Chapter 8

Governance, Leadership and Administration

No organization can thrive without good management, and a research university is no exception. Universities are managed within the framework established by higher education policies of the state or the country. In this chapter, we focus on the internal management of the university and discuss key aspects of managing a research university.

The overall management of a university comprises governance, management or administration and leadership (Gayle et al. 2003). Governance means the structures and processes for decision-making at the institutional level (Middlehurst 2013) for establishing goals, values, policies and directions and overseeing that the decisions taken are implemented. Governance has two important dimensions: academic governance, which focuses on academics, and overall university governance, which looks at all other aspects, including finance and general administration. We discuss both in this chapter.

Governance structures establish policies and make decisions. However, these policies and decisions have to be implemented and followed in the day-to-day administrative functioning of a university, which is the backbone of running any organization.

Finally, leadership is about individuals who influence policies and decisions. Every university has a chief executive, who is expected to provide the main leadership to the university. Examples of how visionary leaders have transformed universities are found in the literature. Effective leaders for research universities now are highly sought after, as the world has realized that talented and visionary leaders can make a huge difference in how a university performs. Many universities often do a global search for the chief executive.

Governance and leadership are of particular importance for developing research universities in a country like India, where, often, universities do not get the benefit of good governance and strong and visionary leadership. The poor state of governance and leadership, and the related processes and structures that perpetuate it, are discussed at length by Chandra (2017). The new NEP of the Government of India clearly identifies this as an area for improvement. The NEP has observed that the governance and leadership of a majority of institutions of higher education in India have been plagued by external interference, which has compromised the autonomy of these institutions, and have not provided the leadership and governance that these institutions deserve. It notices that many decisions are imposed by the regulators or the government on universities, and appointments for leadership roles are made more to distribute favours rather than to find the most competent persons, which leads to a situation where people who do not have the vision or values for providing the inspired leadership and good governance that is needed are appointed as leaders. It also observes that public HEIs are often operated as extensions of government departments and that there is considerable interference in the selection and functioning of the leaders of these institutions (NEP 2019).

In this chapter, we discuss a few key issues related to governance, leadership and administration. Before that, we discuss some key guiding principles for the management of a research university.

8.1 SOME GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR GOVERNING A RESEARCH UNIVERSITY

Research universities are now large and complex systems with, often, thousands of people in the system, and with a budget often exceeding that of many large corporations. At the same time, expectations from universities have increased—the society and governments expect universities to deliver more value and respond speedily to issues that might be raised or new situations and opportunities that may arise. Clearly, effective and efficient governance is required.

A few different approaches are followed in university governance (McNay 1995; Rowlands 2017; Trakman 2008). The most relevant approaches for contemporary universities in India are collegial, bureaucratic and corporation. Although sometimes these models are discussed as competing, all three operate in most universities today, perhaps in different spheres of university governance. The tension today is regarding the scope of each within the university, particularly the collegial and corporation models.

In the collegial model, also referred to as the university governance by the academic staff (Trakman, 2008), decisions are made by faculty bodies, such as the senate or committees of faculty. Freedom from external control, a democratic approach of decision-making based on views of the faculty, and academic freedom are the underlying concepts on which this model rests. This model of governance, while providing freedom and control to the faculty at large, has no clear responsibilities for individual leaders, making accountability harder. Also, as the primary goal of faculty is academics, governance becomes a part-time occupation for the faculty, which is not aligned with their professional goals. Such a model is also bound to be slow, because it requires extensive consultative processes for all decisions. This governance model has other perceived deficiencies.

In the corporate model, top managers are professional managers whose main responsibility is governance. In such a model, decisions are made by top management personnel and

implemented in the organization. In such a model, the top management is responsible for all major decisions, and their own performance is assessed based on how well the organization performs. The corporate model is philosophically at odds with the collegial model.

The bureaucratic model is characterized by processes and procedures and is associated with suitable records and paperwork. This model, though often found cumbersome by users, is essential for the actual implementation of the managerial or collegial model. Hence, it can be seen as necessary for some aspects of university governance. This form of governance need not be in conflict with the other two—it actually supports them.

Although, earlier, some universities were run mostly with the collegial model, a clear trend towards strengthening the corporate-style governance in universities is observed over the last many decades. Many researchers have examined this shift from the collegial to the corporate style (e.g., Shattock 2013; Yielder and Codling 2004). This shift has been necessitated by the changing nature of universities, the context in which they operate and expectations from governments and the public at large of effective and efficient governance of universities.

Today, a combination of professional management and traditional academic approaches is needed in a university (Altbach 2011). This is often also called shared governance, in which both the executive and the faculty share responsibilities and the faculty is involved in most important decision-making (Birnbaum 2004; Stensaker and Vabo 2013; Taylor 2013). Often, the responsibilities overlap, and there is often some tension between the executive and the faculty. Therefore, some guiding principles need to be articulated for the governance and management of research universities. We discuss some of these key principles in this chapter, which have been organized around a few themes. The general principles of sound management of organizations, such as transparency, integrity, fairness, and so forth have not been discussed; the management literature will have much to say about them.

8.1.1 Autonomy and Accountability

Autonomy can be considered as a basic principle of operation for a university. As governments provide significant funds for research universities, there is always a tendency for increased government oversight and control. The governance structure of the university should preserve its autonomy so that all decisions regarding the university are taken within the university by its management structures.

The autonomy of public universities is often viewed as a struggle between the state and the university. Some degree of autonomy is granted to universities by their terms of operation and existing laws. However, the actual level of autonomy at which a university operates is also determined by the working equations between the government and the university that evolve over time. Universities play an important role in evolving these working equations. However, sometimes, autonomy is reduced by the university itself, for example, when difficult internal policy issues are not resolved internally and are referred to the government.

- **Autonomy**. The guiding principle for autonomy is that the research university must strive for greater autonomy.

Public universities are created by the state and supported through public funds. Consequently, it is expected that the state exercises a degree of control over these universities. Autonomy is the degree of control the university has over its matters *vis-à-vis* the degree of control exercised by public authorities. This balance between the degrees of control exercised by the university and public authorities regarding the affairs of a university is dynamic and evolving. In many developed countries, it is now broadly agreed upon that increasing the autonomy of universities is essential for a modern higher education system—the European Union has taken a formal view on this (Estermann 2015; Estermann and Nokkala 2009).

Experience and research indicate that autonomy helps a university in performing better and attracting more funds

(Aghion et al. 2010). The main reason why a state may hesitate in increasing autonomy is that it may lead to universities becoming less accountable to the public at large. However, in the modern context, research universities have become large and complex organizations, trying to respond to the forces of globalization, technology change, changing expectations from students and public, competition for global rankings and prestige, need for enhanced financial resources, and so forth. In such a scenario, providing a higher degree of autonomy to research universities is essential; the university is in the best position to govern itself to face the multifaceted challenges of the twenty-first century and provide desired academic outcomes to students and society.

What does autonomy mean for a public university? The European University Association has identified four key dimensions of autonomy: organizational, financial, staffing and academic (Estermann 2015; Estermann and Nokkala 2009).

Organizational autonomy means the degree of control a university has over its internal administrative structures. Some high-level governance structures are normally stated as part of the terms of establishing a university; these include bodies such as the governing board, senate, and so forth. We have considered these as part of the university's inherent organizational structure. Although these inherent structures must exist and a university might not be able to change them, autonomy with respect to these refers to the degree of control it has in selecting members of these bodies and their composition. Of course, autonomy over its internal administrative structures beyond these inherent structures refers to the degree of control the university has in defining and refining them.

A key aspect of organizational autonomy is with respect to the selection and appointment of the chief executive of a university. The main issue here is who decides who the next chief executive of the university should be. The chief executive may be elected in some manner or may be appointed (Estermann and Nokkala 2009). While election is used as a method in some

older European universities, the common method today is that of an appointment. In this case, the question is who appoints the chief executive. If the appointing authority is a body of the university, for example, the governing board, then the university has autonomy in selecting its leader. If the decision rests with a body of the state, then the university does not have this critical autonomy. A person appointed to a post is answerable mainly to the appointing authority. Therefore, if the appointing authority is not the board of the university but some external authority, then, in many ways, the chief executive is answerable not to the university or the board but to the external appointing authority. To resolve this fundamental issue, the chief executive of a university, like the chief executive of business organizations, should be appointed by and answerable to the university.

In India, most research universities often might not have much authority in deciding the composition of bodies such as the governing board. In many cases, most members of the governing board may be some designated government officials or government-nominated members. In some cases, a university's governing board might have powers to nominate members to the board when the term of the existing members expires. Most research universities have no autonomy in the appointment of the chief executive; the state generally makes this decision. Only a few institutions now have this autonomy, and in these, the governing board is the selecting and appointing authority for the chief executive (e.g., IIIT-Delhi, some Indian Institutes of Management). Universities, however, have a fair degree of control over their internal administrative structures.

Financial autonomy is critical and challenging. It means that a university has full control of its finances, incomes and expenditure. Given that public universities take funds from the state, complete financial autonomy is not possible. However, even in this situation, financial autonomy can be enhanced to near-full autonomy if the funding provided to the university by the state is based on some transparent formula or method (e.g., based on

the number of students). Such a mechanism effectively implies financial autonomy—while the funding comes from the state, it is predictable, and the university can rely on it and has full control over its financial planning and expenditure.

Staffing autonomy means a university has the control to decide the number of staff positions, recruit staff and decide the terms of employment. In many public universities, the number of staff positions is decided by the state, because it has direct implications on the budgetary support that may need to be provided. However, where formula-based funding is practised, exercising this control is not needed explicitly, and it may be left to the university to decide the staffing level. In India, most public universities get budgetary support from the government, and hence the number of staff positions often needs approval from the state. A few universities have this autonomy also (e.g., IIIT-Delhi).

Most universities across the world have a good degree of autonomy in selecting the staff, including junior faculty. In some European countries, however, appointments at senior levels might need to go through some government approvals. In India, most public research universities have autonomy in appointing staff, including faculty at all levels. Procedural stipulations need to be followed, but the university does the appointment.

The autonomy to decide the terms of employment refers to who decides the salary of faculty and other staff. In many countries, salary scales may be decided by the state. If formula-based funding is being practised, again, this autonomy can also be provided to the university. In India, almost all universities have to follow the government-specified pay scale for faculty and staff. Only a few institutions can decide their own scales (e.g., IIIT-Delhi), but even they are required to follow broad government norms.

Finally, academic autonomy is the ability of a university to make decisions regarding its academic programmes and decide on admission in these programmes. Decisions on

academic programmes include introducing or terminating some degree programmes and deciding the structure and content of these programmes, way of delivering the programmes and quality assurance for the same. Most universities in India have autonomy over their academic programmes, although there are some broad national guidelines regarding degree names, their durations, etc.

Autonomy in admission is more complicated. On the one hand, in most US universities that have complete autonomy to decide their own criteria for admission and select students accordingly, often, the criteria are not fully transparent or made public. On the other hand, there are entrance exams in many countries, such as India, and the scores or ranks in these exams are used by universities for admission. In cases where the performance in entrance exams is the sole criterion for admission, universities really have little autonomy in establishing the criteria for admission; they have to admit students based on their performance in these exams. In India, most universities take admissions based on rank in an entrance exam or the school board exam. Some institutions, like IIIT-Delhi, have used their autonomy in admissions to define criteria that are based on the score in the entrance exam but which also give weight to student's achievements in various other dimensions. Performance of students has shown that students who have these other achievements to get benefit in admission, actually do better academically in the institute.

Autonomy does not exist without responsibility and accountability. Society ultimately funds public research universities and has expectations from them. While autonomy is desired, the autonomous governance should ensure that a research university is responsible and delivers value to society, which is necessary for the long-term survival of the university—the society that provides support must benefit from its support.

- **Responsibility**. The university should understand its role in society and its responsibility to stakeholders and should govern itself so that these are fulfilled.

If its societal responsibility is not fulfilled satisfactorily by a university, the state finds ways to enforce it, thus necessarily weakening the autonomy. Hence, it is in the interests of the university to use its autonomy to fulfil its responsibilities to the public and work relentlessly towards its mission.

One aspect of accountability is financial prudence and efficient use of funds. Universities use public funds. Such funds have to be used prudently and for designated purposes. This aspect of university governance has attracted much attention in the recent past, because costs of education have soared across the world. Going forward, universities might be expected to show stronger financial governance and cost reduction.

8.1.2 Shared Governance: Faculty Role in Governance

Given the complexity of managing a large university, and the need to be accountable and respond swiftly to the evolving environment, a research university clearly needs professional management. There are many other reasons for having a dedicated and responsible management team (the executive) working in a corporate-style management.

However, it is also true that academics have thrived in a self-governed environment, and universities are fundamentally different from corporations due to the nature of their goals. Therefore, although using modern governance practices is a need, ensuring that the academic ethos and values are preserved is also needed. Also, in a quest for efficient governance, the main goals of a research university—academic values and pursuit of excellent academics—should not be compromised.

Towards this, a trend that is almost universally followed to have corporate-style governance, while still ensuring that the faculty remain the main decision-makers, is to have an administrative route for the faculty. This has worked well across the world—some faculty members who have a flair and interest in governance can shift from being an academician, with research

and teaching as the main pursuits, towards governance, where administration becomes their main task. While this ensures that most of the members of the executive team have a good understanding of academics and university governance, there is still a need for faculty at large to have a role in decision-making. This is achieved by shared governance.

Although the scope of faculty in governance has shrunk, they still play an important role in a university. The authority of the chief executive and senior administrators has increased; however, the collegial model involving faculty still operates in many subtle ways. For example, views of faculty and faculty committees often constrain the decisions the executive authority can take. Therefore, while theoretically the executive authority may take any decision it deems suitable, often, it is the collegial decision-making that influences the decisions. Similarly, while the executive structure can require faculty to teach in a certain manner, effectively, teaching remains mostly free from executive interference.

Shared governance is practiced in most research universities today, in which the power rests with both the executive and the faculty bodies, and none takes decisions unilaterally exercising the power vested in them, but work with a sense of common purpose (Taylor 2013). However, tension remains between the scope of executive and faculty. For a research university, it is important to have some aspects of governance that employ the collegial model with faculty controlling the governance. We point out two important aspects here.

- **Faculty administration by faculty.** Operationally, some roles in the governance structure are always needed to deal with matters related to faculty. Any administrative role that deals directly with faculty must rest with faculty members. Correspondingly, no administrative role having a professional staff leading it should have direct jurisdiction on any aspect of faculty affairs. According to this principle, a registrar who is typically a professional administrator should not have any

direct jurisdiction on faculty matters. This principle also implies that a broader input of faculty must be taken on all policies and decisions relating to administration of the faculty.

- **Academic administration by faculty.** This principle is indeed foundational for university governance and is generally followed in all universities. Academics (related to education) is the basic purpose of a university, and faculty is its soul. Historically, faculty has debated long and hard over what should be taught to students and how it should be taught. This aspect is least likely to be understood by non-faculty. All aspects of academic administration must rest with the faculty, and policymaking for academics, including curricular issues, must involve a broad section of the faculty. It does not mean there is no need for professional staff to support or execute various functions of this administration; they are of course needed. As academics is the largest function of a university, the staff size may be substantial for helping in managing it. However, all policy matters related to academics must rest with faculty committees or members entrusted with specific roles.

These two are widely followed in research universities. As the scope of the executive and that of the faculty often overlap, there will still be many areas that will fall under the executive which should have inputs from the faculty. To enhance shared governance in such matters, an approach suggested is to have committees of members from both the executive and the faculty to provide an interface between the two bodies (Taylor 2013).

While there is a clear trend towards the corporate style of governance and increasing the power of the executive, there is a view that shared governance in which faculty have significant role in decision-making is critical for keeping the focus on the academic functions of a university, where academics is an end in itself and not a means to an end, as in businesses (Birnbaum 2004). As research universities pride themselves on their teaching and research, it is essential that shared governance be followed in spirit by the executive and top-level governance engaging with the

faculty and taking their inputs for important decisions regarding the university.

8.1.3 Academic Freedom

Academic freedom is, of course, the basic foundation of all academics. This aspect makes universities different from other organizations such as corporations or government labs. Historically, academic freedom was a way to explore and teach as freely as possible and to avoid the restrictions that were often placed by the religious or civil authorities on what could be taught or what topics could be explored. In older times, academic freedom was limited, but it increased rapidly with the rise of research universities, though it has been, and remains, a contested area (Altbach 2001). Although the concept of academic freedom is applicable to both faculty and students, we discuss it here in the context of faculty.

Academic freedom does not seem to have a clear definition, and the degree of freedom enjoyed by universities varies across the world (Altbach 2001). We discuss here academic freedom in the two key missions of a university: how it applies to research and how it applies to teaching. For research, there is a general agreement on what academic freedom means; however, in teaching, the views are not uniform. Let us briefly discuss these two separately.

1. **Full freedom in research.** Faculty largely drive research in universities, and the pursuit of knowledge is the goal. Sometimes, the nature of research questions, or the answers, might be controversial, and sections of the society or governments may not like it. Complete academic freedom in all aspects of research should be maintained and supported in a university, implying that a researcher is free to pursue whatever questions he/she wants to pursue and disseminate the results as wished. It also implies that researchers can question or criticize other researchers' findings or established notions. However, it has another subtle implication, which is sometimes not

fully appreciated by governments or corporations. Given the academic freedom, a university administrator does not have any authority to demand that a faculty member do research on a certain topic. Hence, for any research that needs to be done, the concerned faculty cannot simply be assigned the work—they have to be motivated and suitably incentivized.

2. **Limited freedom in teaching.** Academic freedom can be interpreted as freedom to teach what faculty want in their courses and in the manner they want to. The main goal of education programmes is that students learn. Academic programmes are generally designed carefully, mainly by faculty themselves, to deliver the desired learning. Faculty members together largely control the design of the curriculum and courses in the curriculum, and once the courses are designed, the faculty member teaching a course has to deliver the learning outcomes of the course he/she teaches and does not have the freedom to modify it. The faculty member has the freedom to decide the approach he/she wants to take for teaching; however, it has to be consistent with the learning outcomes that have been established. Therefore, the faculty collectively have full academic freedom to decide the curriculum and the courses and their contents, but the freedom of individual faculty members in teaching a course is indeed limited.

These are the academic freedoms relating to the two key missions. However, academic freedom is a more general concept and applies to other aspects of life as well, particularly in expressing views. It is in this aspect of academic freedom where countries differ (Altbach 2001). This freedom, which is sometimes granted as a constitutional right, is of vital importance in a university, where the free exchange of ideas is a foundation. As universities are often supported by public funds and potentially subject to pressures from the government, it is important that this principle that faculty and students are free to express their views, even if the views are divergent from those of the university or the government in power, be enshrined in the rules and culture of the university. Universities generally support this with the caution

that the person expressing the views should clarify that he/she is not speaking on behalf of the university and should show restraint when speaking in public. Related to this is that the beliefs of administrators, politicians and other powers cannot be imposed on students or faculty. It also means that faculty have a right to criticize the internal functioning or policies of a university, or a government, without any fear of reprisals. The concept of academic freedom adopted by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) is given in AAUP (2001).

8.1.4 Light-Touch Management

Most modern universities have a corporate-style governance model in place. However, the functioning of these systems is hardly like that of a corporation. Indeed, although the structural aspects may have been borrowed, the actual operation of this set-up should be different from how it is practised in corporations. We mention some principles here.

- **Light-touch management.** Universities were, and remain, largely self-governed institutions, with faculty members being autonomous agents with a large degree of freedom in what they pursued and delivered. In corporations, the management approach is used to ensure that the work of individuals is aligned with the goals of the corporation, and for this, a tight management style is often exercised. In universities, given the autonomous nature of the faculty and the academic freedom they enjoy, such a style is inappropriate and likely to be counterproductive. Also, all faculty are expected to be leaders in their own right. Hence, the governance should ensure that faculty management is light-touch, where expectations are clearly articulated to faculty and micromanagement or detailed progress monitoring is avoided.
- **Limited professional management.** All universities need some professional management staff to manage their operations. The size of the management staff is often comparable to the

size of faculty. The role and responsibilities of the management staff have also increased. With the increase in the complexity and size of the management staff, their authority over and oversight of academic activities of research and teaching also increase, leading to bureaucracy, sometimes excessive. This bureaucracy is often disliked by the faculty who want to focus on academics, while the management often focuses on processes, compliances, paperwork, rules, and so forth. To avoid an overly governed system, which inevitably conflicts with the academic freedom ethos, it is important to ensure that the professional management staff size is limited. Also, it is important to ensure that all such management staff are clear about their supportive role in achieving the main goals of the university—research and education—and that their main role is to support faculty and students in achieving these goals.

- **Measure what is necessary.** All sorts of data about various functions and activities in a university are required to be collected. When data is available, different types of analysis can be done. Analyses can often shed light and provide useful insights and understanding. However, they often lead to significant overhead for data collection. This overhead largely falls on faculty already overloaded with their core responsibilities of teaching, research and service. Striking a balance between what data should be collected and how measurements are interpreted is important, keeping in mind that all aspects of academics cannot be effectively measured quantitatively.

8.1.5 Accepting Authority is Distinct from Recommending Body

In universities, committee functioning is the norm. For many policy matters, committees are formed to examine the issue and share their recommendations. Committees are also the norm for the selection or promotion of faculty. A committee examines the case and makes recommendations regarding selection, tenure,

promotion, and so forth. Whenever committees are involved in making a recommendation, the recommendation goes to another body for possible acceptance and is then implemented. Often, a committee of experts, including the head of the department and some other functionaries, is formed to make a recommendation about faculty candidates. The experts on the committee may be from the university, perhaps with some members from outside the department. Alternatively, experts may be mostly from outside the university, as is the case in most universities in India. Typically, there is a chair of the committee. Recommendations of the committee are then sent to a higher authority, which may accept these.

Sometimes, this process might involve multiple layers. For example, in most universities in USA, decisions regarding promotion and tenure often go through many committees. A departmental committee may make a recommendation, which is then examined by another committee at the level of the dean, which makes its own recommendation, and this is further examined at the university level by the provost and/or the president for possible acceptance.

In most smoothly functioning systems, the trust relationship is built over years and the authority generally accepts recommendations. The recommender–acceptor framework then acts more as a method to maintain the integrity of the process, while still allowing for some room for correction in case the recommending committee has erred in its judgement.

For this model to be effective, the accepting authority must be fully distinct from the recommending committee. Ideally, there should be no overlap, so that the accepting authority takes a completely unbiased view. Therefore, in many universities in Australia, the recommendation for faculty appointment is made by a committee of faculty from the department and outside, which is then sent for acceptance to the dean (who is not a member of the recommending committee). Similarly, in USA, the recommendation for faculty selection is made by the department

through a committee or a consultative process and sent to the dean for possible acceptance.

The same is expected for promotions. The committee recommending a promotion should not have any overlap with the committee empowered to accept recommendations. In many universities in USA that have multiple committee levels for promotion, if a faculty is a member of the dean-level committee for promotions, he/she is expected to excuse himself/herself from the department-level committee making the recommendation.

In many large university systems in Australia and USA, recommending committees are typically at the department or dean level, with no involvement of the chief executive. However, in India, where most universities tend to be small, often, the chief executive chairs the committee that recommends the selection or promotion of a faculty. In this case, the accepting authority must be above the chief executive, for example, the chairperson of the board of governors. This is followed in IIIT-Delhi and in all IITs.

If a committee recommending selection or promotion includes the chief executive, the chairperson of the board of governors should be different from the chief executive—an approach followed in most universities in Australia and many institutes in India. Clearly, if the chief executive also chairs the board, the situation violates the basic principle of separating the recommending and accepting bodies and is open to misuse. This happens to be the case in many universities in India that have not yet adopted this modern practice and rely on the old system of allowing much of the decision-making power to be concentrated in the chief executive.

8.2 UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE

As discussed earlier, governance has two important dimensions: academic governance, which focuses on academics, and top-level,

overall university governance, which looks at all other aspects, including finance and general administration.

The responsibility for the top-level, overall governance of a university rests typically with a governing board. This body may be called the board of governors, board of management, board of regents or board of trustees, or have some other name. Legally, this body is recognized as representing the university. We refer to this body as the board of governors or just the board. The board is the body responsible for formulating all the rules and regulations for university functioning.

While the board is the main body overseeing the university and has all the powers for acting on behalf of the university, in some universities, particularly those supported by public funds, there is often a body 'above' the board, which does not have executive powers but can be considered as a broader authority to which the university is answerable. This body may be called a 'court' or a council and is expected to represent the public to ensure that the university serves public interests. It often has political and government representatives in it. In UK, this body is generally called the court and may have hundreds of members (CUC 2009). In India, it is called the court in many universities and the council in many other institutions. The court or the council may be chaired by a 'chancellor', who is often the governor of the state for a state university and an appointee of the president of India for central universities. In IIIT-Delhi, this body is called the General Council and is chaired by the lieutenant governor of the state of Delhi, who is also the chancellor of the Institute. In most central government universities and institutions, there is also a 'visitor', who is usually the president of India, who has some authority for giving directions to the university. We consider a body like a court and a functionary like a chancellor, both of whom do not exercise executive powers, as representing the larger stakeholders of the university—the government and the public. We do not discuss these further.

The responsibility for academic and student governance generally rests with another body, sometimes called the academic

senate (or board of studies or some other name). This body, which comprises of faculty from the university, as well as external experts, oversees the academic programmes of the university. The overall governance by both these bodies is governed by the act and statutes of the university. Hence, we start with a brief discussion on these.

8.2.1 Act, Statutes and Ordinances

All universities have some legal empowerment that allows them to engage in education and research and grant degrees. Although there are different ways in which this empowerment can happen, we have assumed that this is done through an act of some state government or the central government. In other words, some act of some government empowers a particular university to function as it does. Typically, this act lays out not only the scope of the university but also some aspects of the governance structure, responsibilities, and so forth.

The act typically is a high-level document specifying broadly what a university can do, its governance structure, its responsibilities, and so forth. Further policies regarding various aspects of governance and activities of the university are formulated separately while remaining in compliance with the act. We call these statutes, the term commonly used in India. Statutes are generally made by the university, except the first statutes, which are made along with the act. Often, new statutes, or revision of existing statutes, require the concurrence of the government that has enacted the act.

The governance of a university has to be compliant with the act and statutes. In other words, the act and statutes provide the framework within which the board of the university takes its decisions.

The detailed operational rules and guidelines for policies defined in the act and statutes, or decisions made by the board, may be specified in ordinances, which have to be formally

notified. In other words, the governance of a university is driven by its act, statutes and ordinances, and the university is expected to comply with these.

Often, there is another layer below ordinances, called regulations. These are often codified details of the rules specified in ordinances. Often, details of academic programmes and their execution are also codified in regulations.

8.2.2 Overall Governance and Board of Governors

The main role of the board is to formulate policies for the university and ensure that they are executed. However, the scope of policies may have limitations, as defined in the act. For example, in many public universities, the number of faculty and staff positions that a university has may be outside the scope of the board and may be decided by the government.

Rather than discuss in generalities, let us illustrate the responsibilities of the board by taking the example of IIIT-Delhi. The act of IIIT-Delhi empowers the board with a wide range of responsibilities, providing it a large degree of autonomy. The board is responsible and empowered with the following responsibilities:

- Exercising general superintendence, direction and control in the affairs of the institute
- Laying down policies for the functioning of the institute and for the manner of implementation of these policies
- Making statutes and ordinances and approving any regulations that may be made by the senate or any other bodies of the institute
- Instituting academic programmes and reviewing the working of the senate (which is the main body overseeing the academics in the institute, as will be discussed later)
- Preparing the annual report, the annual accounts and the budget of the institute
- Creating positions, appointing persons to academic and other posts in the institute and determining the salary structure

and the terms and conditions of different cadres of employees; regulating and enforcing discipline among employees as the appointing authority; and appointing the director of the institute.

- Delegating any of its powers to the director or any other authority of the institute or to a committee appointed by it
- Exercising all the powers of the institute not otherwise provided for by the act, statutes and ordinances

As we can see, in this structure, the board is the main governing body responsible for all aspects of the functioning of the institute. It is the main decision-making body. It also has the responsibility of creating positions, appointing faculty and staff to these positions and deciding their compensation. Effectively, the board is fully empowered to make all decisions regarding the institute. Structurally, it has a great deal of autonomy in the operation of the institute and is perhaps one of the most empowered boards among public universities in India.

The autonomy of a university is strongly influenced by how empowered and autonomous its board is, which, in turn, depends on the composition of the board and who appoints the board members. If the government appoints most of the members or if there are many representatives from the government on the board, the board is likely to align with government policies and decisions. Therefore, the board should largely comprise members who are independent and committed to making decisions in the interests of the university.

A general structure of the board may include a chairperson and a secretary. The chief executive of a university is an important member of the board. Other members may be the following: officials from the government; some distinguished citizens and thought leaders nominated to the board by the government, the board or other stakeholders (e.g., alumni, faculty, and so on); some faculty from the university; and some alumni.

An important aspect is the size of the board. A large board makes decision-making hard, while too small a board is unable

to provide diversity and multiplicity of views. Broadly, it can be said that a board comprising 12–24 members is appropriate.

Some key aspects of the structure and composition have a significant impact on the functioning of the board and autonomy of a university. Perhaps, the most critical issue is the presence of government officials on the board. Government officials have to take views aligned with the expectations and plans of the government and act in the interests of the government. Their presence impacts the autonomy of the university with respect to the state. Their presence is generally justified on the grounds that public funds are used and, therefore, some governmental oversight is needed. Ideally, there should be no government official on the board, so as to provide the university maximum independence from the state in its governance. If such presence is necessary, it should be minimal, and the expectation should be that these officials facilitate the interaction with the government that a public university might need.

The other important issue is who nominates distinguished citizens or thought leaders. Again, if the government makes the nominations, then the autonomy is likely to be compromised. (An interesting approach is taken by some universities in USA in which nominations are made by the government but for a very long period, so that they are effectively independent of the government for continuation.) It is best that these members are selected by the university itself, perhaps by the board through some consultative process.

As an example, let us look at the composition of the board of IIIT-Delhi. The board consists of the following members:

- The chairman, who is nominated by the chancellor
- The director
- Principal secretary, or secretary, Finance Department of the government
- Secretary, Technical Education Department of the government

- Four persons having special knowledge or practical experience with respect to education, information technology domain of the application of information technology to be nominated by the chairman from a panel of eight persons submitted by the director to the board
- Two professors of the institute to be nominated by the director
- The registrar, member secretary

As we can see, the board is quite compact. The term of the nominated board members is 3 years. Although the board has government representation, it is modest. The board itself selects the four experts on the board. These together make the board quite autonomous.

This structure of the board provides good autonomy to govern an institution, particularly in the earlier stages. However, it does not provide for including other stakeholders, which may be desirable at a later date. For example, it is desirable to have the option to include some alumni once its alumni base has expanded and matured. It is also desirable to have the possibility of having more independent experts as the institute expands. (This could have been addressed in the act, for example, by stipulating that, some years after its establishment, the board may be expanded to include some alumni and expand the number of experts.)

The NEP also recommends that all universities should have an empowered board of governors who feel ownership for the university and are empowered to take decisions in the best interests of the university. It suggests a compact board of less than 20 people, with one-third of the members being from the university (including the chief executive), more than half of the board members being experts who are independent of the government as well as of the university, and no more than three members from the government. It also recommends that the board should itself nominate these experts (NEP 2019). In other words, the recommendations of the NEP are along the lines of the structure at IIIT-Delhi, as discussed earlier.

Related to the structure of the board is the issue of who selects and appoints the chairperson of the board. Usually, the state or the board itself can appoint the chairperson. For the highest level of autonomy, the board should appoint its chairperson through a defined process, ensuring prompt execution of the process by a university when a new chairperson is to be selected, as it is in the university's interests to have a chairperson. However, for public universities, often, the government appoints the chairperson. In such cases, it is desirable if the appointment process is such that the views of the board and other university stakeholders are taken into consideration.

Continuing with the IIIT-Delhi example, its act stipulates that the chairman is to be appointed by the chancellor. The process specified later in the statutes for the selection of the chairman, however, provides means to take the views of the board and other stakeholders in the process. According to the statute for the selection of the chairperson, a search committee is to be constituted, with experts being nominated to the committee by the board and the chancellor in equal numbers. The search committee is expected to take suggestions from various stakeholders for its search. It finally suggests suitable names to the chancellor, from which the chancellor selects one to be appointed as the chairperson.

It is also important that the chairperson be different from the chief executive, as discussed earlier, and is not an employee of the university. Many institutions in India, including IITs and IIIT-Delhi, follow this. However, this important principle is sometimes not followed. The NEP explicitly suggests that the chairperson of the board should be independent and separate from the chief executive and recommends that the board should elect its own chairperson, either from within itself or from outside.

8.2.3 Academic Governance and the Senate

Academics are at the heart of a university. Governance of academics is in itself complex, particularly since it must necessarily deal

with issues related to students. Inevitably, the responsibility for academic governance rests with a dedicated body separate from the board, which is concerned with the overall governance. This body is sometimes called an academic senate, or academic board, or may be known by different names. We refer to it as the senate.

The relationship between the senate and the board needs to be defined, as, for academic freedom, it is important that the senate be independent. Historically, in many universities, the senate, sometimes also called the faculty senate, controlled all aspects of academics, with essentially no role for the governing board. A current approach is that while the academic senate is entrusted with matters related to academics, it governs essentially on behalf of the board, and the board relies on the recommendations of the senate for academic and student matters. The nature of the relationship between the two bodies may be articulated in the rules of the university. However, in reality, the practice followed over the years defines the relationship between the two entities. In many institutions, the views of the academic senate in many matters related to the structure of programmes, courses, teaching, student matters, and so forth are taken as final. Such an arrangement is essential to ensure academic freedom.

For example, in IIIT-Delhi, as per its act, the senate is the principal academic body having the right to advise the board of governors on all academic matters. It is responsible for the maintenance of standards of instruction, education, examination, and so forth. It is also responsible for framing regulations for the academic functioning of the institute, student discipline, and so forth. In this model, while the board is the ultimate deciding body, it must seek inputs from the senate on all academic and student matters.

Although the term 'academics' in a broad sense includes research activities also, senates are mostly focused on educational aspects and academic programmes. The governance of the research mission is left to other governance structures. In the collegial model of governance followed earlier in many universities,

faculty senates often also had research in their purview. The management of research was discussed in a previous chapter.

The design of academic programmes is a key task of the senate. Earlier, when higher education was limited to a small portion of the population, it was pursued for developing thinkers and generalists, with little concern about what skills might be needed by the industry or society. However, today, the scenario is different, and the society, including the industry and the students, expects higher education to provide students skills and knowledge to function effectively in the society and workplace. With this change, it is desirable to have external inputs in the process of designing academic programmes, particularly from the industry.

One way to ensure that there are good external inputs in academic programmes is to have representation from important stakeholder groups, in particular the industry, in the body making decisions regarding programmes (i.e., the senate itself). To have external representation in the senate, the constitution of the senate has to be such that it allows this. As an example, we can consider the structure of the senate of IIIT-Delhi. The statute for the senate states that the senate shall consist of no less than 20 and no more than 40 members, at least half of the members shall be full-time faculty members of the institute and at least one-fourth shall be members who are not faculty of the institute. It also specifies that external members may be academicians from other institutions, experts from industry or alumni of the institute. It specifies that there shall be at least two student representatives and provides the flexibility for co-opting others for a limited term or for discussing special issues. This structure clearly shows the intent—the senate shall have a majority from the faculty of the institute, and so the responsibility for all academics shall rest with the faculty. However, it also formally establishes ways to get external inputs. Academicians from other institutions help in bringing learnings and best practices from other institutions. Also, representatives from the industry and alumni help bring in the industry perspective in deliberations. The NEP also recommends

that the main academic body should have members from the university as well as members from outside the university.

8.3 LEADERSHIP AND CHIEF EXECUTIVE

The main leadership of a university rests with the chief executive officer, often called the vice chancellor, director or president. As is often stated, leadership concerns itself with setting the direction and what needs to be done, while management is about efficiently doing what has been decided. The chief executive, however, is not only the main leader but also the chief operating officer responsible for implementing the decisions taken by the board and the senate.

Although a degree of leadership is expected from people appointed to a specific position of authority, people without authority can also often exercise leadership by championing a cause or a change. In a university, in some ways, all faculty are expected to provide a degree of leadership in their academics—in their research work and their teaching activities. Those who achieve a degree of respect and voice in the peer community due to their knowledge and contributions can be called academic leaders (Yielder and Codling 2004); they derive their 'power' not because of the position they hold but because of the respect they generate in their peers due to their knowledge and contributions. Individuals or groups of individuals can take up leadership to drive a change even in matters related to the university or a particular aspect of it. Keeping this in mind, the task of the appointed leader—the vice chancellor, president or director—is to not only provide the leadership at the top level for the university but also support and motivate others in the university to take up leadership for specific purposes or causes.

Due to the huge task of providing leadership and administration for various aspects of the university, the chief executive has a set of other leaders to assist him/her—these are typically deans, pro–vice chancellors, vice-presidents, etc. These titles and their

roles differ from university to university and country to country. The team of senior leaders together is often referred to as the executive or senior management of the university. In this chapter, we only discuss the chief executive.

8.3.1 Main Responsibilities

The task of the main leader is complex and challenging—even daunting—in a research university, as the leader is supposed to ultimately provide the top-level leadership to all the missions of the university. The 21st-century universities have become complex organizations with multiple roles. Hence, an excellent and multifaceted leader is required to lead it, performing a range of functions (Altbach 2011). Let us look at some of the main responsibilities of the chief executive in the Indian context.

Chief academic officer. The main leader is essentially the chief academic officer of a university, in that he/she presides over academics. The chief executive is the chairman of the body that deals with academic issues—the senate.

Chief of finance. Finance officers may handle daily financial operations of a university. However, the chief executive is typically the ultimate authority for finance also—for example, approving the final budget and annual accounts of the university. The chief executive also may chair the finance committee of an institute, which advises the board on the financial matters of the university.

Chief human resources officer. In India, often, the selection and promotion of faculty and staff are done through committees often chaired by the chief executive. The delegation of these powers, for example to departments or deans, is not very common. Therefore, the chief executive is essentially the main person responsible for all faculty and staff appointments and their promotions. Departments are the main bodies that handle the details of processes related to appointment or promotion, but

it is ultimately the responsibility of the chief executive to make an appropriate decision.

Chief leader. While the board sets policies, the chief executive is expected to provide the initiative and leadership for identifying what policies are needed and formulating them. Similarly, although the board may deliberate and discuss the direction the university is to take, it is the chief executive who is expected to conceptualize the trajectory of the university and seek support and inputs from the board. Essentially, the chief executive is the main person providing leadership to the university. What the university does is largely decided by the chief executive. That is why when histories of universities are written, chief executives who might have steered the university to greater heights are hailed as visionary leaders.

Chief facilitator for internationalization and collaboration. Universities are globalizing worldwide; in developed countries, they are already highly globalized. However, in India, globalization is at a nascent stage—the academic system is hard-pressed to satisfy the local demand itself. For a research university, internationalization is needed to excel in research and build a global reputation. Collaboration with other universities and institutions is not always easy and has to be driven by the top leadership.

Chief operating officer. Although there is always a team involved in the administration of a university, the chief executive, who is also the chief operating officer, is responsible for ensuring that the established policies and processes are being followed. Thus, monitoring the administration team, motivating the team, and so forth is finally the responsibility of the chief executive.

Chief estate officer. Universities have a large expanse of real estate. In India, a university may have accommodation for students, faculty and staff, besides academic facilities. Although there are always units to manage these, the final authority

generally rests with the chief executive. In some universities, handling issues related to housing is a major time-consumer for the chief executive.

The chief executive has many other responsibilities. Effectively, all responsibilities for the effective functioning of the university finally fall on the chief executive. Given the range of responsibilities, clearly, the chief executive needs to have a team of senior executives (collectively often referred to as the executive) to share the responsibilities and duties. In the recent past, the powers and the role of the executive seem to be increasing, with even the top-level governance body (the board) often relying on the executive for many of their decisions (Shattock 2013).

8.3.2 Selection of the Chief Executive

Selecting the chief executive is clearly of great importance. Autonomy demands that the selection of the primary leader of the university, that is, the chief executive, should be left to the university itself. It is in the interests of the university that the chief executive is appointed by the university and so is answerable to the university. If an external body appoints the chief executive, the answerability also lies with that body, which is clearly not desirable.

Let us first discuss a few desirable traits for the chief executive of a research university, who is expected to provide the primary leadership to the university. The leadership of universities is a complex issue, particularly because there are talented, highly individualized and autonomous faculty who are top stars in their own right in their field and often have some contempt for authority. Given the complexities quite unique to the university system, it is now widely accepted that the chief executive for a research university should come from the university system. Some of the desirable attributes of a leader of a research university are as follows:

- **Good academician with a decent reputation**. The leader of a research university need not be a top researcher himself/

herself. The research output of a university depends on its hundreds of faculty and research staff. The goal of the chief executive is not to excel in research himself/herself but to support faculty and other researchers to excel. To be able to support the faculty in research, the chief executive must have been a decent researcher himself/herself so as to have had first-hand experience in key issues faced by faculty in teaching, guiding students and PhD scholars, writing research proposals, managing groups and projects, and so forth. Besides a better understanding of issues, a good academic and research background also provides the desired respect from faculty colleagues. Without a good academic reputation, it is hard to gain the respect of faculty or motivate them for excellence.

- **Vision**. Where a university goes, to a large extent, is driven by the chief executive. Further, where the chief executive wants to take a university is decided by the vision established and followed up by suitable policies and administrative support. In these times of rapid change and questioning about higher education and universities, the chief executive should necessarily be a visionary having the ability to evolve a clear direction of where to take the university to meet emerging and future challenges. Routine and efficient administration and management can keep the university running. However, without a clear vision of where to take the university in the coming years, the university is likely to remain in the current situation and might even lose energy and enthusiasm, as change is expected in today's environment from all stakeholders of the university.

- **Open and collegial, with the ability to build consensus**. This is extremely important, due to the nature of governance in a research university and the shared governance that is followed. If a leader wants to implement some changes, a top-down approach cannot work in a university as it might in a corporation. Although there is a chief executive, a university effectively has each faculty as an autonomous agent, with the chief executive having little control over them. Hence, though an idea may come from the leader, it must have support from

key stakeholders to succeed. Due to this, the chief executive needs to have the ability build consensus for actions to be taken. Given the open nature of the university, it naturally follows that openness is cherished and desired in all aspects of university governance, and the chief executive must have the ability to convince colleagues about any initiatives and changes.

- **Ability to work with a variety of external stakeholders like the government, industry, funding agencies, other universities, etc.** Universities today work in an environment where many external bodies play an important role. For example, universities are expected to generate most of their research funding from sponsoring agencies and industry. They are also expected to play an important role in facilitating industry and local development and engage with the local community. Research universities also engage with other research universities across the world for research and academic collaboration. All these imply that a university cannot be an isolated ivory tower and must be far more externally focused than what may have been the case a century or so ago. Engagement with external agencies will often be led by the chief executive. Consequently, the chief executive should have a good ability to work with these agencies and build relationships globally.
- **Able administrator.** A research university has to be run efficiently and effectively, with all its complex operations running smoothly. This requires effective administration, which is led by the chief executive, as discussed earlier. Therefore, although the main goal of the university is to excel in academics, it rests on the effective administration of all support services and academics. There are, of course, administrative staff for running the organization, but leadership has a huge impact on how the administration functions, and for this, the chief executive must be an able administrator well versed with tools of administration.

These are some traits which need special attention in a research university. Some of these are also the desired characteristics of

vice chancellors in UK, as reported by Middlehurst (2013), who also notes that the role of vice chancellors has been broadening over the years. There are, of course, regular traits of an effective leader that are desirable, for example, the ability to drive change or transformation, trustworthiness, transparency, fairness, the ability to take risks and experiment, encourage others' ideas and accept them when appropriate, behave as exhorting others to behave, and so forth. Many desired attributes of a leader for organizational effectiveness based on general leadership capabilities and special ones needed for universities are discussed by Pounder (2001). As a research university is expected to have many academic leaders in their domain, it is also the role of the chief executive to work with them and nurture and encourage such leadership (Yielder and Codling 2004).

Let us now return to the issue of the selection of a chief executive. Organizational autonomy starts with how autonomous universities are in appointing their chief executive, which is perhaps the most important aspect of organizational autonomy, because it impacts all other organizational issues. In many Western countries, this selection is done by different bodies of the university: the board, the senate, a search committee appointed by the board, and so forth (although the selection may sometimes be subject to approval, which is usually a formality).

In India, the chief executive is often selected by the government, though there is generally a selection committee to recommend a set of names from which the final choice is made. However, some public institutions have empowered boards that select the chief executive.

IIIT-Delhi is one such example. The act of IIIT-Delhi states that the 'Director shall be appointed by the Board of Governors in such a manner, on such terms and on such emoluments and other conditions of service as may be prescribed'. To specify how this appointment is to be made, a statute has been created, which specifies the process. The process is as follows:

1. Before the end of the tenure of the current director, the board discusses the issue of his/her continuation if he/she is eligible and has served only one term.
2. If the board decides that it is in the best interests of the institute that the existing director continue for another term, the board may appoint the existing director for another period of 5 years.
3. Otherwise, a search-cum-selection committee of at least four distinguished academicians/scientists/administrators may be constituted.
4. An advertisement may be placed, but nominations should also be solicited actively.
5. The search-cum-selection committee can follow a process to finally recommend names to the board, which deliberates upon the list and finalizes the order in which candidates are to be approached for the offer.
6. The chairman starts discussions with the recommended candidates about their availability and terms of appointment. After the interactions, the chairman informs the board about the candidate available and the terms agreed upon.
7. The chairman issues the letter of appointment to the selected director.
8. The registrar of the institute issues suitable notifications.

The process shows that the board is fully empowered to select the chief executive, with no role of the government. This process is somewhat unique in India, although such a process of open search by the board is regularly practiced by universities in many countries such as USA and Australia. It is worth pointing out that the NEP recognizes the importance of high-quality leadership and suggests that leaders for universities be chosen from faculty who have a good record in academics and service and possess leadership and management skills. It recommends that the board appoint the chief executive, that the selection be done using processes which will assess potential candidates for their promise of leadership, and that the chief executive report to the board. In

other words, the NEP recommends an approach similar to the one followed at IIIT-Delhi.

While implementing this process, the search-cum-selection committee shortlists a few candidates from the list of nominations and applications it has received. These candidates are then invited to visit the institute, meet with various functionaries and faculty and make a presentation to the faculty. They are then invited to give a presentation on their vision and plans for the institute to the search-cum-selection committee. The committee takes inputs from the departments and faculty on various candidates. The committee then meets, deliberates and recommends three candidates to the board. The board then meets to discuss the recommendations and the candidates and takes a final view. The chairman then contacts the first-choice candidate regarding the terms of appointment. This is a simple and transparent process. Though not followed commonly in India, a process like this can be easily implemented; however, it requires suitable changes in the act and statutes to enable it. This single change can enhance the autonomy of universities tremendously, while making the chief executive fully answerable to the university through the board.

8.4 MANAGEMENT/ADMINISTRATION

The role of the management is to ensure that good support is provided to all those involved in delivering the main missions of an organization, which, for a research university, are education, research and the third mission. The management team also has to ensure that policies formulated by governance bodies of the university are implemented effectively and efficiently. For effective administration, often, universities have a large setup; the non-academic staff size is often as large as the size of the faculty. All well-functioning universities must have decent administration. Effective administration in a university is, in many ways, similar to effective management in any organization. Hence, we discuss it only briefly here.

For administration, all complex systems are broken into units, with people given charge of running these units. Universities are no different. They have different units. Perhaps, the most important and visible units in a university are academic departments. These are the units, generally built around disciplines, which house faculty and run academic programmes. Departments are led by a head or a chair, who is typically one of the senior faculty members appointed for a period of 3–5 years. In a large university, departments may be grouped into schools, which are built around fields of study. A dean typically heads the school. In India, universities generally tend to be small and focused. Hence, the layer of schools is often missing, leading to a flatter academic structure comprising academic departments.

Departments are the bodies responsible for delivering education; they own education programmes. Also, they own courses and ensure that suitable instructors are assigned for teaching courses. Disciplinary research also takes place in departments. They may have research labs and research groups, typically led by one faculty and some other associated faculty members, and have multiple graduate students and other research staff.

Research universities often have centres. Centres are research units, which often may cut across disciplines. Centres are mostly run on research funds and may sometimes be sponsored for multiple years by some agencies or corporations. Typically, centres have faculty from various departments and do not have faculty lines of their own. Therefore, conceptually, centres can be started as needed and shut down when they outlive their purpose (or when the funding stops). Generally, centres do not own education programmes, although, in some places, they may run some postgraduate programmes, necessarily in partnership with some academic departments, because faculty for teaching come from these departments.

Departments take care of delivering education. However, a lot of administrative tasks need to be done for the education mission. These include guiding students, providing them

grades and transcripts, registering students in courses, checking that students have completed the requirements for a degree, arranging for degrees to be distributed and the convocation in which degrees can be conferred, and so forth. For managing all these, there is typically an administrative unit, referred to as the academic section in a university. There is generally a university-level section that deals with all the administrative issues relating to the running of academic programmes. This section is often overseen by a dean. In addition to the university-wide structure, there may be a smaller unit in each department to help and guide students with education programmes run by the department.

Similarly, although research is done in departments and centres and these units may have some support for facilitating their administration, typically, there is a university-level unit to handle research, which is headed by a dean (or vice-president, or some other title) of research. We have discussed research and its management in Chapter 4. The unit to manage research must necessarily have a section to handle sponsored research projects, which generally provide the bulk of the yearly research funds. As they are from sponsoring agencies, they have some amount of compliance and reporting requirements. These are to be ensured by the unit managing projects. Typically, projects are submitted through these units; reporting back to the sponsor also happens through projects. Therefore, the unit becomes the interface between the sponsor and the university for administrative purposes, while faculty and other researchers are responsible for actually conducting the research.

For the third mission, the management structure is less standard. There may be some technology transfer cell, or industry collaboration cell, with a goal to provide support to departments and centres for putting their research to commercial use. The nature of the management structure to support the third mission depends on activities in this mission that are majorly focused on by the university.

Besides units supporting the main missions, there are other administrative units in a university which may not exist in other organizations or corporations. Examples of these include units for fundraising and alumni relations; these are functions specific to a university. These are not large units in public universities. However, in some of the most reputed private universities in USA, they can be large functions and may involve hundreds of people. In India, units for these two functions are generally quite small, because generally they are not given the level of importance they deserve in modern times.

A university has other administration units to support its activities and the running of the university. These can include units for finance and expenditure, security, facilities management, campus maintenance and development, student services, including sports and culture, health services, transport, travel, and so forth. These services are not much different from their counterparts in corporations and other organizations and can be managed in a similar manner using best practices for each.

The scope of this chapter does not permit a detailed discussion of the organizational structures for administration in universities. The administration is, in many ways, the same as in other complex organizations and corporations. However, universities are often focused on their key missions and hence may not sufficiently emphasize administration, sometimes leading to inefficient or ineffective administrative units. Although it is beyond the scope of this chapter to discuss how to manage universities effectively and efficiently (there is much literature on this), it is perhaps useful to discuss a few key principles for administration.

A key principle is that what you cannot measure, you cannot manage. There should be suitable measurements and reporting in place for each unit to ensure that it is working efficiently and is effective in achieving its goals—academic goals, service delivery goals or other goals. A useful concept here is to have reporting methods in place for units to regularly report on key performance indicators. As a general rule, it is always possible to have some

measurement and reporting structures in place for almost any unit regardless of the nature of services provided by the unit.

Another principle is derived from the law of entropy. If a system is not actively managed by applying administrative oversight and energy, it degenerates to one providing a minimal level of service. Active management is required even to keep a system running at the existing levels of efficiency and effectiveness. In many systems, it can be seen how lax management of services leads to the degradation of service levels and satisfaction of those who seek the services.

A fundamental requirement to manage and improve the working of a system is that of having a feedback loop. Feedback is the only way of knowing whether the system is working well or not. Any system that has to be controlled must have feedback loops, according to the systems and control theory. One simple way to get feedback on services is to take feedback from customers (users of services) about the quality of services. This feedback can be obtained in various ways. In IIIT-Delhi, for example, yearly feedback is taken from users (students, faculty and staff) of various services. A simple online survey is conducted on the level of satisfaction of various services such as facility management, finance, R&D management, student support, support for academics, and so forth. Based on the survey results, the administration plans for improvements where needed. The results of the survey and the plans for improvement are discussed and presented to senior administrators or the governing board. The impact of these improvements is discussed after the next year's survey. This simple feedback tool can suffice for ensuring effective administration in a university.

One overall instrument for improving administration is university-level accreditation. Many countries now have accreditation frameworks for assessing the effectiveness of the internal functioning of an institution. Such accreditations are often perceived as unnecessary overheads by universities and academicians. However, they are an important tool for effective

management. These are thorough and elaborate exercises carried out by a team of external experts using a fairly elaborate framework, which looks at all aspects of university management. Hence, they provide good feedback on systems in the university. Reports by these accreditation bodies also provide confidence to sponsors and external stakeholders about how well the university is being managed. Accreditation is also an excellent tool to bring about changes in a research university. Universities are notoriously conservative and resist change. Accreditation is often required, for example, by the government or by funding agencies. Universities can use the exercise to bring about desired changes and get the buy-in from internal stakeholders, particularly faculty.

The NEP also envisages that accreditation will become important and governments will rely more on accreditation to ensure that universities are well governed and fulfilling their mission. It also envisages that there will be separate bodies for regulating and financially supporting universities and that these bodies will rely on accreditation, which will be done by an autonomous authority, to provide information about the governance of universities for taking suitable actions. In other words, accreditation will become the basis of much of regulation and oversight by the government (NEP 2019).

8.5 SUMMARY

In this chapter, we discussed the main layers in the management of a research university: governance, leadership and administration. Before discussing these three dimensions, a set of principles for governing a research university were discussed. These included principles of autonomy and responsibility, shared governance, academic freedom, light-touch management and the presence of an accepting body distinct from a recommending body.

Governance includes a top-level, overall university governance, usually with a governing board, and academic governance, usually done by an academic senate. Governance is

focused on making policies, taking high-level decisions and getting them implemented through leadership and management. We discussed the role of the board and its structure and what is desired to support autonomy. For academic governance, we discussed the main responsibilities of the senate and its possible structure.

Leadership in a university rests with many people; indeed, all faculty are expected to be leaders in their own right. However, the role of the chief executive, who may be called by titles such as vice chancellor, director, president, and so forth, is critical for the success of a research university. We discussed the various dimensions of the role of a chief executive in a research university and also some desirable characteristics the chief executive should possess. We then discussed the important issue of selection of the chief executive—who does the selection and appointment and how. It was pointed out that for maintaining autonomy and ensuring that the chief executive is answerable to the university, the appointment of the chief executive must be done by a university body such as the board. Policies and processes of IIIT-Delhi which support this were also discussed.

Finally, we briefly discussed management or administration in a university. It is often a large function in a university, and its main goal is to implement policies and decisions made by the governing bodies and leadership. A few guidelines on how services may be managed were also discussed. For various issues we also discussed the recommendations of the NEP.

REFERENCES

American Association of University Professors (AAUP). 1940. *Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure*. Washington, DC: AAUP.

Aghion, Philippe, Mathias Dewatripont, Caroline Hoxby, Andreu Mas-Colell, André Sapir, and Bas Jacobs, 2010, January. 'The Governance and Performance of Universities: Evidence from Europe and the US.' *Economic Policy* 25 (61): 7–59.

Altbach, Philip G. 2001. 'Academic Freedom: International Realities and Challenges.' *Higher Education* 41: 205–19.

Altbach, Philip G., ed. 2011. *Leadership for World-Class Universities: Challenges for Developing Countries*. New York NY: Routledge.

Birnbaum, Robert. 2004. 'The End of Shared Governance: Looking Ahead or Looking Back.' *New Directions for Higher Education* 2004 (127): 5–22.

Chandra, Pankaj. 2017. *Building Universities that Matter: Where are Indian Institutions Going Wrong?* Orient BlackSwan.

CUC. 2009, March. *Guide for Members of Higher Education Governing Bodies in the UK*. Committee of University Chairs.

Estermann, Thomas. 2015. 'University Autonomy in Europe.' *Higher Education Trends*, University Education, No. 3.

Estermann, Thomas, and Terhi Nokkala. 2009. *University Autonomy in Europe—Exploratory Study*. Brussels: European University Association.

Gayle, Dennis J., Bhoendradatt Tewarie, and A. Qunton White. 2003. *Governance in the Twenty-First-Century University—Approaches to Effective Leadership and Strategic Management*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report.

McNay, Ian. 1995. 'From the Collegial Academy to Corporate Enterprise: The Changing Cultures of Universities.' In *The Changing University*, edited by Tom Schuller. London: Society for Research into Higher Education.

Middlehurst, Robin. 2013, July. 'Changing Internal Governance: Are Leadership Roles and Management Structures in United Kingdom Universities Fit for the Future?' *Higher Education Quarterly* 67 (3): 275–94.

NEP. 2019. *Draft National Education Policy, 2019*. Government of India.

Pounder, James S. 2001. '"New leadership" and University Organizational Effectiveness: Exploring the Relationship.' *Leadership & Organizational Development Journal* 22 (6): 281–90.

Rowlands, Julie. 2017. *Academic Governance in the Contemporary University—Perspectives from Anglophone Nations*. Springer.

Shattock, Michael. 2013, July. 'University Governance, Leadership and Management in a Decade of Diversification and Uncertainty.' *Higher Education Quarterly* 67 (3): 217–33.

Stensaker, Bjorn, and Agnete Vabo. 2013, July. 'Re-inventing Shared Governance: Implications for Organizational Culture and Institutional Leadership.' *Higher Education Quarterly* 67 (3): 256–74.

Taylor, Mark. 2013, January. 'Shared Governance in the Modern University.' *Higher Education Quarterly* 67 (1): 80–94.

Trakman, L. 2008. 'Modelling University Governance.' *Higher Education Quarterly* 62 (1–2): 63–83.

Yielder, Jill, and Andrew Codling. 2004. 'Management and Leadership in the Contemporary University.' *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management* 26 (3): 315–28.