleges and the departments. Any unavoidable conflicts among the composing entities will be resolved by collaborative efforts. Jessop (1998) already stated that all members of the governance had to mutually communicate to get the issues resolved for the best benefit of the university. This collaborative model of governance has worked in many multi-levelled university systems.

Freeman (2010) followed upon Jessop’s collaborative model of governance by bringing up his stakeholders’ theory. He explained that stakeholders of an organization include all members of the working team who plan and work together to meet the goals of the organization. He uttered that stakeholders became the actual workforce within the organization to keep things moving. Modern research universities have applied the stakeholder theory to a great extent in university governance. All the many committees and taskforces at the all levels of the university governance involve many professors and academic staff of the university. The stakeholders may also include outside volunteers who contribute to the success of the university by offering monetary and material support in addition to personal time and effort. All the stakeholders of a university are benefitted in witnessing the success of the university.

Robbins and Judge (2008) stated that the study of organizational behavior is focused on the relationship of individual behaviors, group behaviors and the system behaviors within an organization and how they could interactively impact the developmental activities of the organization. In a university setting, motivating the most positive psychological spirit of the employees seems to be most contributing to the university success. Research universities build on the positive behaviors of professors and academic staff by allowing them academic freedom, involving them in all the decision-making processes and permitting the academic colleges, departments and research laboratories to operate independently.

LESSONS LEARNED IN PLANNING FOR GOVERNANCE IN RESEARCH UNIVERSITIES

In planning for the system of governance in research universities, there is much to be considered including the culture and the tradition of the country where the university is located. In addition,

the social demand of labor market and the needs for the country's development has impact on the structure of governance of a research university. However, in view of the governance of research universities in the four advanced western countries in this study, some constructive lessons can be learned from their success stories.

(1) Structure of governance.

The structure of governance in research universities does not need to be complicated. The commonly used three-level governance (university, college and department) seems to work fine. The specific responsibilities and the lines of authorities need to be clearly drawn.

(2) Business and academics.

A smart structure of governance in research universities consolidates the major business affairs at the university level leaving the college and the departments (teaching units and research units) to concentrate on academic development.

(3) College and department collaboration.

Collaborative effort within the colleges and departments need to be strongly encouraged. Professors and academic staff should be invited to get involved in all decision-making processes to promote a good sense of ownership.

(4) Academic freedom and independence.

Academic freedom of professors and academic staff should be fully respected. They should be offered the opportunity to be independently operating with the support of the university.

(5) Tradition vs innovation.

While each university of great fame carries its own historical tradition, it would certainly help the university with more progressive development if it continues to look for exploration of innovative ideas to meet future challenges. The effectiveness of the university governance needs to be practically evaluated on a timely basis.

(6) Sources of additional funding.

In addition to the government appropriations and the student academic fee charges, universities need to explore alternative ways of financing for support of programs in higher education. External grants, alumni support, contract services and other university and business collaboration have proved to work in soliciting additional funds in support of program development in many western universities.

(7) Deanship rotation.

Many research universities in this review have indicated that their college deans are actually elected from the department heads who would serve in the deanship for a period of five years. Then, another department head will be elected to pick up the deanship. This rotation of deanship among department heads serves a good purpose. Now, all the department heads understand the work and challenges of the deanship and are more willing to work collaboratively with the deans' offices.

(8) Faculty and college.

Some research universities in this review have been found to retain a governance to include both faculty and college levels. By carefully examining the functions of

a faculty and a college, we notice that the faculty level is above the college level. Yet, some of the duties and responsibilities of a faculty duplicate those of the college. Unless there is a particular reason to maintain these two levels of governance, it seems reasonable to believe that combining faculty and college into one level saves.

CONCLUSION

This paper ends by identifying some of the common characteristics of the features of governance models in research universities of four western countries. It also summarizes lessons that have been learned from these four countries that could be helpful in planning for the governance structure of upcoming research universities. However, it must be remembered that these success stories happen only in identifiable conditions that support the development of their successes. In planning for governance in developing research universities, planners of higher education need to conduct a thorough assessment of all the available resources together with the favorable political and social climates that could contribute to the success of the adoption and implementation of the governance system.

Some research universities may already have practical governances that prove to work by daily operational experiences. However, it is important that universities continue to look forward to future emerging challenges that may create barriers to university governance effectiveness. Universities need to look for continuous improvement that could drive the university to move forward to advancement. Higher education planners need to bear in mind that the program development of a university depends very much on how it can help serve the needs of the community where it is located. University governance may need to be modified to facilitate the offering of such services. The analysis of governance systems in the United States, Germany, the United Kingdom and France has provided significant contributions to the effort of structuring and restructuring governance systems of research universities worldwide.

REFERENCES

- Bauer, M., Bormann, I., Kummer, B., Niedlich, S., & Rieckmann, M. (April, 2018). Sustainability governance at universities: A multi-case study in Germany. A paper presented at the American Educational Research Conference, New York, USA.
- Bleiklie, I., & Kogan, M. (2007). Organization and governance of universities. *Higher Education Policy*, 20, 477-493. DOI: 10.1057/palgrave.hep.8300167
- Braxton, J. M. (1996). Contrasting perspectives on the relationship between teaching and research. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 90, 5-14. (ERIC Document No. EJ532783)
- Brubacher, J. S. (1982). *On the philosophy of higher education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossay-Bass, Inc. (Chinese translation by J. W. Zheng, etc., 1987, Hangzhou: Zhejiang Province: Zhejiang Education Press.)
- Council of Europe (2007). *The democratic mission of higher education*. Strasbourg Ceded, France: Author.
- Deng, L., & Wu, Q. X. (1996). An analysis of the governance of comprehensive universities in the United Kingdom. *Wu Bei University Journal (Philosophy and Social Sciences)*, 5, 105-108.
- El-Khawas, E. (2002) Governance in US universities. In A. Amaral, G. A. Jones G.A., & B. Karseth (eds). *Governing Higher Education: National Perspectives on Institutional Governance*. Higher Education Dynamics, vol 2. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.

- Ehrenberg, R. G. (2005). *Governing academia: Who is in charge of modern universities?* Ithaca, NJ: Cornell University Press.
- Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*. New York: Pitman Publishing.
- Freeman, R. E., Harrison, J. S., Wicks, S. C., Parmar, B. L., De Colle, S. (2010). *Stakeholder theory: The state of the art*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Gee, O. (2016). *The troubles with French universities laid bare*. Available online at <https://www.thelocal.fr/20160929/eight-troubles-with-french-universities-laid-bare>
- Gibson, J. T. (1976). Educational organizations must be responsive to change. *College Student Journal*, 10(2), 127-130. (ERIC Document No. EJ142699)
- Hung, Y. B. (2010). *Co-governance: Structure of governance in university laws*. Beijing: Science Press.
- Jaspers, K. T. (1946). *Concepts of universities*. (Chinese translation by J. Zou, 1991, New Knowledge United Press.)
- Jessop, B. (1998). The rise of governance and the risks of failure: The case of economic development. *International Social Science Journal*, 50(155), 29-45.
- Luthans, F. (2002). Positive organization behavior. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 16(1), 57-72.
- Ma., L. T., Li, X. H., & Liu, P. C. (2002). Special features of the higher education system in German. *Educational Research*, 10, 79-82.
- Newman, J. H. (1852). *The ideas of a university*. London: Aeterna Press. (Chinese translation by N. Gao, 2016. Beijing: Beijing University Press.)
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2008). *Organizational behavior*. (12th ed.). New York: Pearson, Inc. (Chinese translation by Y. Li, 2012. Beijing: Chinese People's University Press.)
- Trakman, L. (2008). Modelling university governance. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 62(1 & 2), 63-83. UNSW Law Research Paper No. 2008-19. Available online at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=1392556>
- Wa, Y. F. (2014). Good governance in universities. *Jiangsu Higher Education*, 6, 15-21, 26.
- Wang, X. Q. (2015). The governance and by-laws of French universities. *Modern University Education*, 4, 19-24.
- Yu, G. P. (2014). *The modern governance of a country*. Beijing: Social Science Documentary Press.
- Zheng, W. (2011). *The compromise and balance of power in universities of the United Kingdom*. Beijing: Beijing University Press.
- Zhou, Z. L. (2015). The internal structure of governance in French universities: An analysis of development from mid-century to 2013. *Educational Research*, 3, 148.