Politics in Institutions of Higher Learning: Issues & Challenges before Educational Leadership

Mokbul Ali Laskar
Assistant Regional Director (Academic), IGNOU Regional Centre, Kohima-797001, Nagaland.

Abstract

Open & Distance Learning (ODL) and flexible approach to learning have become integral to the higher learning system globally. Flexible approach to learning is demanded by gradually increasing numbers of learners as well by the business and corporate communities (which want to develop skill and knowledge bases of their working staffs from time to time). Because of developments in educational and communication technologies, many countries are now increasingly adopting ODL system. The UK Open University (UKOU), one of the old and pioneering ODL Universities, is today reckoned as one of the best Universities in Europe. In India, we already have one National Open University i.e. Indira Gandhi National Open University (IGNOU) and 13 State Open Universities (SOUs), and various other Distance/Continuing Education Institutes/Directorate/Depts., National Open Schooling, etc. As per recommendation of Central Advisory Board on Education (CABE), every State is supposed to have a SOU. At present, about 25% of the enrolment in higher education in India is with the ODL system; the target is 40% by the end of 11th Five Year Plan.

However, one of the most depressing features of the ODL system in India is the lack of student representative bodies. When we speak of student politics, it is almost absent in Indian ODL system. For the educational leadership, it is almost a non-issue. As such, various issues and policies that can adversely affect students' interests (such as various kinds of student fees, student support and welfare services, etc.) are decided by the administrative authorities without any concern and voice of the students. There is lack of any organized student protest and opposition. Students do not feel that they are part of the institution. Leaders are also perhaps happy to see that they are not facing any student protest and opposition; they are not aware of the fact that if the students no longer consider themselves as part of their institutions then higher education can have serious problem. Students' participation in the governance and functioning of the ODL institution is marked by pervasive passivity; there is lack of interest on the part of educational leaders to promote student civic and political activities. Student politics must be encouraged in the Institutions of Higher Learning.

Key words/Phrases : *Educatonal Leadership,Politics,Democracy & Societal Issues.*

Introduction

Universities are "frontiers of human knowledge". Universities and Institutions of Higher Learning (IHL) are central to the creation of a knowledge society. As enduring social institutions of our civilization, universities play vital role in promoting human capitals for societal growth and development. They are charged with responsibility of knowledge management in order to bring about a civilized nation.

Governance of public higher education institutions (HEIs) is increasingly becoming difficult, particularly because of increasing role of external political power. Public HEIs are faced with waves of student unrest concerning various issues that directly or indirectly affect them. Campus crimes and campus violence in IHL have risen sharply. IHL have become afflicted with various activities, which are particularly anti-political and worst in their very nature. Bad politics has damaged educational and learning environment in many reputed universities/IHL. Student and faculty politics have paralyzed proper functioning of many universities/IHL in India. Political violence, murder/killings, boycott of class/exam, protest demonstrations, strikes, criminalism and vandalism, etc. within campuses has serious repercussions on role of universities/IHL; urgently calling for strong educational leadership. However, educational leaders have failed to address campus political activities; and often seem ill-equipped to discharge responsibilities of managing political activities. They see student and faculty politics narrowly and have not yet realized the importance of the same. Despite increasing concern with phenomenal student unrest, there is no clear consensus among educational leadership as to direction of change we can anticipate with regard to politics in IHL.

Thus, educational leadership demands proper management of political activities. This paper looks into dynamics of politics within IHL. It looks into positive aspect of campus/student politics; and, in fact, argues for broader campus political activities and political infrastructure in IHL. It also examines issues and challenges before educational leadership and their role in managing politics and in promoting campus political and civic activities. Student politics and student political and civic activities are the major thrust area of the paper. However, politics/political activities involving faculty and staffs and politics of governance have also been covered. The study is largely analytical and descriptive and rests on normative and prescriptive propositions.

System of Higher Learning – Synoptic View

System of higher learning refers to post-secondary level of education. It includes college education, university education and autonomous/specialized/professional institutions of higher education and higher learning. Traditionally, cultivation of intellect and intellectual excellence were major goals for any higher learning system. Higher learning institutions were traditionally centres of higher learning. They were largely engaged in promotion and enhancement of human knowledge system; and were meant to provide a transformative experience for student by equipping them for life, not just for making a living. Learning was hardly influenced by economic and market forces. Institutions had autonomous spheres of their own; most of them were under control of private entities (particularly under patronage of religious institutions, trusts, etc.). Medieval university system in Europe, which formed basis of modern system of HEIs, had corporate autonomy of their own. Universities were organized collegiately, administered collectively, and operated by students themselves under the aegis of their corporate and juridical *universitas*[1] (Umunc, Himmet). Academic freedom and self-management of institutions were largely un-affected by external political forces. But gradually, governments and state machineries intruded into affairs of such institutions. Today, political authorities *de facto* control most public HEIs.

There are attempts to dismantling traditional university education, converting university campuses into vocational schools for skill development and professional competency. Major issue concerning HEIs today appears to be growing demands for highly qualified manpower and leadership requirement for the market economy. Higher education is increasingly placed under control of business-oriented councils to ensure that curriculum is linked to needs of employers. Colleges and universities are perceived – and perceive

themselves – as training grounds for corporate berths (Giroux, Henry A.). Higher education is now a tradable (service) commodity and many universities/IHL are actually engaged in business of importing and exporting higher education. Some countries, including the United Kingdom and Australia, have national policy to earn profits from higher education exports (Altbach, Philip G., 2008). USA has a strong private higher education sector, which has been most aggressive about overseas exports (Ibid.). Rather than being a transformative experience for students, the motto of today's higher learning is: "Learn more to earn more".

As modern IHL are giving more emphasis on market driven education system, developing nations are facing several dilemmas with regard to access and equity in higher education system. Access and equity have emerged as major political issues. Demand for higher education is dramatically outstripping capabilities of nation to expand access due to: already existing shortages of space in traditional colleges and universities; a growing young population; and limitation of resources, both financial and human (Hanna, Donald E., 2003). Therefore, in system of higher learning, we are experiencing increasing concurrence from new types of institutions (subsidiaries, distance learning, corporate universities, etc.). Various flexible modes of learning, including open and distance learning, have become integral to system of higher learning. There is an increased pressure to increase enrolment; and at the same time demand to provide educational services efficiently and effectively (with less resources; and, simultaneously cutting overhead cost!). Academic quality and program effectiveness are subordinated to issues of politics and economics. Rather than teaching, learning and research, access, equity and inclusiveness have become integral to missions and visions of HEIs. The emphasis is obviously on mass higher education. With gradual expansion of (public) higher education, universities/IHL have to perform a bewildering array of highly sophisticated services for diverse constituencies. This has led to emergence of large single institutions or multiple-institution university system with branches in remote and different locations. Many universities have their own separate campuses, which are either physically connected or separate from each other. There

is ramification of courses and programmes. University is now a multiversity ('city of infinite variety') (Kerr, Clark, 1963), which is marked by several contradictions: "autonomous and constrained, powerful and vulnerable, innovative at the margins yet conservative at the core, dedicated to education as it depreciates teaching, devoted to liberal arts and vocational, non-profit and commercial, and an 'aristocracy of intellect' in a populist society" (Pusser, B, 2002). Within system of higher learning, we see "….the evolution of the 'enterprise university'…. characterised by strong executive control….the emergence of a managerial culture which is said to be at odds with traditional academic values" (Considine, Damien, 2004). With increasing cost of teaching, learning and research, there is increasing pressure on IHL to collaborate with other institutions and with business; meaning increasing regulations by external actors. There is increasing competition among universities as well as between universities and other providers of knowledge, research and education. Universities interact not only with government and agencies on a national level; but also with regional and local governments, with enterprises and business organizations, future students, and the interested public (Bladh, Agneta Ch.). As universities become increasingly strapped for money, corporations are more than willing to provide needed resources; but with binding terms and conditions and, in fact, dictating the academe. Growing influence of corporate culture on university life has served to largely undermine the distinction between higher education and business (Giroux, Henry A.). Academics are now "academic entrepreneurs" and valued according to grant money they attract rather than quality of education they offer to students. As higher education is corporatized, young people find themselves on campuses that look more like malls and they are increasingly taught by professors who are hired on a contractual basis (Henry A. Giroux, 2006). Traditional courses are viewed as impractical and worthless. As such arts & humanities, social sciences, public health, public services, which are at the core of civilizational values, are being relegated to the corner.

Richard Hoftstadter argued that the best reason for supporting higher education "lies not in the services they perform…but in the values they represent" (Press,

Eval, & Jennifer Washburn, 2000). For Hoftstadter it was the values of justice, freedom, equality, and the rights of citizens as equal and free human beings that were at the heart of what it meant for higher education to fulfill its role in educating students for the demands of leadership, social citizenship, and democratic public life. Education does not exclude job preparation; it is more than job preparation; making a life involves more than making a living. Education is both a social and an economic issue.

In brief, increased societal demands have been placed on university/IHL and their concurrent use in national political maneuvering. Primary mission of contemporary universities/IHL appears to be training and education to meet vocational needs of students and human capital needs of society. This is a fact, which can not be altered in an economy driven by market forces. In such a situation, educational leader will necessarily have to ensure that the traditional meaning of higher learning – such as intellectual development and transformation of the mind of students – is made integral to missions of contemporary universities/IHL. Universities are more than vocational schools. As a social institution, the public university has to listen carefully to society, learning about and understanding its varied and ever-changing needs, expectations, and perceptions of higher education (Duderstadf, James J., 2001). Educational leaders will have to assist the evolution of a society of learning, in which opportunities for learning become ubiquitous and universal, permeating all aspects of our society and empowering through knowledge and education all of our citizens (Ibid.)

Politics in IHL

Politics is about organizing and governing societies. No society can be governed "apolitically" (Bergan, Sjur). According to Dwight D. Eisenhower (former US President), politics ought to be the part-time profession of every citizen who would protect the rights and privileges of free people and who would preserve what is good and fruitful. Although politics is a part of our every day life, it is exceedingly difficult to define *politics.* For T. J. Donahue, P is politics *if, and only if,* P is the activity of either (1) making, breaking, or preserving the general arrangements of a group's

affairs, or (2) trying to get a group to take a certain action when some group members oppose taking it, where one can use *any means* to pursue this activity, except violence against others. "General arrangements of a group G's affairs" are those arrangements of G's affairs about which almost every member of G has a strong reason to be concerned (Donahue, T. J., 2007). To make a general arrangement of a group's affairs is to (try to) create a new such arrangement. To break a general arrangement is to (try to) abolish it (such as slavery). To preserve an arrangement is to (try to) take care of that arrangement (such as by making the group members understand the rule and respect it by abiding it. It may be by way of telling goodness about the rule, publishing and popularizing it, campaigning for the rule, etc; doing all these means engaging in politics of preservation) (Ibid.).

If no one opposes when a group tries to take certain action, and the group takes it, then one has not engaged in politics (provided that the proposed action would neither make, break, nor preserve the general arrangements of the group's affairs). For the action to be called political, it has to face certain amount of opposition. Various means can be pursued to oppose and prevent a group taking a proposed action, such as organized protests and marches, to letter-writing campaigns, to speaking out in public against the proposed action, to bribing elected officials to omit taking the proposed action, to coercing the action's proponents to retract their proposal (Ibid.). However, politics can not include violence against others; no action can be an instance of politics if it is a case of such violence (ibid.). Manipulations and coercions can be a part of politics. Coercion to use violent means (such as threats of killing, murdering) can be politics as long as such means are really adopted. Preventing and curtailing violence is one of politics's chief tasks (Ibid.). Real politics, according to Ernesto Cortes, involves discourse, engagement, negotiation, and change. It is about "plurality" and thus key to "enlarged mentality" as people are forced to confront different world views and perspectives, understand others' interests which may be very different than their own (Boyte, Harry C., 2003).

Any modern organization, including IHL, is directly or indirectly linked to political economy. It is based on

allocation of scarce means/resources (such as money, power and authority) among competing ends (Hertz, 1958; Benson, 1975); such allocation is intended to maximize the attainment of the ends (Hertz, 1958). Organizations are tied with networks and may consist of a series of organizations linked with multiple, direct ties to each other or they may be characterized by a clustering or centering of linkages around one or a few mediating or controlling organizations (Benson, 1975). The inter-organizational network is again linked to a larger environment comprising of authorities, legislative bodies, bureaus, publics, etc. (Ibid.). External factors and environmental forces and conditions have important effects upon network relations (Ibid). The political economy of an organization is, thus, characterized by both internal polity and external polity. The success of an organization is dependent on how it manages the internal politics (political economy) and the external politics (political factors) surrounding it.

Politics in universities/IHL occurs at three levels: politics at governance level, involving governing boards or boards of management; faculty and staff politics; and student politics. Within these domains, there are other public political issues that often seem to affect political culture of universities/IHL such as: issues of gender equality, sexual harassment, sexuality (lesbian, gay, etc.), racial politics, national origin, casteism, discrimination, reservations, affirmative action, etc. There are internal politics arising out of inter-departmental conflicts and conflicts between academic and non-academic staffs. Besides, there is politics of curriculum – left-oriented curriculum and right-oriented curriculum, clash between the two; and the issue of re-writing text/curriculum.

Universities are, in fact, political entities and politics is a source of most public university existence toady (Lombardi, John V., Diane D. Craig, Elizabeth D., Capaldi, & Denise S Gater, 2002). State, on behalf of the people, creates institutions, provides significant portion of revenue, and regulates institutional behavior (Ibid). Public universities have to operate within a complex array of government regulations; and their leaders are frequently caught between opposing forces, between external pressures and internal campus politics,

between governing boards and faculty governance (and student politics). Governing boards or boards of management often view their primary responsibilities as being to various political constituencies rather than confined to university itself. They serve as mediating force between universities on one hand, and governments, markets, and societies on the other. The most unfortunate aspect is that external constituencies often do not understand the issue of academic quality (Waugh, Jr., William L, 1998).

With regard to faculty and staff politics, we must bear in mind that faculties in IHL are highly professional people. They are more faithful to their discipline – which make their reputation – than their institutions; and rarely want to follow directions from others. University teachers are still very powerful in university system with substantial autonomy in their practices – teaching and research. They are inclined to resist control and standards of administrations. In such a situation, university leadership has no option but letting the professional group gain control over the conditions under which they work (Scott, W. Richard, 1996:275). What is the most depressing is faculty collective bargaining and faculty unionization. The faculty in modern IHL has so encumbered itself with rules and regulations, committees and academic units, and ineffective faculty governance that the best faculty are frequently disenfranchised, out-shouted by their less productive colleagues who have time and inclination to play the game of campus politics (Duderstadf, James J., 2001). Conflicts between emerging managerial cultures and academic cultures are causing tension and distrust within faculties and administration. Decision processes are becoming more executive-controlled and less collegial. Managerial culture is encouraging deans and dept. chairpersons to restructure participation of faculties and other constituencies in academic planning and program development, as well as in other areas of traditional academic decision-making (undermining role of faculties in determining academic principles and requirements). Academics are being asked to meet the needs of more diverse student groups, to teach at more flexible times and locations, to master the use of information and communication technology in teaching, to design curricula around learning outcomes and

across disciplines, to teach in teams, to subject their teaching to evaluation and to develop and implement improvements, to monitor and respond to the evaluations made by students, to improve assessment and feedback, to meet employer needs, and to understand and use new theories of student learning – all demanding a greater call on the time of academics (Niekerk, Magdalena Maria van, 2005). There is growing dis-satisfaction within academics. While academics have been given more responsibilities, their participation in key academic decision-making is gradually being taken away. As a result, they have started to resort coercive politics, collective bargaining – knowing it very clearly that they are still more powerful in the system of higher learning because of their professional and academic achievements.

Coming to student politics, we must accept that students are important agents of political change. There are numerous instances, where student force challenged governments (and their policies) and toppled governments as well. Student politics had its own share of role to play towards institutionalizing democratic practices. It helps participation of students in elections to represent their fellow students' voices and concerns through leadership roles and negotiations with concerned authorities. It helps students in involving themselves in community, civic and political life. A highly involved student is one who 'devotes considerable energy to studying; spends much time on campus; participates actively in student organizations; and interacts frequently with faculty members and other students' (Astin, A., 1997). Students want to be consulted about their thoughts, opinions, and feelings on important public decisions and issues, especially those that affect them directly (Long, Sarah E., 2002). There is a growing activism of students; they demand for participation in decision-making processes that include issues concerning library, student welfare, curriculum, appointment of faculties, research activities/facilities, etc. Being comparatively older, university students have job, family, and other social responsibilities in addition to their role as students. They can assume many types of leadership role – institutional representatives, community leaders, and agents for effecting social changes and influencing national policies.

Various motivational factors encourage students to get involved both on and off campus and active leadership positions. To quote from a seminar report of 1960s on *Student Participation in University Bodies* (held at New Delhi), "A genuine student movement must be able to see….relationships and interdependence of social, political, economic and cultural factors both within and outside the university. A student movement which fails in this will be one-sided and will soon peter out or cease to be a movement. An exclusive or disproportionate stress either on the socio-political sphere or on the educational sphere will destroy the true revolutionary character of a student" (UNESCO, 1970). Students' participation not only equips students with policy-making skills, but also provides avenues for a meaningful and creative political civic learning. Student engagement in wider political activities and in university governance structures is an important aspect of institutional life (Bateson, Rositsa, & John Taylor, 2004).

As is evident in USA, Europe and elsewhere today, there is a widespread lack of interest in public affairs; ever-rising levels of political cynicism and consequent voter apathy; decline in political participation – not only in declining turnouts in elections, but in alternative methods of engaging political issues of the day; and a general deterioration in respect for the agents and agencies of government. There is crisis in national and democratic political standards. Continuing and steady decline in civic and political participation threatens long-term stability and health of cherished democratic institutions and traditions and is a matter of growing concern for most of the democratic countries (Plantan, Jr., Frank, 2002). Institute of Politics was founded in 1966 at Harvard University – to inspire undergraduates to public service and to bridge the gap between academe and politics. USA and Europe are now very much concerned about decline of democratic political standards within their countries and has already initiated a major project to promote universities as cites of citizenship and civic responsibility. They are looking for promoting democratic and political culture through university. To quote *Report of University as Cites for Citizenship and Civic Responsibility*, "Institutions of higher education are strategic institutions in democratic political development. Universities

can become key institutions for the transmission of democratic values through direct engagement in democratic activities, democratic education on campus. Students need to learn how democracy works – through participation in student organizations and university decision-making bodies". To quote it further, "It is our conviction that modern university is the key institutions in contemporary society for the formulation and transference of stabilizing and legitimizing societal values, the development of the next generation of political elites, and for political socialization in support of democratic values and processes".

Students are, however, still not provided sufficient opportunities to voice their social and political concerns in constructive and effective ways. In western countries, students have rather less time for politics and governance issues; as they are highly/ actively engaged in academic/research activities. Besides, student participation in university governance and in asserting or understanding their rights as students is characterized by a *pervasive passivity* bordering on indifference. Our culture is also generally unsympathetic to student political protest or activism. There are many cases of legal prohibitions on political activities within university system. Codes of conducts are being laid down by educational institutions to curb student political activities.

Use of regulations and disciplinary institutional devices by academic authorities to crack down on activist students and student politics have often become the rallying causes for further politicization of student bodies. In such a situation, we often tend to link cynicism, violence, murder, killings, criminalism, shootings, etc. (happening at campuses of many HEIs across the world) with politics. Such activities are in fact result of apolitical attitude shown by most educational institutions. Politics must be seen as a means of resolving/preventing violence by way of fostering political civic activities. It is worth quoting Donald W. Harward, who said, "Cynicism is not the opposite of civic engagement; indifference is. The promise of education is to foster an attitude of questioning, including the questioning of political authority and process….Our job, among colleges and universities, is to foster both the critical judgment and patterns of challenge that are required for education, and to broker the conditions that support students, and that amplify their voice, as they engage in serving and learning – enduring features of civic responsibility and political action in a democratic society" (Long, Sarah E., 2002). Today democratic development is the primary challenge of society, yet most institutions of higher education have remained trapped by their own inertia of traditional practices in administration, teaching, and research (Plantan, Jr., Frank, 2002). It is high time we recognize student participation in governance of educational institutions, which is itself an educative process that best prepares young peoples for the rights and responsibilities of membership in other social institutions and citizenship in the nation at large (UNESCO, 1970). Student political civic activities provide students with social support, personal development tools, and the power to be effective public change agents (Janc, Helen). HEIs provide not only an academic venue, but also an opportunity for civic benefits that lead to successful citizenship. There is a need to sustain students' interest in politics. Students should have clear expectations of HEIs; they should see themselves as a part of the institution. If students no longer consider themselves as a part of the institution and the academic community, higher education will have a very serious problem (Bergan, Sjur).

The Indian Scenario

Higher education has been a significant factor for growth and development of India. To quote National Knowledge Commission (NKC, 2006), "It is a source of dynamism for the economy. It has created social opportunities for people. It has fostered the vibrant democracy in our polity. It has provided a beginning for the creation of a knowledge society". India has about 350 universities and about 17,700 undergraduate colleges (Ibid). It has islands of excellence in professional education such as IITs, IIMs, and similar IHL in specialized areas. However, scenario of higher education is not rosy at all. It has several weaknesses that are a cause for serious concern – The proportion of our population, in age group 18-24, that enters the world of higher education is around 7 percent, which is only one-half the average for Asia

(Ibid.) and well bellow the rates in most middle income countries (Altbach, Philip G., 2008). Opportunities for higher education are simply not enough in relation to our needs. There is significant unmet demand for higher education access (Ibid.); and a huge unmet demand for high-quality higher education (Ibid.).

The current system of higher education is politicized and militates against producing general intellectual virtues (Kapu, Devesh, & Pratap Bhanu Mehta, 2004). The prevailing political ideological climate in which elite institutions are seen as being anti-democratic, finds its natural response in political control to influence admission policies, internal organization, the structure of courses and funding (Ibid). While private HEIs are mushrooming in India, public higher education system is increasingly being embroiled into bad politics. Autonomy of universities is eroded by interventions from governments and intrusions from political processes (NKC). Politicization has made governance of universities exceedingly difficult and much more susceptible to entirely non-academic interventions from outside (Ibid.). There is a whole lot of political interference in the name of equity and access. Real issue of educational infrastructure and educational facilities in terms of academic research, teaching and learning are missing in political agenda. Political issues involving reservation, casteism, affirmative actions, etc. are gradually eating away HEIs; creating divisions within students and faculties. Student unions are toady more in news for breaking rules, behaving like rowdies, indulging in *goondagiri* (vandalism) and murdering (Sitoula, Robin 2007). Public universities and colleges have strong presence of political student wings of all major political parties. Student organizations have links and co-functions with university administrations, with political parties, with labour unions, with governments. Student organizations are not only linked to a particular universities/IHL; but have their own national and regional organizational set ups. They are organizing or attending meetings outside the campus as well. "Much of "political" activity which we noticed and sensed on the campuses is of a degenerate nature which is a blot on the concept of *politics*. It is a "politics" of expediency, opportunism,…; doing it while even knowing that it is wrong. The price of the little gain for the doer may be a disruption of educational activities for all" (UGC, 1983). Ideology-based political activities of students have led to gross manipulation of young minds by self-serving political powers (Sitoula, Robin, 2007). It has led to growth of militant political activism (naxalism), which is now considered a major challenge to internal security. Faculty unionization has also become a major cause of concern for educational leaders as this has frequently led to faculty boycott of class, exams, etc.

It is of course obvious that student do not have legal/institutionalized rights to claim participation in various decision-making processes that affect them. Several attempts were made to restrict student political activities. In case of private universities/IHL, most of them don't allow involvement of students in political life. There are demands to ban student politics; many universities are coming with proposals to ban student politics and elections. Educational institutions have also laid down codes of conduct for students. Recently, Lyngdoh Committee added some more such restrictions: fixing age limit on students contesting election, doing away with political interference, limiting ceiling on expenditure, making 75% attendance in class (mixing academic career with politics), etc.

Governance of IHL: Issues Before Educational Leadership

Contemporary university has many activities, many responsibilities, many constituencies, and many overlapping lines of authority (Duderstadf, James J., 2001). As such, university governance is a complex construct. Educational leaders very often find that most formidable forces controlling their destiny are political in nature – from governments, governing boards, or perhaps even public opinion, which frequently constrain the institution or drive it away from strategic objectives that would better serve society as a whole (Ibid.). They have to handle competing situations and have to be ready to face challenges posed by the irreverence and indifference of students, the resistance of faculty members who prize their individual and collective autonomy, and the challenges of board members trying to establish their own authority (March, James G., & Stephen S. Weiner, 2003). System of higher learning developed and tested several models for governance;

but so far we are unable to find the best model suitable to governance of universities/IHL. Following six models are very frequently cited with regard to university governance

Collegial model. Most traditional model of university governance, whereby universities are principally governed by their academic staff; it recognizes university as a "collegium" or a "community of scholars" (Pusser, Brian, & Imanol Ordorika). Organizational members determine and control organizational goals on the basis of their professional expertise and a shared value system. Decision-making is inclusive and ideally reflects consensus and facilitation.

Bureautic-rational model. It includes a fixed division of labour; a hierarchy of offices; a set of general rules that govern performance; separation of personal from official property and rights; selection of personnel on the basis of technical qualifications; and a careerist perspective on employment by participants. Organizational goals are clear, and the organization is a closed system. It ignores power of mass movements, power based on expertise, and power based on appeals to emotion and sentiment (Ibid.).

Political model. Organizations are seen as composed of formal and informal groups competing for power over institutional processes and outcomes. Decisions results from bargaining, influencing, and coalition building. Colleges and universities are pluralistic entities comprised of groups with different interests and values. Conflict is a central feature of organizational life.

Garbage can or symbolic model. Organizations are seen as systems of shared meanings and beliefs, whereby leaders construct and maintain systems of shared meanings, paradigms, common cultural perceptions and languages by sustaining rituals, symbols and myths that create a unifying system of belief (Ibid). With growing complexity of HEIs and decision-making this model came to be analogous to a "garbage can", with no structural arrangement of governance. Decision-making is non-rational process in which independent streams of participants, problems, solutions, and choice opportunities are linked through coincidence in time (Ibid.). Solutions are generated on basis of university officials' personal priorities, and those are in turn matched to particular problems. Governance is characterized by organized anarchies[2] (Cohen, Michel D., & James G. March, 1974).

Managerial/corporate model. In this model, decision-making is *de facto* and *de jure* adopting principles, practices and processes of corporate governance; imposing greater responsibility and accountability on university councils. University governance consists of Vice-chancellor and senior executives, plus or minus, or dominated by, University Councils.

Stakeholder governance. Identified variously with collegial and representative governance, it vests governance in a wide array of stakeholders including, among others, students, academic staff, alumni, corporate partners, government and public at large (including environmental, ethnic, gender and other public interests that are particularly germane to university). It exemplifies shared governance; not limited to academic staff, like collegial one and provides for wide participation by internal and external stakeholders in decision-making.

Besides, we also come across a new **mixed model of university governance,** which combines positive aspects/best practices of all the available models of university governance. Whatever model of governance is adopted by university leadership, it has to keep in mind that it can not expect to operate strategically by demanding greater output and imposing unilateral inspection and control on its staff. Universities/IHL differ from other organizations, requiring leadership to be a more shared phenomenon. Rather than being "strong" and decisive, effective leadership is intensely interpersonal, involving working with individuals and teams to "transform" teaching and learning. Leaders' relationships with their "followers" are more important than technical aspects of administration, management and decision-making. In order to avoid too large a gap between leadership and ordinary faculty members, involvement of faculty members in policy formulations and strategic considerations is essential. University leadership will necessarily have to empower the best among the faculty and staff and enable them to exert the influence on the intellectual directions of the university

that will sustain its leadership (Duderstadt, James J., 2001). Strategic academic leadership also involves encouraging strategic discussions with colleagues, students, and other stakeholders. Views, opinion and arguments of students must be heeded to. If there is lack of effective mechanism to ensure participation of students in university governance then university leadership must be aware that students may tend to employ extra-legal, illegal or even violent means to achieve participation, which, by no means, will be very difficult to handle at a later stage.

However, the job of educational leadership (like any other leadership) is not one that produces friends. Because much of leadership of any institution is bound up in enforcing rules and denying request, any administrator who wants a friend should by a dog (March, James G., & Stephen S. Weiner, 2003). It is necessary that the (educational) leaders have management skills in addition to academic ones. Leadership has to have strong external relations (good internal relations essential pre-requisite for this); has to consider *internal* as well as *external* views, and *must* be prepared to come to *decisions* for the development of the institutions – however unpopular they might be (Bladh, Agneta Ch.). Primary administrative talent is, however, not one of knowing how to make good decisions but of knowing how to manage impressions, making the institutions look good in the eyes of others and creating an illusion of direction and control (March, James G., & Stephen S. Weiner, 2003). It is important to maintain a pretense of confidence and strength, even when feeling uncertain and week (Ibid.)

In toto, universities/IHL are increasingly adopting corporate culture and educational leadership is increasingly becoming management-oriented. Professionalizing university governance is emerging as the new mantra for management of contemporary universities/IHL. It may necessarily require introduction of corporate law governance structures to augment or replace traditional university governance system. "While it is certainly impolitic to be so blunt, the simple fact of life is that the contemporary university is a *public corporation* that must be governed, led, and managed like other corporations to benefit its

stakeholders" (Duderstadt, James J., 2001). Like corporate boards, university governing members should be held accountable for their decisions and actions" (Ibid.). Leadership must also be provided with authority commensurate with their responsibilities. They should have the same degree of authority to take actions, to select leadership, to take risks and move with deliberate speed, that their counterparts in the corporate world enjoy (Ibid.). Leadership is, of course, needed to combine the traditional collegiality ethos of universities with the responsive, business-like approach demanded by customers. They have to maintain an academic equilibrium through advancement of learning and development of skills simultaneously.

Role of Educational Leadership

Higher education is integral to fostering the imperatives of an inclusive democracy and that the crisis of higher education must be understood as part of the wider crisis of politics (Giroux, Henry A., 2006). Democracy demands a pedagogical intervention organized around the need to create conditions for educating citizens who have the knowledge and skills to participate in public life, question institutional authority; and engage the contradiction between the reality and promise of a global democracy (Ibid.). IHL can play a crucial role in sustaining the vibrancy of a democratic system. However, if higher education is to keep pace with extraordinary changes and challenges in our society someone in academe must eventually be given the leadership who shall necessarily recognize presence of political infrastructure of faculty and students and defend university as a venue for successful citizenship, a democratic public sphere that connects academic work to public life, and advance a notion of pedagogy that provides students with modes of individual and social agency that enable them to be both engaged citizens and active participants in the struggle for global democracy (Ibid.).

Educational leaders are most of time an administrator as well as a senior academic. They will necessarily have to lead others in a collegiate style, recognizing and encouraging quality, fostering and developing talent, intervening, coaching, being a role model of exemplary behaviour, taking risks and acting as

an agent of change. They must engage the entire institution in their vision. Shared vision is vital for the learning organization because it provides the focus and energy for learning (Senge, P. M., 1990). People generally strive to accomplish a vision that matters deeply to them. Today, "vision" is a familiar concept in organizational leadership; but when you look carefully you find that most "visions" are one person's (or one group's) vision imposed on an organization (Ibid.). To quote Senge, "Organizations intent on building shared visions continually encourage members to develop their personal visions. If people don't have their own vision, all they can do is "sign up" for someone else's. The result is compliance, never commitment" (Ibid.). Educational leadership should be deeply concerned with "value-based leadership" [which] …should be primarily concerned with the generation of knowledge and the promotion of effective teaching and learning (Duignan, P. A., & R. J. S. Macpherson, 1993). For change in university to affect the highly entrepreneurial culture of the faculty, it must also address the core issues of incentives and rewards (Duderstadf, James J. 2001).

Student organizations are representatives of students; they should be represented on appropriate university councils, committees, and task forces as well as committees of external entities related to the university. This is important because students like to be in respectful conversation with faculty, administrator, and other authorities, and to work with them in community building and civic engagement. Institutions must investigate ways to engage in conversation with students – it is not merely enough to talk with students; their inputs should have equal weight when compared to the input of the other stakeholders in the decision-making process (Long, Sarah E., 2002). Students should be allowed to voice and vote on various departmental and campus matters. Educational leaders may take active interest in promoting leadership within student groups; and may resort to various non-institutional means and mechanisms (such as group discussions, informal meetings, adhoc consultation of students by faculties and staffs, open research, etc.) to ensure participation of students. Such participations of student are to be regarded as a part of the democratization of university life, and can play a role in democratic evolution of society in general (UNESCO, 1970).

Educational leaders have a significant role in helping students develop a public and social imagination. Their role is especially important in education for civic engagement and in actual university outreach efforts and community relations (Plantan, Jr., Frank, 2002). Educational leaders can improve their commitment to student civic engagement through service learning[3], community engagement, increased support for student political activity, and attentiveness to student voice. They may develop a host of out-of-class activities, programs, community services (involving surrounding communities), and create opportunities to promote student leadership for community. They can engage students to promote leadership among members of racial, ethnic, minority communities both within and outside institutions. Student leadership initiatives may include engaging and managing students and their affairs by themselves. There may be various student clubs, organizations and arts and cultural groups. Students may be allowed to take responsibilities for developing programs and activities by way of promoting diversified campus activities. They can be engaged in various advocacies, voluntary services activities, arts and sports activities, activities/programs related to cleaning of environment in and surrounding their institutions. They can be provided funds to bring out campus publications/newspapers/magazines, organize debates and discussions, meetings, etc. Campus publications can also be carried out by institutional authorities; and, such publications can profile individuals and tell their stories of service. Better yet, administrators can write in praise of faculty, and vice versa. Campus ceremonies and rituals can be used more widely as occasions for exhibiting mutual recognition and respect (March, James G., & Stephen S. Weiner, 2003). Special days can be designated to recognize roles of various groups on campus and to celebrate volunteer efforts (Ibid.). Institutions can promote a campus culture of social and political awareness by funding campus organizations that let students mobilize and work on social and political causes (Tsui, Lisa, 2000). There can also be occasional lecture series by way of inviting eminent social, political and public figures, whereby students are stimulated to engage in discussions and debates about social, political and other controversial/difficult issues. These strategies may help battle the trend of "political

dis-engagement" currently plaguing college population in developed countries. Thought-provoking discussions spring up more readily in a campus culture that allows for "respectful disagreement" and lets individuals feel comfortable expressing dissenting beliefs and opinions. If such a climate of openness and respect is developed in class, it is more likely that students will conduct themselves in a similar fashion out of class (Ibid.). If there is a general movement against some particular university policies or actions then educational leaders must not bribe or side with only certain sections of leaders of that particular movement. It would only demean the role and value of educational leaders, as it is a strategy to abrogate broader educational responsibility by the leader. In order to discus various issues pertaining to them, students should be provided with separate meeting rooms. In toto, university must have a political infrastructure and a platform to produce effective and efficient political leaders who, in future, can be entrusted to run the greater society and the nation.

Effective educational institutions that excel in student engagement were sensitive to their mission and used it to enhance student engagement strategies (Kezar, Adrianna, & Jillian Kinzie, 2006). An enriching educational environment becomes one where students are charged to create experiences on their own to challenge each other (Ibid.). University leaders can nurture critical thinking by encouraging students to apply critical thinking not only in their studies but also to a variety of collegiate experiences, including active learning, service learning, community/group learning, collaborative learning, etc. It is very much possible that students can be active producers (as opposed to passive consumer) of knowledge and democracy. Students have many ideas and suggestions, and the university has a duty to find out or to listen to their experiences. While university administration must reject all arm-twisting and indiscipline on the part of students, they only way to do so effectively is to allow students to feel partly responsible for decisions affecting them. To diffuse frequent student unrest, it is imperative that steps be taken to develop greater inter personal communication between students and academic staff, as well as between individual students.

Inter-departmental interaction within university has to be encouraged and promoted. Educational leaders also need to actively use various kinds of campus avenues to build trust and resolve grievances – including campus ombudsmen, special campus commissions on human relations, and retreats involving trustees and campus leaders. Campuses are well advised to draw on knowledge of conflict resolution techniques within their own faculties and faculties of nearby institutions (March, James G., & Stephen S. Weiner, 2003). In this regard, *pracademics*[4] can play a significant role to help out educational leaders.

In sum, today, we are faced with irreversible decline in common societal values. If we want our students to acquire the societal and democratic virtues of honesty, tolerance, empathy, generosity, team-work, and social responsibility, we have to demonstrate those qualities not only in our individual professional conduct, but also in our institutional policies and practices (Astin, Alexander, 1995). It is also imperative that public intellectuals within and outside of the university defend higher education as a democratic public sphere, connect academic work to public life, and advance a notion of pedagogy that provides students with modes of individual and social agency that enable them to be both engaged citizens and active participants in the struggle for global democracy (Giroux, Henry A., 2006). Toady, we are much aware of the fact that changes in higher education is driven by market forces; but we also must remember that higher education has a public purpose and a public obligation, and it is very much possible to shape and form the markets that will in turn reshape our institutions with appropriate civic purpose (Duderstadf, James J., 2001). Universities share a common goal with regard to their students which is to transmit knowledge and further their interest in the academic discipline(s), to nurture talent and develop essential skills to enable them to enter the social and professional world as qualified individuals and responsible citizens (Bateson, Rositsa, & John Taylor, 2004). To understand fully and associate themselves with this goal, students need to see its interpretation in their day-to-day life, as active participants and not as passive recipients. They need to become involved in shaping the institutional climate through communication with their professors and

university administrators in which goals, ideas and understandings are conveyed and explored in their full diversity of meanings (Ibid.).

Conclusions

Universities/IHL are experiencing changes and challenges that have not been seen earlier. Accordingly, leaders in higher education must be active in their pursuit of new understanding and ways of leading. The leader should necessarily try to connect and engage different constituents, expand supporters' abilities and loyalty by entrusting them with challenging task; and nourish and groom the young for future leadership by way of giving them the burden of leadership and responsibility. Students are increasingly interested in their studies as citizens. They are interested in politics, want to be involved in politics, and they are also excited about politics. IHL has a role to promote democratic culture and for that matter it must encourage the participation of students as well as staff in governance and politics of their institutions and society at large and also see that their participation has an impact. The purpose of education is not only acquiring knowledge; but also for learning to become responsible citizen. Students will necessarily have to know the broader societal and political roles and responsibilities. As such colleges/institutions of education can not be insulated from national politics. Student politics can, in fact, cover broader societal issues, including national and international ones that can affect each other. Since most of the IHL have lost their traditional autonomy and are very much under the control of political actors, its very much imperative that there will obviously be more politics in IHL; and educational leaders must not try to undermine the role of such politics.

Notes

[1] Universitas was headed by a rector, called rector scolarium, who acted more or less like the corporate head of a trade guild. Elected by students of the universitas, rector and his counsellors were answerable to Congregation of the universitas, which was the supreme governing authority and consisted of the membership of all the fee-paying students. The work of the rector and counsellors was most critically and extensively reviewed and deliberated by the Congregation, which was presided over by the rector. The drafting and enactment of disciplinary and other relevant statutes, the appointment and expulsion of masters, their salaries and working conditions were all matters under the mandate of the Congregation.

[2] To quote Cohen and March: "In a university-anarchy each individual in the university is seen as making autonomous decisions. Teachers decide if, when and what to teach. Students decide if, when and what to learn. Legislators and donors decide if, when and what to support. Neither coordination nor control is practiced. Resources are allocated by whatever process emerges but without explicit accommodation and without reference to some super ordinate goal. The "decisions" of the system are a consequence produced by the system but intended by no one and decisively controlled by no one."

[3] Service-learning has been called a "strategy for civic engagement". Through service-learning, we have the opportunity to share and relate our experiences with others and to explore the broader context of our service activity. Service-learning, with its rich integrations of readings, reflections, and class discussion, offers feedback and recognition and makes us realize that collectively we are powerful force for social change

[4] Pracademic is a term coined to describe academics who are scholars and teachers in the field of dispute resolution and actually practice what they preach in their university. They can be seen as indigenous dispute resolvers in the academic culture. Unlike others who play similar roles and are officially designated to process grievances such as the specialized university ombuds, pracademics retain their traditional faculty role (Volpe, Maria R., & David Chandler)

References

Altbach, Philip G.2008. **Beware of the trojan horse. The Hindu,** July 15.

Astin, A.1997. *Student involvement: A development theory for higher education.* In E. J. WHITT (Ed.) College student affairs administration. ASHE Reader Series: **Simon & Schuster Custom Publishing.**

Astin, Alexander.1995. *What higher education can do in the cause of citizenship.* **The Chronicle of Higher Education,** Oct. 6

Bateson, Rositsa, & Taylor, John. 2004. *Student involvement in university life - beyond political activism and university governance: A view from central and eastern Europe.* **European Journal of Education,** 39(4):471-483

Benson, J. Kenneth. 1975. *The interorganizational network as a political economy.* **Administrative Science Quarterly,** 20(2): 229-249

Bergan, Sjur. *Student participation in higher education governance.* http://www.coe.int / t / dg4 / highereducation / Governance / SB_student_participation_EN.pdf

Bladh, Agneta Ch. *Academic leadership in a turbulent higher education sector – what is needed?* (Internet).

Boyte, Harry C.2003. *Seeds of a different politics.* **The Good Society,** 12(1):70-73

Bulger, William M.2005. *Leadership in higher education.* http://www.polisci.neu.edu / faculty_staff/faculty_research/symposia_related/documents/BulgerLeadership_in_Higher_Education.pdf

Cohen, Michel D., & March, James G.1974. *Leadership and ambiguity : The American College President.* Boston, Mass:**Harvard Business School Press.**

Considine, Damien.2004. *University governance, corporations and cultures: The impact of corporate laws on the development of appropriate regulation, compliance and recognition of diverse university cultures.* Proceedings of the Australian Universities Quality Forum. **AUQA Occasional Publication.**

Donahue, T. J.2007. *What is politics?.* Working Paper, Version of 14 October. **The Johns Hopkins University:** Department of Political Science.tjdonahu.googlepages.com

Downs, Donald A. 2001. *The politics of civil liberty on campus.* Report No. 14(7). **Wisconsin Policy Research Institute.**

Duderstadf, James J.2001. *Leading higher education in an era of rapid change.* **Missouri : Midwestern Higher Education Commission**.

Duignan, P. A., & Macpherson, R. J. S.1993. *Educative leadership: A practical theory.* **Educational Administration Quarterly,** 29(1):8-33.

Giroux, Henry A. 2006. *Higher education under siege: Implications for public intellectuals.* **The NEA Higher Education Journal,** Fall:63-78.

Giroux, Henry A. *The corporate university and the politics of education.* http://www.mono grafias.com/trabajos29/corporate-university-politics-education/corporate-university-politic s-education.shtml

Hanna, Donald E.2003. *Building a leadership vision: Eleven strategic challenges for higher education.* **EDUCAUSEreview,** July/August:25-34.

Hertz, David Bendel.1958.Discussion: *A note on the political economy of organization.* **Management Science,** 5(1):136-138.

Janc, Helen. *A case study: Student political civic leadership development in a higher education co-ordinating board.* http://www.collegevalues.org/pdfs/Janc.pdf

Kapu, Devesh, & Mehta, Pratap Bhanu.2004. *Indian higher education reform:From half-baked socialism to half-baked capitalism.* CID Working Paper No. 108. **Center for International Development, Harvard University.**

Kerr, Clark.1963. *The Uses of the University.* Cambridge, MA: **Harvard University Press.**

Kezar, Adrianna, & Kinzie, Jillian. 2006. *Examining the ways institutions create student engagement: The role of mission.* **Journal of College Student Development,** 47(2):149-172.

Lombardi, John V., Craig, Diane D., Capaldi, Elizabeth D., & Gater, Denise S.2002. *University organization, governance, and competitiveness: The top American research universities.* An Annual Report from The Lombardi Program on Measuring University

Performance. The Center Long, Sarah E. 2002. ***The new student politics. The Wingspread Statement on Student Civic Engagement,*** Second Edition. **Campus Compact.**

March, James G., & Weiner, Stephen S.2003. ***Leadership blues.*** **New Directions for Community Colleges,** 123(Fall):5-14.

National Knowledge Commission (NKC). 2006. Notes on higher education (official website).

Niekerk, Magdalena Maria van. 2005. ***Transformational leadership at a higher education institution.*** Dissertation, **University of South Africa.**

Plantan, Jr., Frank.2002. ***Universities as cites of citizenship and civic responsibility.*** General Report: **European Sites Study.**

Press, Eval, & Washburn, Jennifer.2000. ***The kept university.*** **The Atlantic Monthly,** March 20:54.

Pusser, B.2002. ***The political uses of the university.*** **Review of Higher Education,** 25(4):459-467.

Pusser, Brian, & Ordorika, Imanol. ***Bringing political theory to university governance:*** The University of California and the Universidad Nacional Autonoma de Mexico.http://www.ses.unam.mx/integrantes/ordorika/publicaciones/Handbook.pdf

Scott, W. Richard.1996. ***Professionals and complex organizations.*** In H. M. Vollmer & D. L. Mills (Eds.) **Professionalization,** Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: **Prentice-Hall.**

Senge, P. M. 1990. ***The leader's network: Building learning organizations.*** **Sloan Management Review,** Fall:7-22

Sitoula, Robin.2007. ***Student politics in south Asia: Is Nepal next on the 'banning' list?.*** http://www.lysasia.org/details_expressions.php?id=22

Tsui, Lisa.2000. ***Effect of campus culture on students' critical thinking.*** **The Review of Higher Education,** 23(4):421-441.

UGC.1983. Report of UGC Committee on the Working of Central Universities.

Umunc, Himmet. ***University governance in the middle ages:A historical account.*** http://www.ide.hacettepe.edu.tr/University%20Governance%20in%20the%20Middle%20Ages.pdf

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). 1970. ***Meeting of experts on the participation of students in university governance.*** Final Report. Yugoslavia:Dubrovnik.

Volpe, Maria R., & Chandler, David. ***Resolving conflicts in institutions of higher education: Challenges for pracademics.*** http://law.gsu.edu/cncr/pdf/papers/99-2Volpepap.pdf

Waugh, Jr, William L.1998. ***Conflicting values and cultures: The managerial threat to university governance.*** **Policy Studies Review,** Winter,15(4):61-73.