

Japan-UK HE Collaboration Programme Policy Forum

**'New Challenges for Higher Education Leaders and Policy Makers'
Tokyo, 7 June 2004**

Background to the Programme

The Japan-UK HE Collaboration Programme was set up in 2001 following a proposal by the then HE Minister and her Japanese counterpart at the G8 Ministry of Education meeting held in Japan in 2000. The principal partners of the project are:

on the UK side

- British Council,
- Department for Education and Skills (DfES),
- Higher Education Funding Council of England (HEFCE),
- Universities UK (UUK),
- Leadership Foundation for HE (LFHE)

And on the Japanese side:

- National Institute of Academic Degrees and University Evaluation (NIAD-UE),
- Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT),
- Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS)
- Centre for National University Finance and Management (CNUF)
- Japanese Association of National Universities (JANU).

The programme has assisted the Japanese in the run-up to the incorporation of their 89 national universities in April 2004 through a series of high level policy fora and workshops held both in the UK and Japan. 7 UK and 6 Japanese universities have been involved in a programme of "twinning". These have resulted in a series of publications about lessons learned at levels ranging from national policy to institutional and thematic case studies. The programme to date has covered HE governance and management, financial and HR management, quality assessment, university-industry links and university leadership.

The Policy Forum held in June 2004 in Japan was the fifth event in the HE collaboration programme comprising key note speeches and a panel discussion on the policymaking and leadership challenges facing both countries. An audience of 200 senior Japanese academics and policy makers attended. The following is a summary of key points made at the Forum.

Opening Remarks

Mr. Shigenori Yano, Deputy Ministry of Ministry of Education, Culture, Sport, Science and technology (MEXT).

- higher education important to foster the human resources needed to provide the vision and technology to take us forward in the 21st century
- workshop is opportune time to learn from UK experience as Japanese university presidents strive to accelerate change following incorporation.

Alan Curry, Director British Council Japan

- effective policy making and successful leadership have never been more important for universities as rapidly accelerating globalization and heightened expectations of all stakeholders lead to major changes
- delighted to take part in a programme of international collaboration and exchange, elements which have long been an essential element of the health of any nation's higher education system.

Keynote address I:

National University Reform and Presidents' Leadership

Mr. Motoyuki Ono, President of the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS):

Function and role of JSPS

- since incorporation, JSPS has more freedom to manage own programmes and support universities flexibly
- in 2004 budget increased to nearly 2000 billion yen (almost 1 billion pounds)
- main source of grants for university research
- JSPS, unlike the Research Councils, covers natural science, humanities and social sciences
- 80,000 grant proposals received each year – 17% social sciences, science and engineering 36%, and bioscience including medicine 45%.
- grants selected by peer review based on quality and quantity of proposals
- International collaboration is JSPS's No.1 priority.

JSPS Core-to-core Programme

- New core-to-core programme set up in 2003 to build international collaboration in cutting edge fields
- 12 programmes started, 5 with UK:-
 - o Kyoto/Cambridge molecular analysis particularly for cancer treatment
 - o National Institute for Basic Biology and The Wellcome Trust/Cancer Research Institute – functional genomics
 - o Tsukuba and Tokyo Universities – computational particle physics
 - o Tokyo and Strathclyde Universities – ultra intense laser science
 - o National Astronomical Observatory and Cambridge – virtual laboratory.

Other valuable cooperation with Sheffield and Brighton Universities and the Royal Society.

Exchange programmes set up between UK and Japan with cooperation of British Council.

21st Century Centres of Excellence (COE) Programme

- 250 centres of excellence created in Japanese universities each receiving 0.5 to 2.5 million pounds.
- programme is having impact on structural reform of Japanese universities
- COE in small as well as large universities, diversity and depth of research capacity is impressive
- submission of proposals by university presidents results in selection of world class projects.

Why did Japanese Universities need reforming?

- copious rules and regulations prevented universities from taking new initiatives and shielded them from competition
- faculty council decision-making by consensus delayed new initiatives
- new top down management structure now speeds up decision making
- each university now has to submit a clear 6-year plan to MEXT with objectives.

(Japan's national universities were incorporated on 1 April 2004 giving them greater autonomy.)

What are the advantages of university incorporation?

- more flexible curricula
- external evaluation will improve teaching standards
- performance-based benefits for faculty members
- easier to employ outside academics at all levels up to president
- closer links possible with private companies.

Incorporation increases responsibilities

- new systems of quality assurance needed as universities no longer fully overseen by governments
- NIAD-UE to take lead on assessing 6-year university plans, results of which will affect future funding allocations
- government grant levels to universities have been maintained
- in the future more should be invested in a limited number of world-class universities with emphasis upon certain important fields. This goes against the current desire for equal treatment for all universities and fields which breeds uniformity and mediocrity
- universities themselves need to exercise efficient management and work hard to find external sources of income
- universities must be transparent and reflect a wider range of public views in their programmes in order to gain the respect and trust of the public.

Universities need to exercise leadership in three directions:-

- towards the government: working and negotiating with government to present their plans, obtain increased block grants and research funds, and respond to assessments by external agencies
- towards society and the world: gaining support, building links and sharing research outcomes with industry and the public
- towards the university: showing leadership to the faculty council, grasping and directing university trends, allocating resources, coordinating the 3 new university boards (executive, administrative and academic), balancing top-down and bottom-up management, leading the university's administration department and communicating effectively to students.

10 qualities of an ideal university president:-

- kyoiku ryoku – strong educational abilities
- kenkyuu ryoku – strong research abilities
- handan ryoku – good judgement
- setsumei ryoku – accountability
- sekinin ryoku – sense of responsibility
- nintai ryoku – patience
- kikaku ryoku – planning skills
- chosei ryoku – coordinating skills
- shukin ryoku – fund-raising skills
- shiko ryoku – good sense of direction

No president achieves all qualities, minimum are: intelligence, boldness, courage, a positive attitude and a good sense of humour.

Keynote Address 2:

New Challenges for Higher Education Leaders and Policy Makers

Sir Howard Newby, Chief Executive, Higher Education Funding Council of England

Background to British HE System

- evolved over several centuries not centrally planned - diverse and complex
- current 2 million HE students
- 44% participation rate, government target is 50% by 2010
- high rates of graduation (84%) as in Japan
- 179 HE institutions in UK including non-degree awarding colleges
- while there are separate funding bodies for England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland there are nonetheless close relationships between these bodies
- £9 billion of £14.5 billion HE institution income in 2001-02 was from government grants. Proportion of government funding is declining and set to decline further.
- HEFCE funds 40% university budgets in England
- 0.8% government GDP spent on HE institutions, close to OECD average but higher percentage spent on funding students.

HEFCE

- UK universities are autonomous with private charitable corporation status
- government prevented by law from funding universities directly to protect them from undue interference
- government sets policy objectives and sets budget for Higher Education then passes money to HEFCE to distribute according to an accompanying letter of guidance
- HEFCE allocates 92% of funds according to a funding formula, retaining 8% for special projects
- the two thirds allocated for teaching purposes are distributed essentially on the basis of student enrolments for undergraduate courses
- the remaining one third allocated for research is distributed according to the results of periodic evaluations known as research assessment exercises (RAEs). These take place every five or six years and are intended to measure the quality of research outputs. Funding is selective and aims to fund the best quality research by international standards
- 75% of research funding goes to just 25% universities: in last RAE (2001) 62 universities received funding for having at least one department with international quality research
- HEFCE funds are passed to universities as block grant for senior university management to allocate according to their needs. Block grants are very effective in encouraging autonomy, enterprise and strategic planning in universities and colleges. Planning therefore takes place at individual university not national level.

Challenges and opportunities

- globalisation of research, teaching and student mobility mean universities must compete successfully on an international not national basis
- People are the main resource to remain competitive in global economy. Education at all levels will therefore be the driver for economic success in the new knowledge-based economy. Education is thus too important to be left to the academic community alone
- the role of universities has shifted from just research and teaching to include knowledge transfer to industry, public services and communities, social inclusion, regeneration of local and regional communities, and civil society
- a shift from university study for only one period to life-long learning means universities have to be much more flexible in their delivery
- research has doubled in the last decade and interest from industry and public sector has grown
- transferring knowledge to those who can use it in industry, public services and our communities has become key
- social inclusion: increasing student participation rates in universities and diversifying the backgrounds from which they come
- contribution to the regeneration of local and regional communities
- contribution to a civil society: inculcating civilizing values in students

Universities are not sufficiently funded to carry out above activities simultaneously. There is thus a need to formulate a policy which allows the system as a whole to meet all the above objectives and sustain diversity without each and every institution having to fulfil them.

Current research is the main discriminating variable amongst universities. However, not all universities have an equal focus on research. Challenge to define other incentives for excellence. UK has made start – not an altogether successful one - by offering recruitment incentives to recruit and retain students from non-traditional backgrounds.

Current challenges place a heavy emphasis on quality leadership, governance and management as universities seek to manage their resources in order to play to their relative strengths in a very competitive system.

Implications of recent government white paper on university funding:-

- contains very controversial legislation to increase tuition fees that nearly brought current government down
- universities will be able to charge up to £3000 per undergraduate student
- universities will set fees according to their position in the market place and what is sustainable. Different fees may be charged by different departments and even individual courses
- universities will opt for either a) market position and sell exclusivity or b) market share to create the growth necessity for economic stability. As a result brand management will be critical
- shift to students as consumers – in future student choice of courses will, to a large extent, determine future structure of our university system
- There are two major risks to this strategy a) some subjects and disciplines in the national interest may be undersubscribed b) universities may position themselves incorrectly and run into financial difficulties
- As universities increasingly derive income from students, its role may shift from funding body to strategic leader for the sector and public sector regulator.

In conclusion

- global demand for HE learning is expanding rapidly
- learners are going to be more in control of their education
- teaching and research must be excellent not just good
- both individual institutions and nations will need to identify their comparative advantages and then collaborate with each other to deliver range of functions HE institutions should offer
- not completely confident that current proposals for the future of HE in the UK are stable or sustainable over the long term.

Question and Answer Session

Q (Yoshida) What methods were used to set the increased student fees and how can this be explained to the public? Japanese universities find it difficult to change fees as they are constrained by past fees.

A (Newby) The increase only applied to undergraduate fees. In the UK all other fees are already deregulated. The rate set was a political decision. Even £3000 is well below the market rate.

The increase in fees is hugely controversial. Towards the end of the decade the maximum fee might be increased or removed altogether. It remains to be seen how universities will set the fee: for some, £3000 is low compared to market value; for others it is high: decisions about fees remain critical.

Q. Osaki (National Institute of Humanities) UK fees are a similar level to Japan's. If the top-up fee was set at one quarter of the educational cost, what is the significance of that figure? Secondly, will the regulations regarding student numbers stay the same?

A (Newby) £3000 is below market cost. New fees will introduce a quasi-market. Universities will need to be much more sophisticated in the way they price their courses and analyse their costs: they already have a much better understanding than previously.

As regards student numbers, the current government rhetoric is not to intervene when student numbers decline in e.g. mathematics, physics, chemistry, engineering and modern languages whilst they increase in e.g. business, health, sports and media studies. However, I think the government may intervene to sustain provision that is in the national or international interest but has low demand.

Q Kakazu (Ryukyu University) Is there any regional variation in the university participation rate and if so what action is taken to narrow the gap?

A (Newby) There are regional discrepancies. To move towards 50% participation we need to increase the number of students from poorer backgrounds. As students from poorer backgrounds more frequently live at home it is necessary to make provision available in parts of country where historically it has been lacking.

A (Ono) I think we should encourage the construction of universities in areas with few institutions. But we should also try to increase high-school participation rates, improve academic standards, and offer scholarships and grants to narrow the gap.

Q. Moriya (Chiba University). In the UK and Japan overall authority resides with the university president; in many American universities responsibility for education and research resides with the president or chancellor whilst operations and management resides with a separate CEO. What is your view of the US approach?

A (Newby) There are advantages of having one person retaining both roles. However given the sheer pressure of work UK universities are beginning to divide the role as increasingly the Vice-Chancellor must deal with a range of stakeholders. This split, I think, is likely to increase in the future.

A (Ono) When we considered incorporation in Japan we debated whether we should emphasise the university president's CEO-ship or his academic authority and competence. In private universities we found examples both of one person holding both roles and of cases where the CEO had too much authority. Traditionally, given universities research remit, the president has been from an academic background. This may change, but I believe a person with strong academic abilities should be the president of national universities.

Q. Yamamoto (Nagoya University) Industry is not a simple client of knowledge, but a partner [in its creation]. The entrepreneurial university challenges the Humboldtian idea of the altruistic [and abstract] pursuit of knowledge. What do you think?

A (Newby) I agree. In the modern world the Humboldt idea of the university is dead. The idea that universities existed separate from society and that professors discovered knowledge and then passed it in a linear way to the rest of society who turned it into some useful product is also dead. Knowledge transfer is an iterative process between universities and the rest of society (industry, public services and communities); knowledge transferred should be based on partnership and, as speed-to-market is one of major competitive forces, the iteration needs to take place as early as possible in the process of discovery.

Q (Watson – University of Brighton) In the case of Japan how can levels of public confidence and trust in the future development of universities be maintained at the same time as a more competitive, entrepreneurial spirit is engendered?

A (Ono) In the past the national universities were seen as part of government so it was not necessary to communicate. Now, however, under incorporation and the need to compete for the decreasing number of students as demography changes, each university will have to sell itself in each region and to redevelop and win the trust and faith of the people. I hope each university president will develop his/her leadership.

Q. Tien Sun (National University of Singapore) As we move from an elite system of higher education to a mass system of higher education, there are tensions and trade-offs, e.g. as student participation increases staff/student interactions suffer. How we manage these changes and student expectations is extremely important. Harvard and Stanford are talking about increasing staff.

A. (Newby) Over the last couple of years in the States there have been budgetary constraints and as a result huge fee increases. Parents and students thus analyse "Value for Money" more carefully – dissatisfaction exists where students are taught by assistants

in elite universities. UK institutions may suffer the same problems since income from the increased fees may go towards research. It is impossible for all universities concurrently to fulfil all activities equally well. In future therefore, a division of labour is needed. The question to be asked is how this is to be achieved.

A (Ono) With the new start in Japan it is important for the government to maintain their overall level of financial support to the universities and to maintain basic research. But within this we need to reward success.

Q What do you think about the current levels of funding, 0.8% of GDP in the UK and 0.5% in Japan?

A (Newby) The percentage of GDP is too low but for governments there is a tension between recognising that, on the one hand Higher Education is major driver of economic competitiveness in the new knowledge economy and that thus it needs investment, and, on the other hand, in order to be economically competitive governments need to reduce the percentage of GDP by going through the private sector. The question is whether current funding arrangements are sustainable: the UK may be living off past intellectual capital.

Q What do you think of the future system in Japan in which the government will distribute funds based on evaluation results?

A (Ono) Private universities have resources allocated through an association not MEXT. For public universities MEXT would like to judge how to allocate funding objectively after receiving the universities' 6-year plans.

Q Nakai (Nagoya Institute of Technology). System has changed to give presidents full authority by what criteria should universities' success be judged by?

A (Newby) Performance-related pay is inevitable for research but there are many questions over what mechanisms are appropriate and how selective one should be. One alternative is performance-related pay for attracting increased numbers of poor students. But performance pay may not be appropriate for teaching – intervention may be necessary but if funding is reduced for poor-performing departments, students will be penalised.

Additional fees only ring-fenced under this government, future governments could use these to substitute existing public funding for universities.

Final point on leadership: defining a mission for a university and communicating it to all stakeholders is a very important part of the modern university leader's job, as are governance and management. Leadership and management are not the same, but there is overlap.

**Presentation: The Leadership Foundation for Higher Education
Mr. Ewart Wooldridge, CEO, Leadership Foundation**

Vision and scope for the Leadership Foundation for higher education

- Vision: leadership, governance and management of UK HE institutions should be regarded as world class; the practice of excellent leadership should be valued by the Higher Education sector and the wider community
- research, learning, teaching and leadership are inextricably linked
- the Leadership Foundation covers all 170 HE institutions in UK
- scope includes management, governance and staff development
- The Leadership Foundation is small: it works in partnership with other organisations to deliver relevant courses
- it is primarily UK focussed but it also has a strong international dimension.

Insights into leadership and development of leaders

- leadership is distributive: stems not just from the top person but embedded in a number of people and distributed across whole organization. Leadership development includes both vice chancellors and staff at other levels.
- important leadership behaviours are:-
creation a vision and communicating it, inspiring others, energy to effect transformational change, setting a sense of direction, interpreting the external environment, encouraging challenge and modelling the values of your organisation, supporting others through change (servant leadership)
- tight/loose structure best for managing universities i.e. tight business-like processes around the institutional with ample space for learning and creativity
- it is best to work from current or most recent work experiences
- confidentiality is necessary for frank discussion
- development courses create networks of people who can exchange experiences powerfully both within and across sectors
- it is always necessary to recognise the power of diversity – roles, groups, gender, race
- in practice, the most effective leadership training occurs when an organisation is going through a major period of change.

Research on top public service managers showed best leaders

- can connect vision at top with the day-to-day delivery
- use information and communication very effectively
- support staff through change – understood change from staff's perspective
- were good project managers
- understood value of staff development

Results of recent research on perceptions of leaders as seen by UK university staff:-

- desirable qualities: clarity of vision, integrity, sound judgement, and effective relations with politicians and external partners.

- weaknesses: communication skills, inability to engage employees with a vision of their organization, not creating appropriate climate for change.

Four key questions when analysing leadership in an organisation:-

1. how is the leadership process viewed? Top-down or bottom-up? How seriously is it taken?
2. how is a leader identified and what is the selection process?
3. what esteem is attached to successful leadership in the organization?
4. who actually leads major change project? This reveals where leadership actually lies.

Initial work programme of the Leadership Foundation - Still in early stages

Five areas of work:-

1. Developing individual leaders:
 - the top management programme is designed for leaders one or two levels below vice-chancellor. So far a network of 80-90 programme graduates has been developed.
 - courses for managers further down their institutional hierarchies are intended to equip the next generation of leaders 5 – 7 years hence.
 - a mentoring programme links individual leaders with others at the same level in the private sector or in another university. A national mentoring scheme will be set up.
 - master classes in key skill areas at vice-chancellor level involve working with government, managing large capital projects, marketing, fundraising and performance development.
 - training for individuals in governance positions.
2. Developing institutions through working with groups is intended
 - to bring together groups from different institutions working on major change projects to exchange experiences within and across institutions
 - to create a network of fellows across UK institutions who are leading important change programmes
3. Creating communities of learning:
 - Leadership Foundation alumni,
 - professional associations e.g. Association of Heads of University Administration (registrars) and international networks.
4. Prioritising issues in research. Identified to date are the following:-
 - Improve understanding of context in which tomorrow's leaders are trained
 - career paths and selection processes
 - mapping types of leadership appropriate to different types of institutions
 - comparing the process of leadership development across different types of institutions
5. Championing leadership through identifying, writing up and disseminating good practice

Issues facing leaders in higher education in the UK

1. Expansion of higher education and widening participation
2. Increased competition – national and international:
3. University and business relationships
4. Changes in income streams and funding sources resulting from legislative changes
5. University linking at regional level and accountability within their local context
6. Management of human resources and the HE career
7. Techniques, strategies and skills for leading change
 - Skills for managing partnerships, alliances and mergers
 - Skills for managing flexible delivery through e-learning and Internet
 - Skills for managing equality and diversity
8. Working effectively with international partners
 - can good learning networks be created across national boundaries?
 - how can we benchmark comparative processes between leadership management in institutions in different countries?
 - what is the value of e-mentoring relationships?
 - how may we develop groups from different institutions in different countries

Q (Kitagawa from Hitotsubashi University) Do you encourage collaboration between different types of institutions?

A Yes. Collaboration from different types of institutions within the same sector particularly across sectors is very powerful.

Q. (Osaki) Could you clarify the role of the Leadership Foundation in brokering or commissioning courses?

A The Leadership Foundation will deliver some courses directly, e.g. the management programme, but it will commission partners to deliver other courses. A second and important role will be the research and development of courses to be delivered by others in some cases. A third role will be to identify where good leadership development opportunities exist – this is particularly important in the international context.

Panel Discussion

Panellists

Sir Howard Newby (Moderator)
Sir David Watson
Prof. Bob Boucher
Ewart Wooldridge
Nick Sanders

Chief Executive, HEFCE (moderator)
Vice-Chancellor, University of Brighton
Vice-Chancellor, University of Sheffield
CEO, Leadership Foundation
Higher Education Advisor, DfES

Dr. Hitoshi Osaki
(NIHU)

Director National Institute of the Humanities

Dr. Seizo Miyata

President, Tokyo University of Agriculture and
Technology (TUAT)

Dr. Shinichi Yuta
Takafumi Goda

Tsukuba University
Director, MEXT, Higher Education Bureau

Panellists' Comments

Panellist 1: Dr. Osaki: University presidents have very strong authority compared to other countries, therefore whether universities grow or not depends strongly on leader. "Objectives" may be more appropriate than "vision" for Japanese University presidents' leadership in Japan as objective formulation is core to university incorporation. In order for the government to supervise the universities objectives must be set. The formulation of objectives is first area in which leadership must be exercised and targets developed jointly. Format used by MEXT for planning covers the six-fold mission described by Howard Newby may not be appropriate given that these six require selection and prioritization. Universities should look beyond the six-year planning horizon.

Panellist 2: Dr. Miyata (Tokyo University of Agriculture and Technology (TUAT))

In the future within the university authority will probably be reduced without violating the law. TUAT has only two departments, agriculture and technology, so mission is clear. At the same time it aims to maintain and improve the environment. New initiatives in TUAT:-

- further strengthen the veterinary department
- a new university education centre
- new graduate school covering safety in manufacturing processes, consumer usage and product discard
- strengthening university social responsibility
- seeking more external funding
- public relations – important as TUAT often confused with Tokyo University of Agriculture.

Miyata's role as president:-

- setting specific initiatives (see above)
- gaining external funds from industry for cooperative research
- sell TUAT to MEXT
- enable TUAT employees to understand and share the vision
- patience to persuade university staff to agree and set up e.g. the specialized graduate school.

Panellist 3: Shinichi Yuta (Tsukuba University – formerly Tokyo Kyoiku University)

University characteristics:-

- leadership role of president and vice-president emphasised since university's inception
- physical education, medical science, arts, sports and 11 satellite affiliated schools within the university
- graduates and undergraduates managed independently.

Tsukuba mid-term plan:-

- improve the quality of education
- be very active in research
- contribute to society at large.

Issues relevant to the management of the university

- philosophically or conceptually speaking, autonomy and freedom of education and research activities needs to be consistent with the coordination and effective function of the different parts of the university so that they support coordinated decision making and leadership
- how to integrate administrators and faculty members to become mutually supportive? Through the leadership of the vice-chancellor
- how to train future university leaders

Panellist 4: Takafumi Goda (Higher Education Planning, MEXT)

- universities are for regional communities, the nation, the international community and for society. University leaders need to keep all of these in mind.
- University leaders should follow Wooldridge's servant model. University leaders should create the most staff-friendly environment possible - staff benefits must be enhanced regularly. Leaders should model values.
- leaders need to balance carefully interests of stakeholders, presidents and faculty members
- when setting objectives need to balance clarity with sufficient flexibility to accommodate change
- universities very diverse, objective setting at university level and college level different, president's instructions sometimes not followed at other levels
- a university association could evaluate university activities on a constant basis and report this to the public. Government and university associations should always provide support to the universities
- a leadership model should evolve – learn through comparison of leadership model in different countries.

Panellist 5: Nick Sanders (Senior Civil Servant for Higher Education, DfES).

- relationship between government and HE in UK much lighter than in Japan but DfES has clear priorities and sets much of agenda

- DfES will shrink by 30% in next 4 ½ years
- DfES believes autonomy for institutions best arrangement for delivering institutions which are responsive, flexible, drive their own agenda forward and compete in a tough world.
- leadership means both the vice-chancellor and all the senior management team in institutions – leadership is about change
- over last 10 – 15 years DfES has given autonomy to schools and further education colleges to allocate the budget and set staffing levels whilst building in a very public system of accountability – there is a bargain between autonomy and accountability
- using public funds for research is good value but for the tax payer institutes need to be able to publicly demonstrate that their money is well spent – this is leading to new relationships with everyone who pays for research
- role of universities in bringing about social justice means stepping beyond the boundaries of their traditional role including working within the community to reach 11 – 13 year olds.
- UK already recruits vice-chancellors from other countries – can be seen as a global business

In summary, universities are absolute central to future UK economy, they cannot hide from competition, and we must move forward or be overtaken – this is the greatest challenge for leadership.

Responses on earlier contributions:-

- possibly impatience a characteristic of leadership in the UK context rather than patience as mentioned by Ono
- from personal experience has learnt important of understanding own strengths and weaknesses and ensuring that latter are compensated for by other members of the team

Panellist 6: Prof. Robert Boucher (Vice-Chancellor, University of Sheffield)

- leadership is about getting things done through others who will need training to understand what they need to achieve and how
- need to take a positive view of training and lead from the top.
- staff training should pervade through the institution to all those in leadership positions include those in administrative and technical management positions
- Sheffield conducts in-depth departmental interviews every three years. Each department produces:-
 - o Mission and purpose statements
 - o Vision of where department will be in 5 – 10 years time
 - o Research, teaching and external engagement strategies coupled with financial delivery plans
 - o Risk analysis
 - o Competitor analysis

- bringing about change and effective management requires both the effective use of resources and the role of staff training and development in achieving good leadership and effective management.

Panellist 7: David Watson (Vice-Chancellor, University of Brighton)

Ten challenges facing both UK and Japanese university leaders

1. universities will have to manage both reductions and increases in funding as allocation of funding for specific objectives varies across institutions and over time
2. research funding should not only preserve current excellence but create the circumstances in which excellent work in new areas can develop in the future. For the UK the Japanese experience in which generic research schools are supported from the centre is interesting
3. meeting the challenge of growing the demand in HE from under-represented groups is not just a university problem; it requires training professionals from those groups to work in schools and communities
4. how much should universities play a remedial role in preparing students for HE study particularly where there is a downturn in demand
5. who pays for what in the context of the knowledge economy? How can industry and commerce work with the higher education system in a strategic fashion to develop pre-competitive research that both serves the industrial partner and contributes to knowledge and intellectual capital in the university
6. need to understand how proximity affects the industries and universities. For small and medium-size industries this is very important but not necessarily with large industries
7. need to understand the relationship between public and private sectors particularly in education where a number of new entrants are anticipated
8. how can the very important role of community development and regeneration be funded?
9. how can HE institutions maintain their reputation of being central to the economy and society in the 21st century as a generic operation when under pressure particularly from market forces
10. how serious are we about diversifying top university leaders from other non-academic backgrounds?

Question and Answer Session

Q: Keiji Takanashi (University of Fukui). Should we allocate all our funds through competition? If we did, there is a risk of eliminating long-term research. How have the 75% of universities who only received 25% of the research funding in the last RAE reacted?

A Goda Japan's mix of core and competitive funding is likely to continue with the latter expanding. The challenge is to allocate competitive funds effectively.

A. Newby: Universities in general do not welcome highly selective allocation of research funds. Research performance is improving but research funding is fixed. Selectivity does not imply a government policy of creating universities which are dedicated to teaching exclusively - all universities receive some research funding. It is occasionally remarked that some universities are overly focussed on research at the expense of teaching and therefore need to improve their teaching. Funding Councils and HEFCE need to ensure long-term research is still funded.

A Watson: There is a need to ensure that over-concentration of funding does not preclude new entrants into the system.

Q. Ohmori (Kumamoto University) Does Mr. Goda think Japanese universities should have their own strategy in addition to the 6-year plan submitted to Ministry? What should the relationship between the two be?

A. Goda: Universities need long-term strategies as well as the six-year mid-term plan. It is important to synchronise the two.

A. Newby: HEFCE decided it was sufficient to receive plans as evidence that strategic planning is taking place. No relation between university strategy and funding partly because a) it is difficult to evaluate effectively b) universities have sources of funding beyond HEFCE.

Q. Ohmori What are the consequences of department-level reviews?

A. Watson: Practice varies across the UK. The consequences are mainly very positive: investment requested for expansion usually produces returns after 12 – 18 months. Weaker plans are revised where market assumptions are unrealistic or different structures and processes are needed. Reviewers external to UK brought in as often have new perspective. This process mostly fixes weaker departments, occasional small weak departments with no future are closed.

Q. Amano (Centre for National University Finance and Management)

Are there any particular areas where UK universities need to improve their leadership? Where does the initiative for the Leadership Foundation come from and how is it funded?

A. Wooldridge: The Leadership Foundation works with universities as clients responding to their needs rather than identifying problems and intervening to fix them. Overall programmes reflect government priorities. Funding comes partly from UK funding councils and partly from revenue earning courses and programmes.

A. Newby: The Leadership Foundation was set up in recognition that historically there has been under funding in leadership and management training at all levels. It is a partnership with the organisations representing UK universities and HE colleges and is one way good practice can be spread without government interference in the autonomy of

universities. HEFCE occasionally intervenes to fix universities. It is not the Leadership Foundation's role.

A. Watson: The Leadership Foundation operates in a competitive market; it is not the compulsory provider for UK universities.

Q. Amano. How are we going to tackle leadership development in Japan? How does MEXT view the development of the Japanese Association of National Universities?

A. Goda: By appointing:-

- vice presidents and assistants who will grow into presidents.
- staff from outside the universities to support the presidential function.
CNUF and JANU can offer training for administrators and executive programmes respectively.

A. Miyata: There is a need for presidents to develop negotiating skills etc. In future JANU could offer training.

Q. Osaki In Japan in the past there was reluctance to offer training to top-level leaders. Where can we start with such senior people?

A. Wooldridge: It is necessary to ask very senior people in private to define their own needs. Top UK civil servants identified:-

- evaluation of very large capital projects
- managing the poor performance of very senior colleagues

It is important to equip leaders to deal with real issues – these change over time and are situation specific.