Proposal of Special Issue for Asia Europe Journal

Proposed Special Issue Theme:

Comparative perspectives and cases in academic leadership and governance in European and Chinese Higher Education

Proposed by special issue guest editors

Prof. Dr. Chang Zhu and Dr. Aysun Caliskan

Vrije Universiteit Brussel

1. Short Introduction of Special Issue Editors

Chang Zhu is a professor in Educational Sciences at the Vrije Universiteit Brussel. Her research mainly focuses on organizational culture, innovations in higher education, higher education governance and academic leadership; she has been coordinating several large scale fundamental and collaborative international research projects on university governance and academic leadership, and capacity building for higher education institutions. She was special issue guest editor for European Journal of Higher Education (Volume 7, 2017 - Issue 3) Reforms and collaborations in Europe-China doctoral education); and book guest editor for the book on 'University Governance and Academic Leadership in the EU and China (Zhu & Zayim-Kurtay, 2019).

Aysun Caliskan is a postdoctoral researcher at the Vrije Universiteit Brussel. Her strongest interests lie in higher education, organizational culture, educational innovations, academic leadership and governance.

2. The topic of the special issue

The twenty-first century is likely to be dominated by the knowledge- based economy, and the most important sources of economic growth will turn out to be the production, processing, dissemination, and application of knowledge in both developing and developed countries. Therefore, higher education will play a prominent and basic role both in knowledge creation and dissemination, and human resource development (Wang & Zhou, 2011).

With the rapid internationalization and the recent development of the knowledge economy, universities are now facing competition around the globe and greater accountability to society. Consequently, there has been greater emphasis on university governance and academic leadership for its significant role in enhancing the performance of universities (Bush & Coleman, 2000).

Governance can be defined as 'a means for realizing institutional goals and, in an ideal world, should enable the institution to respond to the demands of the political environment by regulating its internal affairs accordingly' (Salter & Tapper, 2002). Furthermore, academic leadership may be conceptualized as a process of fostering change (Astin & Astin, 2000), leading, empowering people (Kekale, 2005). Very common in these concepts is the definition of Stogdill (1950). He considers that academic leadership influences an organized group on others instead of an individual role in order to achieve goal setting and achievement.

In addition to the definition, previous literature has established a big range of issues governance and academic leadership in terms of internationalization in different contexts. The main topics are related to the roles and responsibilities for academic leaders (Banker & Bhal, 2019), strategic planning in university governance (Poister, 2010), transformation of university governance (Kretek, Dragsic & Kehm, 2013). environmental conditions, organizational traits and rationales (Seeber, Meoli & Cattaneo, 2018), internationalization in university research (Jones & Oleksiyenko, 2011), autonomy (Altbach, 2011), academic freedom (Tiplic, 2006), massification (Xie, 2007), international research collaborations, joint degrees, promoting student and staff mobility (Egron-Polak & Hudson, 2014) and quality issues (Van Damme, 2001).

So far there has been little discussion about internationalization, academic leadership and governance structure of Chinese and European universities under the framework of

collaboration. However, it is essential to consider how internationalization is a two-way process, being open to external cultural and educational influences, as well as promoting aspects of one's unique cultural

In addition to this research gap, the knowledge deficits in both sides regarding the unique characteristics of HE governance systems (d'Hooghe et al., 2018), gaps between the administrative procedures and legislations (Zhu et al., 2017) and the discrepancy between the understanding and ways of practicing the fundamental values of higher education (d'Hooghe, 2010) call for collaborative and comparative studies in this area.

International cooperation is almost a mandatory practice for the countries' visibility on science and technology and trust building among countries as well as engagement of the researchers among others (Knobel, Simoes &Cruz, 2013). In the era of internationalization, EU and China, as pivotal forces, have placed a crucial importance on collaboration in all aspects due to the associated benefits and opportunities (Saarela, 2018).

In Europe, higher education was shaped by two political reforms- Bologna Declaration in 1999 and Lisbon Strategy in 2000. Based on these reforms, the governance of HEIs is generally characterized by collegiate style structure under which universities have been undergoing significant transformations in academic governance with the effect of intensifying movement towards internationalization. Although universities are autonomous in staffing, finance, and other scholarly matters within the boundaries (Eurydice, 2008), they face a significant change in the authority and the use of structures (Kretek, Dragsic & Kehm, 2013; De Boer, Enders & Leisyte, 2007).

Chinese universities' performance has been increasingly enhanced with more Chinese institutions appearing in international rankings. According to the Academic Ranking of World Universities, the number of Chinese universities that have entered the top 500 universities worldwide has increased to 45 in 2017 from 8 in 2004 (Shanghai Ranking, 2017). The experience of educational development in China indicates that a high-quality educational system has a particularly strategic role in narrowing the gap between China and developed countries thanks to The Chinese government's educational strategy.

These differences call for studies comparing academic leadership and governance structures under the context of internationalization in Chinese and European universities to manifest how political and administrative factors matter (Frolich & Caspersen, 2015).

This special issue aims: (1) to enhance understanding and awareness of university governance systems and academic leadership in European and Chinese universities from a comparative perspective; and (2) to broaden the perspectives through academic research on the various systems, approaches, strategies or solutions on university governance and academic leadership in the global and international cases (Esser & Vliegenthart, 2017).

In order to address these key issues, the contributions of this special issue identify comparative perspectives and cases in academic leadership and university governance in nine articles.

The first two articles take up the theme of university governance structure in European and Chinese universities. In the first article, Xue, Cornelis and Zhu analyze the differences and communalities between European and Chinese universities to learn from each other's governance structures. The second article by Wang proposes the paths and policy suggestions for internal governance optimization of China's universities based on the experiences of European universities.

Complementing those as a multiple case study, the third paper by Kondakci investigates the leadership for and management of internationalization in Chinese and European universities. The study compares management, governance and leadership in different cultural contexts. Addressing the question of how MOOCs on academic leadership and governance provide the professional development in the fourth paper, Castro-Garcia and Zhu investigate the influence of participants' locations on reasons for enrolling in a MOOC for professional development. In the fifth paper, Ma, Cao and Fan explore the action, problems and optimization path of Chinese university governance under the concept of "Streamlining administration and delegating power; strengthening regulation; improving services. This strategic measure promotes the modernization of governance capacity and governance system in the field of education.

The following three papers focus on enhancing globalization. The sixth paper by Sziegat conducts a multiple case study of institutional governance of German higher

educations and draws a deep insight into university governance from the perspectives of new public management and internationalization. In the seventh paper, by constructing a model of the relationship between university governance field and academic leadership generation, Guanghai and Yang present the internal logic between the two, and then examine the current status of Chinese university governance from the perspective of globalization. The eight paper by Liu and Yao contributes to this Special Issue by constructing a general framework of organizational structure, module structure, and value chain process structure in Chinese universities from an international comparative perspective. The last paper addresses a relevant and timely topic. Haikun analyzes the challenges caused by COVID 19 epidemic and proposes suggestions for optimizing the university governance system.

Overall, this special issue sheds considerable light on exchanges and collaboration between Europe and China in academic leadership and university governance. It also provides a comparative perspective both in the current situation of the universities through case studies and the impact of comparisons on Chinese and European universities.

3. Short introduction of the authors of the SI articles

Jan Cornelis is an Emeritus Professor with part time research appointment at VUB, since 2016. He is also a consultant professor at NPU-Xi'an and visiting professor at UO-Cuba. His current interests are in the fields of satellite data analysis for weather forecasting and climate studies and in data driven approaches in the field of biomedical engineering.

Chang Zhu is a full professor at the Department of Educational Sciences of VUB, the Director of the EU-China Higher Education Research Center of VUB, Director of VUB Blended learning Competence Center. She is leading several international, European and national research projects focusing on innovative teaching and learning, online and blended learning, creative thinking and higher education transformation, organizational culture, university governance and leadership.

Yujie Xue is currently a PhD researcher at the Faculty of Educational Sciences at VUB. Her main research domains are university governance, academic leadership research, and higher education.

Wang Yan is an Associate Professor of Higher Education Institute of Tongji University and Deputy Director of Development and Planning Division of Tongji University. She is mainly responsible for Tongji's educational decision-making research, comprehensive reform and strategic planning. Her main research domains are institutional research, university governance and engineering education.

Yasar Kondakci is a Professor in Educational Administration and Planning at the Middle East Technical University, Ankara Turkey. His research focuses on educational administration, policy and leadership at all levels of education, including higher education.

David Castro Garcia is currently completing the 2nd year of the master's in Educational Sciences at Vrije Universiteit Brussel. He has knowledge of research methodologies for social sciences. He has experience in the assessment of instructional designs fostered by technological innovations, as well as in research on the influence of ICT on educational environments.

Huanling Ma works as a Professor and Doctoral supervisor of Education at the Department of education, Guangxi Normal University, China. His academic interests mainly lie within the domains of the teacher policy, school bullying, student's disciplinary punishment dispute, supervisor-postgraduate relationship.

Liping Cao is currently a PhD student in the Department of Education of Guangxi Normal University, China. Her research interests lie within the areas of Higher Education Management and Comparative Higher Education.

Wenji Fan is the lecturer, master instructor and the director of the International Office, Faculty of Education of Guangxi Normal University. His main research interests are education economics, education management and higher education. He is currently a council member of the Young and Middle-Education Theory Workers Branch of the Chinese Education Society and the deputy secretary-general of the Education Management Committee of the Guangxi Education Society.

Hongmei Sziegat is a postdoctoral researcher at the Institute of Education, University of Tuebingen, Germany. Her research fields are university governance, educational

governance, e-learning, digital teaching and learning in higher education, quality assurance and accreditation in higher education, transnational higher education.

Li Guanghai works as an Associate Professor of Education Management at the Faculty of Education, Guangxi Normal University. His academic interests are mainly concentrated in the higher education management, higher education policy and human resource management in colleges and universities, foreign teachers work stress, education in national regions, education culturology in areas.

Hui Yang works as an Associate Professor at the Department of Comprehensive Governance, Beijing Academy of Social Sciences. She is also a Postdoctoral at the School of Public Policy and Management, Tsinghua University. Her research focuses on educational administration, international and comparative education, and educational management innovation. More specifically, her academic interests mainly lie within the domains of educational evaluation, comparative education policy, and cross-sectoral governance and multi-subject cooperation in higher education policy implementation.

Yarong Liu is a professor in education management and director of Department of Program Planning and Administration at National Academy of Education Administration in China. Her research topics focus on higher education, financial management and resource allocation, and educational policy analysis.

Xiang Yao is an assistant professor at the National Academy of Education Administration in China. Her research interests include but not limited to interdisciplinary research, performance management in higher education, human resource management in education, citizen trust in government, citizen participation, etc.

4. Abstracts of the articles

4.1. EU-China university governance structures—case studies

Yujie Xue, Jan Cornelis, Chang Zhu
Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Belgium

In the context of globalization and internationalization, several common development trends and challenges have emerged in higher education systems around the world. University governance will be affected, and the governance structure will be changed and reshaped according to the actual situation. It is necessary for Chinese and EU universities to learn from each other's governance structures. The governance structures of universities in China and the Europe are quite different. To conduct better and further cooperation and collaboration between EU and Chinese universities, it is critical to understand and acknowledge the differences. This study analyzes the differences and communalities between both, first from a general perspective in a kind of helicopter view and thereafter in more detail through case studies. Chinese universities have a unified governance structure, that is statutory based on the Presidential Accountability System under the Leadership of the UCCP in which the UCCP is officially designated to play the core role of leading the university. EU universities are more diversified in their governance principles, and each has its own unique features. More specifically, this paper analyzes the university governance of VUB, University of Vienna, Middle East Technical University, Guangxi Normal University and Beijing Normal University, and summarizes the similarities, differences, advantages and disadvantages of their organizational principles.

4.2. Comparative Study on the Internal Governance Models of Chinese and European Universities

Yan Wang
Higher Education Institute, Tongji University, China

Creating the world first-class universities has become an important part of China's national development strategy. The external condition and mechanism of university governance, however, is relatively stable in China. Improving the autonomy of the university through publishing a series of related documents is therefore essential for the Chinese government. Thus, the internal governance of the university has become the key factor of reform for the

construction of world first-class universities. Analyzing the research statues and the progress of university internal governance in China, we take a comparative study on the internal governance of European and Chinese universities. This study proposes the paths and policy suggestions for internal governance optimization of China's universities based on the experiences of European universities. The results are expected to provide the prominent features and common issues of different models in China and Europe.

4.3. Multiple Case Analysis of Leadership and Management for Internationalization

Yasar Kondakci
Middle East Technical University, Turkey

Internationalization in higher education has received an extensive interest from scholars of higher education and academic leaders over the last 20 years. The issue has been investigated extensively around international student mobility. However, very little attention has been devoted to the management and leadership frameworks that are settled to manage internationalization in higher education at universities. In other words, the management framework of internationalization has largely been uninvestigated. More importantly, there is a very limited comparative investigations on different higher education institutions' frameworks that are implemented to manage internationalization. The convergent understanding among different management frameworks implemented to manage internationalization is critical to ensure a convergent understanding and practice of different internationalization dimensions including student mobility, staff mobility, joint programs and practices. This study aims at investigating the leadership for and management of internationalization in five Chinese universities and five European universities. The study is designed as a multiple case study and compares management, governance and leadership of internationalization in ten different universities. The outcomes are expected to inform convergence in understanding and practice of management and leadership for internationalization. The convergent understanding is expected to facilitate the collaboration between different institutions located in different cultural contexts.

4.4. Influence of MOOC participants' location on reasons for enrollment: The case of MOOC on academic leadership and university governance

David Castro-Garcia, Chang Zhu
Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Belgium

Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs) generally embodies the fundamental premise of providing professional development and learning opportunities to virtually everyone, anytime, and anywhere in the world with internet access. This implies that participants from different backgrounds can equally take advantage of these opportunities, yet it is also something that glosses over the diverse participants' sociodemographic characteristics and their motivations. Researches describing participants' sociodemographic and their reasons for taking a course have been partially covered in MOOC studies. However, little is known about the direct influence of participants' locations on reasons for enrolling in MOOCs. Therefore, this research aims to investigate the influence of participants' locations on reasons for enrolling in a MOOC for professional development. This study presents the preliminary analyses of a welcome survey from a MOOC on university governance and academic leadership. 321 people from different countries of residence filled in a 14-item questionnaire. The results demonstrate that participants' locations are significantly associated with particular reasons for enrolling in MOOC courses. As a consequence, understanding the reasons for enrolling in MOOCs from a perspective of cultural differences provides insight into the inclusive online professional development. Still, the role of socio-demographic characteristics may also influence the MOOC participants' expectations and will therefore remain the focus of future research.

4.5. Streamlining Administration and Delegating Power; Strengthening Regulation; Improving Services: The Action, Problems and Optimal Path of University Governance in China- Based on The Analysis of 50 Colleges and Universities in Guangxi Zhuang Autonomous Region

Huanling Ma, Liping Cao, Wenji Fan
Guangxi Normal University, China

Streamlining administration and delegating power; strengthening regulation; improving services" is an important strategic measure to promote the modernization of governance

capacity and governance system in the field of education. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to explore the action, problems and optimization path of Chinese university governance under the concept of "Streamlining administration and delegating power; strengthening regulation; improving services". By using a descriptive research design, this study takes the self-inspection report of 50 colleges and universities in Guangxi Zhuang Autonomous Region in 2018 (0.64) on the implementation of the reform of "Streamlining administration and delegating power; strengthening regulation; improving services". The results of the study show that, at the operational level, the Chinese University is actively leading and coordinating the reform of its units by formulating implementation measures and rules, undertaking decentralized autonomy in running schools, revising and improving the relevant supporting management system, undertaking implementation and improving the internal governance mechanism. However, the leadership and overall planning progress of colleges and universities are different, the degree of autonomy and decentralization is not enough, and the relevant mechanism and supporting measures are not perfect. In conclusion, effective paths of governance should be followed in Chinese universities under the concept of "Streamlining administration and delegating power; strengthening regulation; improving services".

4.6. University Governance in German Higher Education: Retrospect and Prospect

Hongmei Sziegat
University of Tuebingen, Germany

The German government has gone through a series of policies to enhance international competitiveness and visibility of German higher education institutions. Since the implementation of Excellence Initiative and Excellence Strategy to build world-class universities, German higher education institutions have been reforming institutional governance of German higher educations and draws a deep insight into university governance from the perspectives of new public management and organizational change. It identifies challenges challenges of institutional governance, especially for those selected as Universities of Excellence, in response to the traditional horizontal stratification and differentiation of German higher education system and the dominant governance mode in German higher education system as a combination of political regulation by the state and professional self-regulation by an "academic oligarchy". It aims to reveal how institutional strategies and governance of German universities react to performativity, institutional autonomy, organizational effectiveness, transparency, funding, internationalization and recent digital

innovations. This study proposes to form effective strategies and good governance for sustainable development and innovation of German higher education institutions.

4.7. The Construction of University Governance Field and The Generation of Academic Leadership

Guanghai Li, Hui Yang
Guangxi Normal University, China

Throughout the famous universities since the establishment of the medieval university, strong academic leadership is one of its important characteristics. The strength of university academic leadership depends on the level of university governance. On the contrary, the improvement of academic leadership can promote the improvement of university governance. Therefore, constructing the field of university governance from the perspective of globalization and promoting the generation of academic leadership is logical to promote the strong development of higher education. By constructing a model of the relationship between university governance field and academic leadership generation, the article sorts out and presents the internal logic between the two, and then examines the current status of Chinese university governance with the form of governance field that universities should have. It also analyzes the current governance issues in Chinese universities in terms of subjects, governance concepts and governance environment. According to the problems of Chinese university governance and the reasons for its formation, a strategy for constructing a university governance field is proposed around the goal of "how to promote the generation of academic leadership".

4.8. International Comparative Study of University Organization Operating Practices: China Section

Yarong Liu, Xiang Yao
National Academy of Education Administration (NAEA), China

Universities have become a must exist organization in modern society, however, how this organization works in various countries has not been studied intuitively. The EU project "University Governance and Leadership" has provided exceptional advantages to study this issue. Based on the previous discussions by relevant project members, this article's major contribution is to construct a general framework of organization operation in Chinese universities. It is expected that this framework will primarily include the hierarchical

relationship structure of universities, university organizational function module structure, and value chain process structure for talent cultivation and research in universities. If space permits, this article will also give a brief overview of the general operating status of Chinese universities.

4.9. University Governance in Response to the COVID-19 crisis: Challenges and Countermeasures

Du Haikun
China University of Geosciences (Wuhan)

The COVID-19 epidemic reflects new but objective realities and challenges faced by university governance in public health emergencies, such as incomplete epidemic information disclosure, insufficient capacity for prevention, response and governance. Based on collaborative governance theory, the paper tries to analyze the challenges caused by public health emergencies, and to propose countermeasures and suggestions for optimizing the university governance system and improving collaborative capacity respectively in five aspects including, designing and optimizing rules of the university internal coordination management, defining rights and obligation for multiagent emergency response, improving whole-process information sharing mechanism and enhancing psychological counseling for teachers and students. The last but the most critical one is to meet the challenges posed by normalized digital teaching and learning with ecological, decentralized, personalized characteristics after post-epidemic era, which requires university internal governance to be flatter, faster and more flexible in a foreseeable way. Universities are supposed to improve digital education quality, administrative efficiency and automation technology service, and to construct high-quality digital resources and public service supporting system relying on big data, cloud computing, IOT information technologies.

5. References

Altbach, P. G. (2011). The Past, Present, and Future of the Research University. In *the Road to Academic Excellence: The Making of World-Class Research Universities*, edited by P. G. Altbach and J. Salmi, 11–32. Washington, DC: The World Bank.

Astin, A. & Astin, H. (2000). *Leadership Reconsidered: Engaging Higher Education in Social Change*. USA: W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

Banker, D. V., & Bhal, K. T. (2019). Creating world class universities: Roles and responsibilities for academic leaders in India. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership* 47, 1, 1-21https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143218822776.

Bush, T. & Coleman, M. (2000). *Leadership and Strategic Management in Education*. London: SAGE Publications.

De Boer, H. F., Enders, J., & Leisyte, L. (2007). Public sector reform in Dutch higher education. The organizational transformation of the university. *Public Administration*, *85*(1), 27–46. doi:10.1111/j.1467- 9299.2007.00632.x

d'Hooghe, I. (2010). *The limits of China's soft power in Europe: Beijing's public diplomacy puzzle*. Retrieved from https://www.clingendael.org/publication/limits-chinas-soft-power-europe-beijings-public-diplomacy-puzzle.

d'Hooghe, I., Montulet, A., de Wolff, M., & Pieke, F N. (2018). *Assessing Europe-China collaboration in higher education and research*. Retrieved from http://leidenasiacentre.nl/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/LeidenAsiaCentre-Report-Assessing-Europe-China-Collaboration-in-Higher-Education-and-Research.pdf.

Egron-Polak, E., & Hudson, R. (2014). *Internationalization of Higher Education – Growing Expectations, Fundamental Values*. Paris: International Association of Universities.

Esser, F., & Vliegenthart, R. (2017). Comparative Research Methods. In J. Matthes, C. S. Davis & R. Potter (Eds.), *The International Encyclopedia of Communication Research Methods* (pp. 248-269). London: Wiley-Blackwell.

Eurydice. (2008). *Higher education governance in Europe: Policies, structures, funding and academic staff*. Retrieved from http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/education/eurydice/documents/thematic_reports/091EN.pdf

Frolich, N., & Caspersen, J. (2015). Institutional governance structures. In J. Huisman, H. de Boer, D. D. Dill, & M. Souto-Otero (Eds.), *The Palgrave international handbook of*

higher education policy and governance (pp. 379–397). London: Palgrave Macmillan. doi:10.1007/978-1-137-45617-5_21.

Wang, H. & Zhou, Y. (2011). China: Challenges for Higher Education in a High Growth Economy. In: Göransson B., Brundenius C. (eds) *Universities in Transition. Insight and Innovation in International Development*. Springer, New York, NY pp 143-170.

Jones, G., & Oleksiyenko, A. (2011). The internationalization of Canadian university research: A global higher education matrix analysis of multi-level governance. *Higher Education, 61*(1), 41-57.

Kekale, J. (2005). *Academic Leadership in Perspective*. Nova Publishers.

Knobel, M., Patricia Simoes, T., & Henrique de Brito Cruz, C. (2013). International collaborations between research universities: Experiences and best practices. *Studies in Higher Education, 38*(3), 405-424.

Kretek, P. M., Dragsic, Z., & Kehm, B. M. (2013). Transformation of university governance: On the role of university board members. *Higher Education*, *65*(1), 39–58. doi:10.100710734-012-9580-x.

Poister, T.H. (2010). The future of strategic planning in the public sector: Linking strategic management and performance. *Public Administration Review*, 70: 246–254.

Saarela, A. (2018). *A new era in EU-China relations: More wide- ranging strategic cooperation?* European Parliament, Directorate-general for external policies, Policy Department.

Salter, B, Tapper, T (2002) The external pressures on the internal governance of universities. Higher Education Quarterly 56: 245–256.

Seeber, M., Meoli, M. & Cattaneo, M. (2018). How do European higher education institutions internationalize? *Studies in Higher Education*, 1-18.

Shanghai Ranking (2017). Academic Ranking of World Universities. http://www.shanghairanking.com/ARWU2017.html.

Stogdill, R. (1950). Leadership, membership and organisation. *Psychological Bulletin* 47(1).

Tiplic, D. (2006). The Governance of Higher Education Institutions." In *Higher Education Governance Between Democratic Culture, Academic Aspirations and Market Forces*, edited by J. Kohler and J. Huber, 135–151. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Van Damme, D. (2001). Quality Issues in the Internationalisation of Higher Education." Higher Education 41 (4): 415–41.

Xie, W. (2007). *A study of higher education structure during the process of massification 1998–2004*. Beijing: Educational Science Press.

Zhu, C., Cai, Y., & François, K. (2017). Perceptions of European and Chinese stakeholders on doctoral education in China and Europe. *European Journal of Higher Education, 7*(3), 227-242.

Zhu, C., & Zayim-Kurtay, M. (2018). University governance and academic leadership: Perceptions of European and Chinese university staff and perceived need for capacity building. *European Journal of Higher Education, 8*(4), 435-452.