

THE IGOPP REPORT & BILL 107 : ALARM THROUGHOUT QUEBEC

CONCERNS AND PROPOSAL

Cécile Sabourin
Présidente, FQPPU

MAUT Conference on University Governance
February 27, 2009

Problems (generally recognized)

Data raising questions

Would Bill 107 correct actual problems?

Governance of a complex organization

Central issues of university governance

What should we do? Proposal

PROBLEMS

- ✘ Lack of basic university funding
- ✘ Consequences :
 - + Opportunity to impulse an «instrumental» conception of knowledge
 - + Opportunity to «impose» market values
 - + Undesirable/unacceptable behaviors/decisions:
 - ✘ Fixed assets (*ppp-immobiliers*)
 - ✘ Competition between universities

✘ Continual «slipping» towards managerial approach (NPM)

- + Increase in the number of managers without academic background
- + Increase of total salaries of managing personnel
- + Bureaucratization of administrative processes
- + Increase of work load of professors
- + Deterioration of working conditions for professors
- + Strong tensions in labor relations (strikes, lock out)
- + Attacks to collegial management

DATA RAISING QUESTIONS

- ✘ Salaries in the budget of universities
- ✘ Distribution of salaries by category of personnel
- ✘ Distribution of total salary increases in recent years
- ✘ Management of operation vs fixed assets budgets

TOTAL SALARIES AS % OF OPERATION BUDGETS

	McGill	All universities
2004-2005	55,6	62,4
2003-2004	56,2	62,4
2000-2001	60,3	65,5
1997-1998	61,4	66,8

DISTRIBUTION OF SALARIES BY CATEGORY OF PERSONNEL - 2004-05

	McGill	All universities
Management	20,2%	11,1%
Professors	31,0%	38,0%
Part time teachers	2,3%	7,5%
Other teaching personnel	8,5%	9,7%
Support and trade	22%	33,7%

DISTRIBUTION OF TOTAL SALARY INCREASES - ALL UNIVERSITIES 1997-98 / 2004-05

Total increase in salaries : 50,1%

Share of each category of personnel :

83,2 % for managers

36,4 % for professors

97,1 % for part time teachers

80,2 % for other teaching personnel

46,3 % for support staff and trade

SOURCES OF FINANCING OF FIXED ASSETS FUNDS OF UNIVERSITIES

	1997-1998	2006-2007
Fixed assets funds	395 M\$	656 M\$
From MELS	64 %	45 %
Transfers from operation funds	26 %	45 %

WOULD «BILL 107» CORRECT ACTUAL PROBLEMS?

NO, being based on IGOPP report :

- ✘ Applies inappropriate governance rules
- ✘ Transfers a private commercial sector approach to a complex organization
- ✘ Major defaults :
 - + Shortsighted analysis of governance problems in universities
 - + Shortsighted analysis of real issues of university governance
 - + Ignorance of a large corpus of research and analysis on university and complex organization governance

FQPPU'S POSITION

- ✘ Bill 107 would :
 - + Centralize and concentrate power in the hands of a « new managing class »
 - + Ignore the fact that universities are institutions and complex organizations
 - + Institute a «lack of transparency» in some aspects of decision making
 - + Reduce accountability to budget and submit intellectual responsibility to «easily» measured criteria

-
- + Introduce a questionable conception of performance evaluation
 - + Threaten collegial management

In addition, it would lead to :

- + More PPPs
- + More aggressive New Public Management
- + More competitive behaviors between and within universities

GOVERNANCE OF A COMPLEX ORGANIZATION

(Dupuis 2008)

« the governance of an academic institution is organic, not mechanical. It is not designed as much as it evolves because it uniquely supports the activities of a social institution whose processes and goals cannot be clearly defined, whose outcomes cannot be precisely measured, but whose critical importance is indisputable. Proposals to improve governance by clarifying roles are as problematic as suggestions that institutions can become more effective by specifying outcomes. Both are likely to lead to increased bureaucratization, administrative influence, and the selection of data based on availability rather than on importance.»

Birnbaum, Robert (2003), « The End of Shared Governance: Looking Ahead or Looking Back ». <http://www.usc.edu/dept/chepa/gov/roundtable2003/birnbaum.pdf>.

Or ce qui fait la force d'une organisation à la mission, aux moyens et aux résultats complexes, indéterminés, opaques et ambigus comme l'université, c'est la gouvernance « douce » et peu formalisée fondée sur l'engagement des porteurs de la mission et sur les normes sociales qui encadrent les décisions individuelles et permettent la critique mutuelle et la collégialité en général. Ces mécanismes de gouvernance « douce » justifient l'autorité fonctionnelle des professeurs et des universités dans la société.

Au contraire, les mécanismes de gouvernance « dure » relèvent d'un régime de confiance faible et de contrôle à distance au moyen d'indicateurs superficiels. Comme l'indique Fulton (2003, p. 159), on tente de redéfinir les professeurs non plus comme les responsables de fonctions et de valeurs importantes dans la société, comme les porteurs d'une institution sociale de premier plan, mais comme des fournisseurs de services aux intérêts étrangers à la mission de l'université.

Dans cet esprit, la société ne peut avoir confiance en eux et il faut donc les contrôler étroitement. C'est le type de régime qu'instaure le managérialisme, comme le soulignent Reed, Meek et Jones (2002, p. xxii) :

new managerialism/new public management comprise an innovative configuration of institutional, organisational and operational reforms that, collectively, push universities towards governance structures and practices characterised by a 'low trust/high control' syndrome

Fulton, Oliver (2003), « Managerialism in UK Universities: Instable Hybridity and the Complications of Implementation », dans Amaral, Alberto, V. Lynn Meek et Ingvild M. Larsen (Dir.), *The Higher Education Managerial Revolution?* Kluwer Academic Publishers, p. 31-53.

Reed, Michael I., V. Lynn Meek et Glen A Jones (2002), « Introduction ». Dans Amaral, Alberto, Glen A. Jones et Berit Karseth (dir.), *Governing Higher Education: National Perspective on Institutional Governance*. Kluwer Academic Publishers

CENTRAL ISSUES OF UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE

- ✘ Recognition of universities as institutions and as a public service
 - + Neither a private enterprise
 - + Nor a public enterprise
- ✘ Preservation of the values and missions of universities with regards to knowledge, persons and society

- ✘ Recognition of the complexity of accomplishing university missions
- ✘ Submitting university governance (organization and management) to the needs of the institution

VALUES AND MISSIONS OF UNIVERSITIES

- ✘ Values (among others)
 - + Autonomy
 - + Academic freedom
 - + Collegiality
 - + Responsibility regarding criticism of knowledge and society (*Capacité critique*)
- ✘ Missions with regards to knowledge, people and society
 - + Scientific mission
 - + Social et human mission

WHAT SHOULD WE DO? PROPOSAL

- ✘ Start the exercise again :
 - + Define the problems in order to identify and put forward adapted solutions
- ✘ Organize a democratic debate - *États généraux*
- ✘ Give Quebec a Charter of universities
 - + Stating common principles that all stakeholders - institutional, political and civil society – would agree to
 - + Providing guide lines for appropriate university governance

FROM FQPPU'S POINT OF VIEW

- ✘ Urgent recognition that :
 - + basic funding (operation) is the #1 problem of universities
 - + universities (institutions) are complex organizations that cannot and should not be governed like private firms

TO KNOW MORE ABOUT IT

- ✘ Documents and positions of FQPPU
www.fqppu.org
<http://fqppu.org/themes/organisation-gestion.html>
- ✘ Data and analysis of FQPPU's committees on financing of universities and professors
- ✘ Positions of *Table des partenaires universitaires*
<http://fqppu.org/tpu-gouvernance.html>

-
- ✘ Dupuis Alain, *Managérialisme ou collégialisme dans la gouvernance des universités ? Le cas des projets immobiliers de l'UQAM*, Cahier de recherche du Cergo 2008-03,
http://benhur.teluq.quebec.ca/SPIP/cergo/IMG/pdf/Cahier_du_Cergo_2008-03.pdf
 - ✘ Keel Othmar, Kempeneers Marianne, *La fiction de l'université-entreprise*, l'Autre forum, déc. 2007. pp.29-36
http://www.sgpum.com/images/Autre_Forum/af_nov07.pdf

Thank you

Questions?

Comments?