



GUNI SERIES ON THE SOCIAL COMMITMENT OF UNIVERSITIES

Higher Education in the World 6

Towards a Socially
Responsible University:
Balancing the Global with the Local

Higher Education in the World 6.
Towards a Socially Responsible University: Balancing the Global with the Local

© GUNi 2017

First edition
Girona, March 2017

ISBN: 978-84-617-5508-0

Coordination:
Global University Network for Innovation (GUNi)

Graphic Design:
Jordi Ribot - Nexa Impressions

Individual or collective authors are responsible for the choice and presentation of the facts, findings, interpretations, and conclusions expressed in their articles, which do not necessarily reflect the views of the GUNi Network or its secretariat, UNESCO, the United Nations University, the Catalan Association of Public Universities (ACUP), or other institutions that support this project.

The designations used and the presentation of the material in this publication do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on behalf of GUNi concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area, or of the authorities of such, or concerning the endorsement or acceptance of such opinions.

Team Involved in the Preparation of this Publication

EDITORIAL TEAM

Francesc Xavier Grau
John Goddard
Budd L. Hall
Ellen Hazelkorn
Rajesh Tandon

AUTHORS

Khairon Abbas (Tanzania)
Adrián Acosta (Mexico)
Santiago Acosta (Ecuador)
Eduardo Aponte (Puerto Rico)
Bjørn Asheim (Norway)
Rita Axelroth Hodges (USA)
Enric Banda (Spain)
Ahmed Bawa (South Africa)
Paul Benneworth (The Netherlands)
Alicia Betts (Spain)
Sanjay Bhushan (India)
John D. Brewer (United Kingdom)
Matthieu Calame (France)
Francisco Javier Carrillo (Mexico)
Martí Casadesús (Spain)
Maria Casado (Spain)
Marta Cayetano (Spain)
Garette Clark (USA)
Laura Corazza (Italy)
Axel Didriksson (Mexico)
Reena Dobson (Australia)
Christopher Duke (Australia)
Peter D. Eckel (USA)
Eva Egron-Polak (Canada)
Cristina Escrigas (Spain)
Yan Fan (China)
Candelaria Ferrara (Argentina)
Emmanuel Jean François (USA)
Chad Gaffield (Canada)
Nadja Gmelch (Spain)
John Goddard (United Kingdom)
Francesc Xavier Grau (Spain)
Budd L. Hall (Canada)

Ira Harkavy (USA)
Matthew Hartley (USA)
Ellen Hazelkorn (United Kingdom)
Arab Hoballah (Lebanon)
Anna James (South Africa)
Barbara Ibrahim (Egypt)
Jouni Kekäle (Finland)
Denise Kirkpatrick (Australia)
Juan-Luis Klein (Canada)
Elizabeth Larrea (Ecuador)
Betty Leask (USA)
Itziar de Lecuona (Spain)
Denise Leite (Brazil)
Walter Lepore (Argentina)
Vincent Lomotey (Ghana)
Jack Makau (Kenya)
Jorge M. Martínez (Spain)
Federico Mayor Zaragoza (Spain)
Francisco Michavila (Spain)
Mircea Miclea (Romania)
Anand Mohan (India)
Carlos Iván Moreno (Mexico)
Josep Joan Moreso (Spain)
Claudia Neubauer (Germany)
Peter A. Okebukola (Nigeria)
Luis Enrique Orozco (Colombia)
Sheela Patel (India)
Andrew Petter (Canada)
Nelson Piedra (Ecuador)
Nandita Pradhan Bhatt (India)
Jaana Puukka (Finland)
Sally Randles (United Kingdom)
Dzulkifli Abdul Razak (Malaysia)
Liam Roberts (United Kingdom)
Núria Saladié (Spain)
Jamil Salmi (Morocco)
Katya Salmi (Morocco)
Wafa Singh (India)
Morshidi Sirat (Malaysia)
Juan Pablo Suárez (Ecuador)
Sharifah Hapsah Syed Hasan Shahabudin (Malaysia)

Alfred Tan (Hong Kong)
Rajesh Tandon (India)
Nieves Tapia (Argentina)
Crystal Tremblay (Canada)
Stevie Upton (United Kingdom)
Raúl Valdés (Mexico)
Josep M. Vilalta (Spain)
Shirley Walters (South Africa)
Chang Da Wan (Malaysia)
Joann Weeks (USA)
Hans de Wit (USA)
David Wolff (United Kingdom)

GUNi President

Sergi Bonet (UdG rector)

GUNi Non-Executive Director

Francesc Xavier Grau

GUNi Executive Director

Josep M. Vilalta

GUNi SECRETARIAT

Josep M. Vilalta
Alicia Betts
Marta Cayetano
Àngels Cortina
Cristina Escrigas
Joan Esculies
Nadja Gmelch
Mariona Miret
Nia Solé

FOUNDING INSTITUTIONS

UNESCO

United Nations University (UNU)
Associació Catalana d'Universitats
Públiques (ACUP)

List of Abbreviations Used in this Publication

- AAU** - Addis Ababa University
- AAU** - American Association of Universities
- AAU** - Association of African Universities
- ACE** - American Council on Education
- ACPC** - Africa Climate Policy Centre
- ACU** - Association of Commonwealth Universities
- ACUP** - Catalan Association of Public Universities
- AECID** - Spanish Agency for International Development Cooperation
- AHEAD** - Alliance for Higher Education and Democracy
- AHRC** - Arts and Humanities Research Council
- AIU** - Albukhary International University
- APEX** - Accelerated Programme for Excellence
- APHERP** - Asia Pacific Higher Education Research Partnership
- ApS(U)** - Spanish Service-Learning University Network
- APUCEN** - Asia-Pacific University-Community Engagement Network
- AQRM** - African Quality Rating Mechanism
- AQU** - Catalan University Quality Assurance Agency
- AR** - Augmented Reality
- ASU** - Arizona State University
- ASUU** - Academic Staff Union of Universities
- AUCC** - Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada
- BEPA** - Board of European Policy Advisors
- BMVSS** - Bhagwan Mahaveer Viklang Sahayata Samiti
- BSU** - Building Stronger Universities in Developing Countries
- CAAT** - Campaign Against the Arms Trade
- CAWR** - Centre for Agroecology, Water and Resilience
- CBR** - Community-Based Research
- CBUB** - Bioethics and Law Observatory at the University of Barcelona
- CCCB** - Barcelona's Contemporary Culture Centre
- CCPH** - Community-Campus Partnerships for Health
- CES** - Centre for Social Studies
- CGHE** - Centre for Global Higher Education
- CIHE** - Center for International Higher Education
- CIQG** - CHEA International Quality Group
- CIRCLE** - Centre for Innovation, Research and Competence in the Learning Economy
- CIRSFID** - Interdepartmental Research Centre in Legal History, Legal, Philosophy and Sociology and Computer Science and Law
- CISC** - Ibero-American Community for Knowledge Systems
- CKS** - Center for Knowledge Systems
- CLAYSS** - Latin American Centre for Service Learning
- CNPq-UFRGS** - Research Study Group Innovation and Evaluation
- COEP** - Committee of Public Entities in the Struggle against Hunger and for a Full Life
- CONACES** - National Commission for Quality Assurance in Higher Education
- CONACYT** - National Council of Science and Technology
- CoP** - Community of Practice
- CORD** - Centre for Organization Research and Design
- CPD** - Continuing Professional Development
- CRISES** - Centre for Research on Social Innovation
- CRUE** - Spanish University Rectors' Conference
- CSIRO** - Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation
- CSO** - Civil Society Organizations
- CSPO** - Consortium for Science, Policy and Outcomes
- CSR** - Corporate Social Responsibility
- CTEF** - Commonwealth Tertiary Education Facility
- CuCeA** - University Centre for Economic and Administrative Sciences
- CUE** - Community-University Engagement
- CUPP** - Community-University Partnership Programme
- DCE** - Department of Continuing Education
- DESD** - Decade of Education for Sustainable Development
- DRUSSA** - Development Research Uptake in Sub-Saharan Africa
- DTIE** - Division of Technology, Industry and Economics
- EAIR** - European Higher Education Society
- ECIU** - European Consortium of Innovative Universities
- ECOWAS** - Economic Community of West African States
- ECTS** - European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System
- EHEA** - European Higher Education Area
- EIT** - European Institute of Innovation and Technology
- ELRU** - European League of Research Universities
- EnRRICH** - Enhancing Responsible Research and Innovation through Curricula in Higher Education
- EPSRC** - Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council
- ERCEG** - European Research Council Expert Group
- ERIC** - Evaluating Research in Context
- ESD** - Education for Sustainable Development
- ESIF** - European Structural and Investment Funding

E3M - University Third Mission
ETHZ - Federal Institute of Technology in Zurich
FIU - Florida International University
FLACSO - Latin American Social Sciences Institute
GITASP - Research Group on Innovation in Productive Systems
GKBDN - Global Knowledge-Based Development Network
GPS - Global Positioning System
GREP - Research Group in Power Electronics
GRF - General Research Fund
GSSL - Global Survey on Sustainable Lifestyles
GUNI - Global University Network for Innovation
GUPES - Global Universities Partnership on Environment and Sustainability
GWS - Greater Western Sydney
HDI - Human Development Index
HE - Higher Education
HEA - Higher Education Authority
HEBCIS - Higher Education and Business and the Community Interaction Survey
HEFCE - Higher Education Funding Council for England
HEIF - Higher Education Innovation Fund
HEIRRI - Higher Education Institutions and Responsible Research and Innovation
HEIs - Higher Education Institutions
HEIW - Higher Education in the World
HEPRU - Higher Education Policy Research Unit
HKBU - Hong Kong Baptist University
IARSCLE - International Association of Research on Service-Learning and Community Engagement
IAU - International Association of Universities
IAU-MCO - International Association of Universities and the Magna Charta Observatory
ICI - Institute of Science
ICO - Instituto del Conurbano
ICPHR - International Collaboration for Participatory Health Research
ICREA - Catalan Institution for Research and Advanced Studies
IDEI - Industrial Economics Institute
IDPs - Internally-Displaced Persons
IHD - Institute of Human Development
IISUE - UNAM - Institute for University and Education Research, of the National and Autonomous University of Mexico
IMHE - Institutional Management in Higher Education
IPPTN - National Higher Education Research Institute
ISCN - International Sustainable Campus Network
IUPUI - Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis
FE - Further Education
GDP - Gross Domestic Product
GMO - Genetically Modified Organisms
GNLC - UNESCO Global Network of Learning Cities
HUD - US Department of Housing and Urban Development
IAU - International Association of Universities
ICLC - International Conference on Learning Cities
IICED - International Institute for Creative Entrepreneurial Development
IIEDG - The Catalan Inter-University Women and Gender Studies Institute
IPPTN - National Higher Education Research Institute
INCREA - Innovation, Creativity and Learning
INP - Toulouse - Institut National Polytechnique de Toulouse
IT - Information Technology
KBD - Knowledge-Based Development
KCWS - Knowledge Cities World Summit
KIP - Key Intangible Performance
KISIP - Kenya Informal Settlements Infrastructure Program
KM - Knowledge Management
KNUST - Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology
KPIs - Key Performance Indicators
KT - Knowledge Transfer
KTO - Knowledge Transfer Office
KTPSD - Knowledge Transfer Partnership Seed Fund
LEAP - Liberal Education and America's Promise
LERU - League of European Research Universities
LKN - Living Knowledge Network
LMS - Learning Management Systems
MAKCi - Most Admired Knowledge Cities Awards
MCO - Magna Charta Observatory
MDGs - Millennium Development Goals
MEI - Mondragon International Education
MESA - Mainstreaming Environment and Sustainability in Africa
MIT - Massachusetts Institute of Technology
MOOCs - Massive Open Online Courses
MSE - Multi-Stakeholder Engagement
MS2E - Microbial Systems Ecology and Evolution
NANS - National Association of Nigerian Students
NASA - National Aeronautics and Space Administration
NAU - New American University
NBM - Normative Business Model
NCCPE - National Co-ordinating Centre for Public Engagement

- NGO** - Non-Governmental Organization
- NSDF** - National Slum-Dwellers Federation
- NUS** - National Union of Students
- NWO** - Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research
- NYLC** - National Youth Leadership Council
- OBD** - Bioethics and Law Observatory
- PAQAF** - Pan-African Quality Assurance and Accreditation Framework
- PD** - Peritoneal Dialysis
- Penn-AHEAD** - University of Pennsylvania's Graduate School of Education
- PIMA** - Pascal International Member Association
- PRIA** - Society for Participatory Research in India
- P2P** - Peer-to-Peer
- R&D** - Research and Development
- RAE** - Research Assessment Exercise
- RBPC** - Podocarpus Biosphere Reserve - The Condor
- RIBAS** - Iberian-American Service-Learning Network
- RRI** - Responsible Research and Innovation
- SAHECEF** - South African Higher Education Community Engagement Forum
- SAQA** - South African Qualifications Authority
- SARUA** - Southern African Regional Association of Universities
- SCP** - Sustainable Consumption and Production
- SCS-UPF** - Science, Communication and Society Studies Centre at Universitat Pompeu Fabra
- SDGs** - Sustainable Development Goals
- SDI** - Slum Dwellers International
- SFU** - Simon Fraser University
- SIAMPI** - Social Impact Assessment Methods for research and funding instruments through the study of Productive Interactions
- SLCI** - Sustainable Lifestyles, Cities and Industry
- SLUSH** - Student-Led Entrepreneurship
- SMEs** - Small and Medium-sized Enterprises
- SMILE** - Shanghai Municipal Institute for Lifelong Education
- SMS** - Short Message Service
- SPARC** - Society for the Promotion of Area Resource Centers
- SSHRC** - Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada
- STELLA** - Student Empowerment through Language, Literacy and Arithmetic
- TELS** - Transnational Education and Learning Society
- THE** - Times Higher Education
- TIESS** - Territoires innovants en économie sociale et solidaire
- TQM** - Total Quality Management
- TSEP** - The Student Engagement Partnership
- UAB** - Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona
- UB** - Universitat de Barcelona
- UCL** - University College of London
- UCLA** - University of California, Los Angeles
- UdG** - Universitat de Girona
- UEF** - University of Eastern Finland
- UFRGS** - Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul
- UIL** - UNESCO Institute for Lifelong Learning
- UKM** - Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia
- UN** - United Nations
- UNDP** - United Nations Development Programme
- UNECA** - United Nations Economic Commission for Africa
- UNEMAT** - Mato Grosso State University
- UNEP** - United Nations Environment Programme
- UNESCO** - United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
- UNICEF** - United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund
- UniTo** - University of Turin
- UNITWIN** - University Twinning and Networking Programme
- UNU** - United Nations University
- UNU-INRA** - United Nations University Institute for Natural Resources in Africa
- UNU - WIDER** - United Nations University World Institute for Development Economics Research
- UPC** - Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya-Barcelona Tech
- UPF** - Universitat Pompeu Fabra
- UPM** - Universidad Politécnica de Madrid
- URV** - Universitat Rovira i Virgili
- US** - United States
- USIM** - Islamic Science University Malaysia
- USM** - Universiti Sains Malaysia
- UTPL** - Universidad Técnica Particular de Loja
- UWC** - University of the Western Cape
- VINNOVA** - The Swedish National Governmental Agency for Innovation System
- WCHE** - World Conference on Higher Education
- WCI** - World Capital Institute

4

Institutional Governance, Organization and Management

4.1. Institutional Governance for a Shared Glocal Engagement Mission

Peter D. Eckel

Abstract

Governing bodies can and should play essential roles in advancing a glocal agenda. Governance is essential because glocal work is strategic, includes an accountability dimension and relies on the talents and perspectives governance participants can bring to the university. Boards should leverage their traditional oversight and accountability functions and their strategic work. However, to be most useful in this work, boards should also add a leadership function, in which they make sense of a dynamic environment and raise key issues for the university to address.

A good governance structure and favourable regulatory conditions can promote innovative behaviour among tertiary education institutions.

The World Bank SABER Governance Report.

Too many college [and university] boards add too little value too much of the time.

Richard Chait, Trusteeship

Yes, governance is exceedingly important to universities around the world now and into the future as the first quotation suggests. Yet, as the second demonstrates, it is exceedingly difficult to do well and do well consistently. The challenges and opportunities of the glocal context only seek to exasperate these two points. This

chapter explores the need for increasingly effective governance as essential to actualize glocal universities and offers insights for those governing universities as to how to move forward. This chapter outlines the need for increased and different governance capacity. It offers strategies to ensure a glocal focus in governance, provides a three-dimensional framework for glocal governance, and offers a checklist to ensure governance effectiveness. The ability to address global issues such as health, security, human rights and climate change, while also addressing local needs such as workforce and economic development, citizenship, tech transfer and innovation will tax university governing bodies unprepared for the challenges. **If they are not intentional about governing the glocal university well, which includes putting the right processes and structures in place but also adopting the necessary mind-set and perspective, governing bodies will fall short of their responsibilities and risk becoming a burden rather than a strategic asset for their universities.**

“If they are not intentional about governing the glocal university well, which includes putting the right processes and structures in place but also adopting the necessary mindset and perspective, governing bodies will fall short of their responsibilities and risk becoming a burden, rather than a strategic asset for their universities.

Writing about university governance in a global context is challenging because of the variance in governance structures and scope of authority and because the policy contexts in which governing occurs differ. To find common ground within this diversity, governance is defined as the structures and patterns of interaction through which key stakeholders make strategy-level decisions that affect the future trajectory of the university. It adopts a future emphasis and addresses strategy-level decisions to differentiate it from management. Furthermore, this chapter focuses specifically on governing boards, which also vary in their composition, structure and scope of responsibilities as well as their relationship with government and with university administration.

Why governance matters more in a glocal context

The demands facing universities around the world are too great and the issues too complex for ineffective governance (Association of Governing Boards, 2014; Fielden, 2008; Shattock, 2013). One of the pillars of world class universities is having ‘appropriate governance’ (Salmi, 2009: 27). However, effective governance does not come without appropriate intentionality. Systems in both established and developing governance contexts fall short. For instance, even exclusive of the complexities of a glocal agenda, a survey of American university presidents found that one in five individuals leading research universities – those types of institutions arguably advancing both local and global agendas that include teaching, research, and economic development, tech transfer and other types of service – lack confidence in their board’s effectiveness to address future challenges over the next five years (Eckel, 2013). The sentiment is echoed in a recent survey of Malaysian vice chancellors (Ministry of Higher Education, 2015). Forty-six percent reported that “not all board members are clear on their roles” and 76 percent noted that the “current board composition is not optimal”.

To risk vast over simplification, universities are facing three challenges that call for increasingly effective governance and which come into sharper relief in the glocal context:

1. **Universities will need to do new things and embark on new pursuits.** The world is not stagnant and universities must understand, shape and respond to evolving challenges in the myriad contexts in which they operate to remain viable civic institutions.¹ Governance plays an important role in bridging to the external environment, particularly for those governing bodies that have external stakeholders serving in governing roles (Aghion et al., 2008). It is also the arena in which stakeholders come together to make decisions about future institutional or system direction.
2. **Because universities tend not to have sufficient financial resources to pursue everything they would like to, they need to make choices among competing priorities.** Governance is the structure where institutions make choices. “Good governance requires institutional leaders to be attentive to the mission of the institution. Without a clear mission, institutions often fall into the trap of trying to be all things to all people” (Harkavy et al., 2014: 103). Governance determines mission and sets priorities and strategy within that mission.
3. **Universities need to be increasingly accountable for their actions and impact.** When governments provide universities with more autonomy, as is the case in many countries, there is a corresponding shift in accountability.

While these three charges are not new, they are likely to continue to evolve, often exponentially, along two dimensions: complexity and speed. The result is more pressure to get governance right (Association of Governing Boards, 2014, Ministry of Higher Education Malaysia, 2015) and do so within more consequential time constraints.

To complicate matters further, the environments in which universities must operate are changing rapidly, and the variance in policy context calls for different responses to a glocal governance agenda. For instance, those universities in countries with a strong market-orientation and low state control (Dobbins et al., 2011), such as the USA, the UK, Canada and Australia, will require continued governance capacities to successfully balance market forces with increasingly complex public policy and mission-serving objectives that may be at odds with them (Berdahl, 1971; McGuinness, 1997). The pull of the market may suggest one set of priorities and pursuits while those of public policy or mission may suggest another (Marginson and Considine, 2000; Morphey and Eckel, 2009). For example, universities may be driven to invest in yet another Executive MBA programme in the pursuit of revenue and cut back funding for teacher education or music that requires subsidy. Countries with historically more state-centred higher education systems, such as India (Ministry of Human Resource Development, 2013), Kazakhstan (Hartley et al., 2015) and Malaysia (Ministry of Education, 2015), are advancing autonomy agendas that require new and heightened capacities for self-governance. Less direct governmental control and intervention, including financial support, mean more responsibilities

¹ Some will argue with this point, seeing that universities also serve an important conserving function, which they do. However, they also need to be responsive to evolving needs, new fields and disciplines, cutting edge research and social and economic development.

for universities and their governance bodies. Compliance with ministerial policy is no longer the gold standard, but financial success and mission relevance are the twin indicators of university wellbeing. These universities most likely need to develop their governance capacity within a complex glocal context where little robust governance capacity existed before (Hartley et al., 2015).

The importance of governance is increasing and it is evolving at the same time that 1) universities are changing, and 2) the environments in which they operate are shifting. These threads create a dynamic situation calling for more intentional and effective governance.

Without intentional focus on the needed governance, universities will likely struggle to meet the demands of both local and global challenges. Too many governance bodies are ‘mired in mediocrity’ and do not focus on substantive issues, do not have the ability to tap the intellectual capacity of board members, do not put in place a culture of collegiality and effective discussion and decision making, and do not work to intentionally improve their own governing processes (Trower and Eckel, 2015). Such middling performance will be a detriment to universities in a glocal context. As heightened demands outstrip the current capacity of most governance bodies, higher education will need to improve governing bodies that intentionally evolve to add value. They must ask themselves hard questions about their priorities, structures and cultures (AGB, 2014; Chait, 2016).

Ensuring a glocal focus

The starting point to governing the glocal university is to understand the multiple roles of governance and then to be familiar with how those roles function in a glocal context. **Governance has traditionally been seen as having two functions – ensuring accountability and providing institutional strategy, or conformance and performance roles** (Cornforth 2003, as cited in de Boer et al., 2010). In the first function, governance focuses on the evaluation of efforts and often public (or governmental) reporting. Governance pursues questions related to how well the university is conforming to its mission and purpose. The second strand of work focuses on the forward-vision, strategic work of boards to advance the university.

However, governance in a glocal context may well need to step into a third role. Chait, Ryan and Taylor (2005) argue that boards should provide leadership, or what they call ‘generative work’. The *leadership* work of boards brings diverse governing board member knowledge and wisdom to the challenges and opportunities facing the university to provide overall leadership in conjunction with the CEO for the long-term future of the university. Trustees contribute their abilities to think, perceive and frame issues and understanding to the collective work of the board to help the university think wisely about its future.

The leadership/generative work of governance is about “perceiving, grasping and grappling” (Trower, 2013: 18) collectively on behalf of the university in partnership with the administration and academic staff. This work asks governing bodies to look into the future and the unknown, to spend time not approving policies or ensuring compliance and progress, but “being playful and inventive,” and “focusing on higher-order problems” (Ibid: 134). In this line of governance work the board “generates: 1) insight

and understanding about a question, problem, challenge, opportunity or the environment; and 2) a sense of the organization’s identity in order to most effectively respond... It is about how the organization or board wishes to frame – consider, examine – an issue”. (Trower, 2013: 12).

The likely complexity of a global agenda demands this type of work because it is fast-moving, ambiguous and full of contradictory signals and priorities. In this role, boards should look for clues and cues in the environment that will be important to the university, determine how to make sense of what they see, determine what ‘frames’ will they use to define and understand the problem or opportunity (Chait, et al., 2005), and make collective sense, turning perception and speculation into action. Trower (2013: 12) cites the long-time head of research at General Motors, Charles Kettering, “a problem well-stated is a problem half-solved”.

Figure 1. Governance as leadership framework.



Boards will need to develop capacities that allow them to work across these three types of work. Trower has an extensive comparison (2013: 17-18). Brief highlights appear in Table 1.

Table 1. Comparing the different work of boards

	Accountability	Strategy	Leadership
Board’s role	Sentinel (oversight)	Strategist (foresight)	Sensemaker (insight)
Approaches to problems	Identify them	Solve them	Frame them
Meeting time	Report listening and evaluating	Deliberating	Exploring
CEO-board dynamics	Evaluative	Partnership	Think-tank

The work of boards is and should be complex. Boards need to understand and appreciate the diversity of their work across these three dimensions of accountability, strategy and leadership.

The challenge and opportunities of glocal governance provide ample opportunity to work across these three domains and place increased demands on the leadership aspect of governance. The table that follows outlines a set of glocal-related questions that boards should explore related to four functions of their work - *purpose*, *performance*, *resources* and *bridging to external communities*.

“The work of boards is and should be complex. Boards need to understand and appreciate the diversity of their work across the three dimensions of accountability, strategy and leadership.”

Table 2. A matrix of board responsibilities and governance modes²

	Accountability	Strategic	Leadership
Purpose	<p>Do we have sufficient priorities that focus on a local level and at a global level? To what extent do these activities align with our mission or extend it in new ways? Are our performance metrics for these efforts reasonable?</p> <p>Is there an appropriate balance between local efforts and global efforts?</p>	<p>Do potential new degree programmes make sense? What aims are they trying to serve? What types of education should we be emphasizing, given local demands and global trends? How will new degree programmes advantage us in the future?</p>	<p>How is the local environment changing and what new needs are emerging? How is the global environment changing? Can and should our university respond? What new parties or potential stakeholders should our university be engaging with?</p>
Performance	<p>What are key performance indicators for our local impact? Are they being met?</p> <p>What are our key performance indicators for the global impact? Are they being met?</p>	<p>Given our future directions, what local and global indicators now make sense? What indicators are no longer useful given how the context and our efforts have changed?</p>	<p>What is the most important work that the institution should be doing in the next 5 to 10 years locally? Globally? To what extent is the university organized to get there?</p> <p>What lessons might we learn from other sectors that are successfully working locally and globally?</p>

² Some of these questions are modified from Chait (2009), and Chait, Ryan and Taylor (2005) as well as from Trower (2013).

Resources	<p>Is the university's budget consistent with priorities? What share of our money is spent on local efforts? What share is spent on global efforts? Are these percentages what is needed? How did we do budgetarily this year?</p>	<p>What key investments can we make that will have desired returns to advance a local and a global agenda? What should the balance be between local and global efforts? Do we have the right academic staff to drive these priorities? What new physical space or technological investments might we need?</p>	<p>How robust is our business model? What are our model's current assumptions and how likely are they to be reliable in the future? What new opportunities are emerging locally and globally to potentially secure additional resources?</p>
Bridging	<p>How many new alliances did the university make and are they working as predicted? What is the evidence of local impact? Of global impact? As a board, how well did we help broker such relationships locally and globally?</p>	<p>What are the emerging sectors locally and globally? To what extent is their synergy between what is happening locally and globally? What new alliances and partnerships should the institution be pursuing?</p>	<p>What do we as a board need to learn? Where can we develop needed new insight?</p> <p>How is the global context changing? How is the local context changing? What are emerging points of synergy?</p>

A checklist for effective governance

The work of governing in a dynamic environment can be challenging. However, boards can and should make intentional efforts to be effective. A definition of effective governance by American university governance scholar Richard Chait can be extremely helpful in creating a checklist for those governing universities and those ensuring effective governance:

Effective governance entails influential participation in meaningful discussions about consequential matters that lead to significant outcomes (Chait, 2009: 2).

This simple statement, although complex in practice, has four elements that can serve as a template for boards to ensure their effectiveness. Furthermore, these four elements must work in tandem. Failure in any single dimension will lead to ineffective governance.

- » Influential participation: Does the board have on it the right people and to what extent are their skills, knowledge and talents being fully tapped? Too often boards are not composed of the right people for the job of governing. **In a glocal context, are board members well versed in global trends and issues as well as local ones? Do they have a firm understanding of trends in both of these contexts to do the work of governance?** Secondly, are these individuals prepared for the tasks of governing? Is there an orientation? Do clear expectations for board members exist and are they communicated to them?

- » Meaningful discussions: **Does the board have the knowledge and ability to engage in meaningful discussions about local as well as global issues?** Are board members well informed about the university's mission, values and history, as well as future challenges? Are they clear about the context – the global and local contexts – in which it must operate?
- » About consequential matters: **Does the board spend its time on substantive matters?** Too often board meetings are full of content that is not sufficiently substantive or consists of too many presentations without sufficient discussion. **To what extent is meeting time used well to focus on the most important issues (and not simply the urgent ones)? How intentionally are meeting agendas crafted to ensure that they have the right issues and are allocated appropriate amounts of time?** Is sufficient time spent on both global and local issues; on glocal ones?
- » That leads to significant institutional outcomes: **To what extent is the board confident that its work adds value to the university? To what extent does the work of the board matter? And how does the board know this?** Has it conducted an evaluation of its impact and of its meetings?

Building governance capacity

Boards many need to develop new structures or revise their current ones to accommodate glocal issues. For example, the University of Pennsylvania has the Local, National and Global Engagement Committee of the board, which is atypical in the USA (See Box). An alternative, and more common, strategy is to embed such work across board committees. For example, the Academic Affairs Committee addresses issues associated with teaching, learning, the curriculum, assessment and faculty. Whereas, new business opportunities might fall to the Committee of Commercialization and Economic Development, such as exists at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. At the University of La Verne in California, the board addresses issues of environmental sustainability across its committees. The Facilities Committee discusses the university's efforts on LEED certified buildings, water resources and electrical usage. The Academic and Student Affairs Committee learn about new and novel curricular issues related to teaching the science and practice of sustainability, and the Finance Committee discusses issues of sustainable financial investment as well as the ROI on various capital expenses.

“Boards may need to develop new structures or revise their current ones to accommodate glocal issues.

University of Pennsylvania Board of Trustees: Local, National, and Global Engagement Committee Charge

Building on and incorporating the work of the former External Affairs and Neighborhood Initiatives Committees, the Local, National, and Global Engagement Committee supports the university in its efforts to foster the university's presence, positive engagement and contributions at every level from our West Philadelphia neighborhoods to the global arena. Recognizing that international scholarly/academic initiatives are within the purview of the Academic Policy Committee, the Committee is concerned with how best to build on the university's extensive international network of alumni, students, parents, faculty and friends to promote and effectively communicate Penn as a global leader in education, research, public policy, service and environmental responsibility.

Conclusion: elevating purpose

This chapter has asked and answered many questions that are arguably essential to governance in a glocal context. **However, it has yet to address what might be the most important but often unasked question: For what purpose governance?**

The common refrain regarding most problems with governance is that the roles and responsibilities of governance participants – academic staff, administrators, trustees, the government – need to be clarified (American Association of University Professors, 1995; AGB, 2015). More clarity equates with better governance, goes the argument. An alternative view is that most problems arise not because governance participants do not know what to do, but because they do not find the work meaningful or engaging. Chait, Ryan and Taylor (2006) argue that purpose is what really matters to governance:

What if one of the central problems plaguing the board is not, in fact, uncertainty about its important roles and responsibilities, but rather a lack of compelling purpose in the first place? We maintain that many board members are ineffectual not just because they are confused about their role but because they are dissatisfied with their role. They do not do the job well because the job does not strike them as worth doing (Ibid, 15-16).

Nothing could be more challenging for university governance when the members do not believe their efforts matter. Purpose is essential for effective

“The question for boards in a glocal context is simply: For what purpose are we governing this university as the world is changing?”

governance. **The question for boards in a glocal context is simply: For what purpose are we governing this university as the world is changing?** Asking such a question in the boardroom should sharpen the focus and help boards craft their reason for governing. To do so in light of the university’s mission will be powerful.

As the environment changes and the demands on universities evolve in ways that require a local and a glocal focus and set of priorities, governing bodies will need to develop the mechanisms and skill to address this question and the ones it spurs, and then to put their answer into practice. This is no small task.

References

- Aghion, P., Dewatripont, M., et al. (2008) Higher aspirations: An agenda for reforming European universities. Bruegel Blueprint Series. Retrieved from <http://bruegel.org/wp-content/uploads/imported/publications/BPJULY2008University.pdf>
- Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (2014), *Consequential Boards: Adding Value Where It Matters Most*. Washington, DC: AGB.
- American Association of University Professors (1995) Policy documents and reports (8th ed.). Washington DC: American Association of University Professors.
- Berdahl, R. O. (1971) *Statewide Coordination of Higher Education*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Chait, R. (2016) *The bedrock of board culture*. *Trusteeship*, 20-24.
- Chait, R. (2009) Gremlins of governance. *Trusteeship*, 2-5.
- Chait, R. (2006) Why good boards go bad. *Trusteeship*, 1-4.
- Chait, R.P., Ryan, W.P. and Taylor, B.E. (2005) *Governance as Leadership: Reframing the Work of Nonprofit Boards*. Hoboken: Wiley.
- De Boer, H., Huisman, J. and Meister-Scheytt C. (2010) Supervision in 'modern' university governance: boards under scrutiny. *Studies in Higher Education*, 35(3), pp. 317-333.
- Dobbins, M., Knill, C. and Vogtle, E. M. (2011) An analytical framework for the cross-country comparison of higher education governance. *Higher Education*, 62, pp. 665-683.
- Eckel, P.D. (2013) What presidents really think about their boards. *Trusteeship*, 6-13.
- Eckel, P.D. and Morphew, C.C. (2009) Toward a clearer understanding of privatization. In: Morphew C.C. and Eckel, P. D. (eds.) *Privatizing the public university: Perspectives from across the academy*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, pp. 181-191.
- Fielden, J. (2008) *Global Trends in University Governance*. Education Working Paper Series, 9. Washington DC: The World Bank.
- Harkavy, I., Hartley, M., et al. (2014) Effective governance of a university as an anchor institution. *Leadership and Governance in Higher Education*, 2, pp. 97-116.
- Hartley, J. M., Gopaul, B., et al. (2015) Learning autonomy: Higher education reform in Kazakhstan. *Higher Education*, 1-13.
- Marginson, S. and Considine, M. (2000) *The enterprise university: Power, governance and reinvention in Australia*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- McGuiness, A. C. Jr. (1997) The functions and evolution of state coordination and governance in postsecondary education, *State Postsecondary Structures Sourcebook*. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.
- Ministry of Higher Education, Malaysia (2015) Enhancing University Board Governance. University Transformation Programme Green Book. Retrieved from <https://www.mohe.gov.my/en/muat-turun/awam/penerbitan/university-transformation-programme/7-the-unitp-green-book/file>
- Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India (2013) *Rashriya Uchcharat Shiksha Abhiyan: National Higher Education Mission*. Author. Retrieved from http://mhrd.gov.in/sites/upload_files/mhrd/files/upload_document/RUSA_final090913.pdf
- Salmi, J. (2009) *The challenge of establishing world-class universities*. Washington DC: The World Bank.
- Shattock, M. (2013) University governance, leadership and management in a decade of diversification and uncertainty, *Higher Education Quarterly*, 67 (3), 217-233.
- Trower, C. (2013) *The Practitioner's Guide to Governance as Leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Trower, C. And Eckel, P. (2016) Mired in mediocrity. *Inside Higher Education*. Retrieved from <https://www.insidehighered.com/views/2016/01/25/governing-boards-are-too-often-only-mediocre-their-performance-essay>
- World Bank (2012) SABER - Tertiary Education Governance: A Background Paper for the SABER Tertiary Education Domain. Washington DC. Retrieved from http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EDUCATION/Resources/278200-1290520949227/7575842-1338568982199/Background_paper_SABER_Tertiary_Governance_Sept2012.pdf