Management of International Partnership in the Perspective of Good University Governance

Anies Fortina Febriani, Drajat Tri Kartono, Didik G. Suharto
Sebelas Maret University
Surakarta, Indonesia
didikgsuharto@yahoo.com

Abstract—The objectives of this study are to know the description of the management of international partnership in university from the perspective of good university governance, and to identify factors that effect the man-agement of international partnership. Type of the research is qualitative descriptive. The sampling technique of this study is purposive sampling. The data collection technique is by interview, observation and document re-view. Triangulation techniques was used to ensure the validity of the data. Considering the result of research, the principle of transparency has been accomplished on the mechanism that facilitates the public questions about the processes in governance; the principle of accountability has been accomplished in the distribution and grouping of work in accordance with the duties and functions principally; the principle of responsibility is not yet implemented in the management of international co-operation; the factors that support the implementation of good university governance are human resources and authority, while the inhibiting factor are the organizational structure and co-ordination systems.

Keywords—*management; international partnership; good university governance*

I. INTRODUCTION

Responsibility in providing high-quality education is the main focus of a college. A college assumes a heavier duty along with global demand for producing human beings with quality superiority and high performance.

One challenge in achieving successful global competition to government is to establish high education institution in order to be the World Class University. Indonesian Government's policy developed in developing high education is to direct some colleges to be the World Class University [1]. World Class University (WCU), according to [2], is a dynamic concept ensuring further discussion because most countries in the world feel highly requiring their institution to have high reputation and to be very appreciated by global community. Transnational education has been an important approach applied by many universities throughout world as the attempt of internationalizing colleges. Anggreani and Vijaya said that there are some challenges encountered to achieve the WCU predicate, one of which is to build an effective collaboration in both internal and external structures of university [1].

The colleges with WCU predicate should meet the following qualifications:

- Ranking among the foremost in the world (of an international standard of excellence);

- Excellence in research, teaching and extension (recognized by international and local peers and the ones that expand the frontiers of knowledge);

- Recruiting and retaining top quality academics and students via providing an atmosphere of intellectual excitement and academic freedom;

- Operating with a significant measure of internal self-governance and accountability to the government, industry and community;

- Providing adequate resources and facilities for advanced and creative research, teaching and extension services;

- Operating with sufficient, consistent and long-term funding from the government, industry and community in the form of research grant endowment and contribution from university alumni [2].

To be a World Class University, a college needs network support in the form of broad co-operation with international world as mentioned in the point number 4 of WCU's qualifications, international participation. The demand for realizing WCU is treated by colleges/universities through improving co-operation with such parties as high education institution, industry, donor institution, and foreign work partner.

Aleixo et al. and Dlouha et al.'s study highlights the importance of conceptual and organizational change in high education institution through a commitment to internationalization. Networking can be a mechanism important to the systemic change in high education [3,4].

In 2012, the United Nations' Conference on Sustainable Development released a report on an urgency of "collaboration between academic, scientist and technology communities, particularly in developing countries", needed to "offset the technology gap between developing and developed countries and to strengthen the science-policy interface, as well as to encourage the international collaborative research for sustainable development [5].

A study conducted in Turkey found that the university-industry collaborative has not been established comprehensively. Companies do not trust in external organization and university. Some companies believe that several universities do not offer high-quality education. Universities in developed countries are considered as the source of knowledge, so that co-operation with foreign universities is required [6].

High education institution contributes significantly to economic and social life. Co-operation between universities and industry can facilitate transfer of knowledge and encourage the knowledge of production and new technology. High education plays an important part in equipping people with high-level skill and competency. High education facilitates innovation in high education and business, particularly in catching up other countries. The implication is that there is an increasing trend of transnational cooperation between universities [7–9].

It is expected that the co-operation between university and many parties abroad will create a net-work that can raise the institutional name in international world. The awareness of the importance of internationalization to high education can be seen from the increasing funding for research and the presence of scientific co-operation project between universities in many different states [10]. Chen define internationalization as the process of integrating international elements into teaching, research and service [11]. Transnational education has become an important approach adopted by many universities around the world for its internationalization.

The activity that should be done to meet international participation element will not be implemented well when there is co-operation between actors in college to co-operate in achieving the collective objective to be achieved by individual actors.

The factors affecting the successful transnational collaboration are, among others: combining local and global considerations, utilizing digital technology effectively; utilizing cultural and national difference; and optimizing the available resource. An integrated approach is needed in transnational collaboration. The comprehensive perspective is not only related to administrative or technical effort, but should also consider cultural, institutional, social and personal aspects [12].

College, as an organization operating in education sector, should be managed well. Governance indicators serve as strong contributor to the improvement of education, that later can help formulate the policy of university internationalization. Good university governance problem has encouraged university to be more efficient since 1990s [13,14].

Good University Governance (GUG) concept derives from Good Governance concept to provide a better, responsive and innovative service in answering the society's need and wish, so that bureaucratic perception that society serves as a passive service receiver should be changed. The government should build belief and be responsive to the public interests and needs as mentioned in good corporate governance including transparency, independence, accountability, responsibility, equality, and fairness. The participation of society as

stakeholders is expected to contribute to and to be a valuable investment in which there is a positive interdependency within it.

Thus, the attempt of developing international co-operation governance referring to GUG principles as the ideal form of college governance system in Indonesia is the universities' serious attempt of organizing international co-operation, in the expectation that international co-operation governance based on Good University Governance can improve the quantity and the quality of international co-operation, expand network, and contribute significantly to supporting autonomy improvement and university independency and the achievement of *Tridharma* (three principles) of College.

Quyên conducted a study on developing university governance with the following dimension indicators [15]: Direction, Participation, Accountability, Autonomy, and Transparency. The prior result showed the relatively high level of importance of all indicators proposed, so that none is excluded. The weight of its indicators and factor is highly varying. Out of five dimensions, participation is found to be the most important one; experts' consensus is considered as low in the term of participation and transparency.

Anggreani & Vijaya, study explored the relationship likely occurring between governance indicators and education reform [1,13]. The analysis shows that governance indicators such as voices and accountability, political instability and violence, government effectiveness, regulation quality, rule of law and corruption control contribute to university internationalization. Universally, government and corresponding authority try to develop regulation and to allocate much more fund for institutional research and development.

The role of international co-operation in achieving World Class University cannot be considered as trivial; therefore, it is very important to analyze the management of university co-operation. Thus, this research aimed to find out how the management of international co-operation is existing in the colleges (universities) viewed from good university governance perspective and what factor affecting the management of international management.

II. METHOD

Type of the research is qualitative descriptive. The sampling technique of this study is purposive sampling. The object of research was International Cooperation Governance, the process of organizing international co-operation between the college (university) studied and other university, and business realm. This research was conducted in one state college (PTN) in Surakarta, Indonesia. This field study was intended to obtain data related to co-operation governance viewed from good university governance. Data collection was conducted using recording technique from various sources, through interview, observation and document existing in related unit/institution. Informant was selected purposively, intended to obtain informant as much as possible by maintaining relevance to research context. Technique of analyzing data used was qualitative descriptive one, by describing all facts obtained from the field by applying the

following procedures: data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing/verification.

III. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The management of international co-operation viewed from good university governance perspective. The status of university as Public Service Agency requires organization to be managed based on performance. The performance-based organization can only be done when the management is conducted based on governance principle ensuring the organization of good practices. Therefore, to find out international co-operation in university, the analysis on co-operation management is conducted using Good University Governance (GUG) principles, including transparency, accountability, and responsibility.

A. Transparency in International Co-operation Management

Transparency is a demand for the public organization to deliver information about the organization of activity that has been provided by the authority holder to the authorized organizer. Transparency principle requires the mechanism facilitating the public questions about the process in providing service. Access to information by external actors to be an important measure of governance transparency [16]. Different perception or point of view on a policy in organization needs communication through discussion and consultation to equate perception so that the management of co-operation can run uniformly in a college institution.

Considering the result of interview, communication is among others conducted through discussion and consultation when there is an initiative to hold national and international co-operation activity in faculty, technical executive unit (thereafter called UPT) and institution still requiring management help from UPT of International Office due to limited knowledge and implementation management procedure. In addition, UPT of International Office tries to establish more intense communication, among others, by holding an event centralized in UPT of International Office as the part of socialization. As a result, any co-operation activity conducted by a unit of faculty, UPT, institution will be registered and monitored by university.

The university's UPT of International Office also applies transparency aspect through opening communication infrastructure for consultation and help in developing co-operation agreement with various faculties, institutions, UPTs and other executive units expectedly to create transparency between the central (university) and executive units. In transparency attempt and to grow the spirit of initiating international co-operation, UPT of International Office holds treaty release of international co-operation activity informing the stakeholders about some MoUs that have been conducted by university and foreigners thereby can be used as the foundation for faculty, institution, UPT and other executive units to initiate technical activities and Memorandum of Agreement (MoA) with potential outsiders according to its area. It is intended to make the *civitas academica* in all universities provoked to follow up the existing co-operation program and even to expand to foreign institutions becoming the partners. The activity of co-operation treaty release can be

conducted periodically depending on the university's interest and need. Transparency can be implemented through releasing the data of international co-operation through the socialization to all *civitas academica* that has been uploaded online in website of UPT of International Office.

Transparency principle requires the presence of clear and understandable transparency system and standardization from all of public service providing processes. The standardization existing includes, among others, policy, Standard Operating Procedure (SOP), rule, and guidelines. Through standardization, it is expected that there is no co-operation executive unit making policy, rule, and procedure itself in managing and organizing international co-operation. However, until this research is conducted, no special policy, rule or SOP contains the management of international co-operation, so that individual executive units in faculty, UPT, and institution should often consult with the central (in this case, Law and Co-operation Administration Division and UPT of International Office) in conducting its international co-operation management. It is because the absence of guidelines on co-operation rule results in different procedure in the term of recruiting co-operation organizer in units and faculty. Similarly, the absence of maintenance system, monitoring system, and evaluation on co-operation makes the transparency principle apparently difficult to enact because many MoUs and MoAs not registered in any divisions and units even in Study Program. Meanwhile, transparency principle requires the mechanism of reporting or distributing information on public apparatus' deviating action in its service organizing activity.

B. Accountability in International Co-operation Management

Public accountability principle relates to the mandate holder's responsibility for the implementation of duty/activity or organizational performance vertically to the higher authority or horizontally to the society through accountability media (report) conducted periodically.

Accountability in education is a broad concept that could be addressed in many ways, such as using political processes to assure democratic accountability, introducing market-based reforms to increase accountability to parents and children, or developing peer-based accountability systems to increase the professional accountability [17]. The management of international co-operation in university is hierarchically under the authority of deputy of rector for co-operation division. It is in charge of validating co-operation from MoU, MoA, to contract. UPT of International Office and Law and Co-operation Administration Division as the organizing unit at university level serves to administrate, to facilitate, and to monitor the organization of co-operation. Meanwhile, after MoU has been conducted like MoA and contract, the activity is conducted by organizing and executive units at faculty level, UPT and institution. However, accountability system has not run well either vertically or horizontally in managing international co-operation in research location. The delegation of authority to unit has not been followed yet by a consciousness of reporting periodically to UPT of International Office and Law and Co-operation Administration Division. The deviation in co-operation activity implementation, particularly in the procedure of validating and legalizing co-

operation document/script proves the weak accountability of co-operation management.

The accountability of international co-operation management can also be seen from how the delegation of authority from central unit, in this case UPT of International Office, to executive units. The delegation of authority to follow up the result of MoU is intended to make the sustainable co-operation management run target-appropriately and maximally to improve its contribution to university. However, the attempt is not supported with a good understanding at executive unit level in both faculty and institution. Many units of faculty, UPTs and institutions have not understood yet the duty and function of good cooperation management. The consciousness of initiating co-operation, reporting and sharing its benefit to university is in fact still low. It can be seen from the absence of report on international co-operation implementation that can generate revenue.

The similar condition occurs in the accountability of financial reporting. The absence of reporting initiative from Person in Charge of co-operation activity concerning co-operation budget responsibility and the absence of standardized mechanism of reporting income and expense leads to very limited real data of total revenue generating in university, as it is presented in written form only. So far, the co-operation activity is more personal in nature and disseminated in many faculties, institutions, UPT and units existing in universities, particularly the disorganized SOP, reporting, monitoring, and evaluation systems leads many co-operation practices to be held through the legality of university as the provider of co-operation law foundation.

From the result of analysis, it can be concluded that division and categorization of international cooperation management work by main duty and function and the clarity of international co-operation implementation plot become the supporting elements of accountability.

C. Responsibility in International Co-operation Management

Accountability and responsibility are indeed separate terms with different meanings, responsibility can be shared while accountability is often linked to a particular actor who is answerable for their actions [16]. Responsibility is not of the individual but of collective entity, being a synthesis between ethics and pragmatic-utilitarian [18].

The principle of responsibility means that the implementation of public organization activity should be conducted corresponding to the correct administrative principle corresponding to the organizational policy, either implicitly or explicitly [19]. Responsibility is a key aspect of all regulation. Without rules the concept of responsibility makes no sense, so it is first necessary to introduce a sociological understanding of rules. Accountability is linked to self-specification of what is to be accounted for, and auditing as the primary regulatory technique [20].

One infringement related to international co-operation is the presence of rule stating that educators who have completed their advanced study abroad should get back to university to undertake their obligation as educators and use the discipline

they have acquired for the sake of university development. However, the implementation shows that some educators who have completed their advanced study abroad continue their education to post-doctoral degree with the excuse that there is an opportunity of cooperating and inactive status as educators in university, and even some of them do not get back to their original institution after obtaining post-doctoral degree. The data of Personnel and Cooperation Divisions show that during 2000-2015, there are about 8 (eight) educators with Civil Servants who take advanced study abroad and do not get back to their original institution with various reasons.

Until today, university has not had mechanism of sanction and punishment imposition to individual or institution infringing the international co-operation. Regarding responsibility system and budget reporting of co-operation, there has been no Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) because the disbursement of co-operation budget can be done through Rector's account-managed Fund in which the fund through this channel cannot be accountable for its use as it only passes through and is registered.

In applying the responsibility principles, the indicators used in this research are taken from GEG (Good Executive Governance) concept in 2006, including the clarity of responsibility and authority, having commitment to implement responsibility and authority, having Human Resource management policy and having management policy. However, the principle of responsibility has not been apparently fulfilled in the management of international co-operation.

Factors Affecting the Management of International Co-operation. Considering the finding of field research, 4 (four) factors are identified affecting the management of international co-operation in good university perspective governance: human resource; authority; organizational structure; and co-ordination system.

The factors deriving from human resource (SDM) or *civitas academica* of college consists of educators (lecturer), educational staff and students. The *civitas academica* is the executive organizer of international co-operation or the actor/performer of co-operation. The actors mean those who have implemented foreign activity whether in the attempt of taking advanced study, initiating or organizing co-operation (MoU), joint research, attending international conference, conducting sit in lecture, exchange lecturer, exchange students, and other academic supporting activities. The organizers mean those dealing with administrative affairs and helping the international co-operation management. The large potential human resource in college can result in dynamics in the management of international co-operation and can make it run smoothly.

Leaders should adequately address management staff, develop appropriate incentives, undertake well-defined career planning, offer job-related training to them, and fully mobilize enthusiasm and initiative while upgrading their professional quality to improve the management level and provide students with better services [21].

Authority factor in the management of international co-operation constitutes the power belonging to stakeholders (unit,

institution, faculty, and UPT) to undertake their own role and functions in organizing international co-operation. As the central figure, the deputy of Rector for Planning and Co-operation Division in international co-operation management authorizes directly the Law and Co-operation Administration (HAK) Division to held domestic and foreign co-operation, and the UPT of International Service to deal with publication affairs, activity coverage, public relations, and to facilitate international co-operation, service of foreign student, educator, and education staff, and international promotion.

UPT of International Office and Law and Co-operation Administrative Division are the organizer at university level, in each of faculties, institutions and UPTs, there are administrative units having authority of dealing with co-operation in their own division. The clarity of authority can govern the role of every institution corresponding to their own position and authority synergistically, and vice versa. The over-lapping and disintegrated authority tends to complicate the management of international co-operation in university.

Organizational structure factor relates to the institution's duty and function corresponding to its role in an interaction pattern agreed to achieve the in-tended objective. The form of organizational structure will determine job division, responsibility mechanism, co-ordination mechanism, authority delegation and interaction pattern, as the poor organizational structure will make the organization not performing well in achieving the intended objective. The over-lapping organizational structure in the implementation of co-operation administration function between Law and Co-operation Administration Division and Public Relation taskforce in UPT of International Office makes the organization running ineffectively and inefficiently.

Co-ordination factor is related to the organizational structure condition of university co-operation management. The problem of co-ordination results from the different co-ordination pattern between one unit and another in communicating co-operation management as there are 3 co-operation entrances: Public Relation and Co-operation Office, UPT of International Office, and Law and Co-operation Administration Division. It will affect the good university governance. The three institutions in different office make co-ordination and communication difficult to do. There are two different sections dealing with the co-operation management: one under Academic and Co-operation Administration Bureau and another under Planning and Co-operation Division. This condition also impacts on the difference of co-ordination pattern between central office and units below such as faculty, institution, and UPT with institution at university level.

Considering the finding of research, as suggested by Zehir et al., transparency is a basic principle of corporate governance [22]. The consistency of transparency principle has been conceived as exerting positive effect on qualitative and quantitative performances through stakeholder participation. The external actor's access to information becomes the important measure of transparency. Transparency can be made to strengthen the implementation of policy. In other words, transparency requires the manager to implement standard, principle, and behavioral norm.

Transparency requires an audience with the capacity to understand and act [23]. Considering the indicators taken from Mardiasmo's, transparency cannot run well not because of the presence of transparency of communication medium between organizer and either stakeholders or partner, but due to disorganized organization structure and co-ordination system [24].

The principle of accountability, Mardiasmo and Turner and Hulme states that accountability in education is a broad concept that can be implemented in many ways [24,25]: through political process to ensure democratic accountability, to introduce a market-based reform, to improve accountability to parents and children, or to develop peer group-based accountability system in order to improve the professional accountability.

Based on Zaman's analysis, to improve the institutional governance, the capacity of government and high education sectors should be improved, so that the institution can implement a meaningful policy reform, as internationalization is a sustainable process [13].

IV. CONCLUSION

Transparency, accountability, responsibility principles are relevant in analyzing the performance of public bureaucracy, particularly in considering the international co-operation management of university. Transparency, accountability and responsibility are also important dimensions in realizing good university governance. Responsibility dimension as the weakest point should be improved particularly through organizing a clearer and more complete "rule of game" instrument, and overseeing it consistently. This research describes that in managing international co-operation, organizational structure and co-ordination system cannot be underestimated because they can determine the performance of co-operation. Human resource and authority as other affecting factors should be improved in order to create a larger opportunity of managing international co-operation. The implication is that serious attention should be paid to the factors affecting the management of international co-operation and its strategic dimensions.

REFERENCES

[1] A. Anggraeni and V. Vijaya, 2017.

[2] Hassan, Zaharah, Abu Daud Silong, Ismi Arif Ismail, Soaib Asmiran. Developing New Generation of Educational Leaders for World Class University. Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences. 15 (2011) 812-817. 2011.

[3] Aleixo, M., Susana L., Ulisses M. A. Conceptualization of Sustainable Higher Education Institutions, Roles, Barri-ers, and Challenges for Sustainability: An Exploratory Study in Portugal. Journal of Cleaner Production. 172 (2018) 1664-167. 2018.

[4] Dlouha, J., Laura H., Dana K., Clemens M. Sustainabil-ity-oriented Higher Education Networks: Characteristics and Achievements in The Context of The UN DESD. Jour-nal of Cleaner Production. 172 (2018) 4263-4276. 2018.

[5] Berchin., Issa I., Mihaela S., Maurício A. D. L., Shelly B, Leandro P. D. S., Renata V. F, Jose B. S., Osorio de An-drade Guerra, Flavio Ceci. The

Importance of Inter-national Conferences on Sustainable Development as Higher Education Institutions' Strategies to Promote Sus-tainability: A Case Study in Brazil. Journal of Cleaner Production. 171 (2018) 756-772. 2018.

[6] Ozturk., Fahrettin., Bayrak, T. World Conference on Technology, Innovation and Entrepreneurship the Acade-micians' Perspective on the Challenges Facing Higher Edu-cation in Turkey. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sci-ences 195 (2015) 202-209. 2015.

[7] Fleacă, E., Alexandru M., Bogdan F. The Challenges of Romanian Higher Education – A Review on The Key Ena-blers for Modernization. Procedia Technology. 1121–1128. 2016.

[8] Horta, Hugo, & Yudkevich, Maria. The Role of Aca-demic Inbreeding in Developing Higher Education Systems: Challenges and Possible Solutions. Technological Fore-casting & Social Change. 113 (2016) 363-372. 2016.

[9] Bektaş., Çetin., Tayauova., Gulzhanat. A Model Sugges-tion for Improving the Efficiency of Higher Education: University–Industry Cooperation. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences. 116 (2014) 2270-2274. 2014.

[10] Araujo, D., Izabel Cristina, Ana Sevilla, Joni de Almeida Amo-rim, Sergio Ferreira do Amaral. The Internationalisa-tion of Higher Education in Brazil: Analysis of A Spanish-Brazilian Scientific Cooperation Project in CAL. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences. 46 (2012) 3172-3175. 2012.

[11] Chen, P. University's Transnational Expansion: Its Meaning, Rationales and Implications. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences. 171 (2015) 1420-1427. 2015.

[12] Caniglia, Guido, Christopher L, Milena G, Maximilian M, Be-atrice J, Lauren W. K, Henrik V. W., Manfred Laubichler, Arnim Wiek, Daniel Lang. Transnational Collabora-tion for Sustainability in Higher Education: Lessons from A Systematic Review. Journal of Cleaner Production. 168 (2017) 764-779. 2017.

[13] Zaman, K. Quality Guidelines for Good Governance in Higher Education Across the Globe. Pacific Science Review B: Humanities and Social Sciences. 1 (2015) 1-7. 2015.

[14] Dearlove, J. The Deadly Dull Issue of University "Ad-ministration"? Good Governance, Managerialism and Or-ganising Academic Work. Higher Education Policy. Vol-ume 11, Issue 1, March 1998, Pages 59-79. 1998.

[15] Quyên, D. T. N. Developing University Governance Indi-cators and Their Weighting System using A Modified Del-phi Method. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences. 141 (2014) 828-833. 2014.

[16] Devaney, L. Good Governance? Perceptions of Ac-countability, Transparency and Effectiveness in Irish Food Risk Governance. Food Policy. 62 (2016) 1-10. 2016.

[17] Hanushek, Eric A., Stephen Machin, Ludger Woessmann (ed.). Handbooks in Economics. Vol. 3, The Netherlands: North-Holland. pp. 383-421. 2011.

[18] Croitor, E. Ethics of Responsibility? Some Post-modern Views. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences. 149 (2014) 253-260. 2014.

[19] Dwiyanto, A. Mewujudkan Good Governance Melayani Publik. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University. 2006.

[20] Löfmarck, E., Ylva U., Rolf Lidskog. Freedom with What? Interpretations of "Responsibility" in Swedish For-estry Practice. Forest Policy and Economics. 75 (2017) 34-40. 2017.

[21] Liu, H., Pan, F. The Thinking for Management of School Roll in International Cooperation. Procedia Environmental Sciences. 1393-1396. 2012.

[22] Zehir., Cemal., Fadime, Ç., Halil Ş. Role of Stakeholder Participation between Transparency and Qualitative and Quantitive Performance Relations: An Application at Hos-pital Managements. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sci-ences. 229 (2016) 234-245. 2016.

[23] Sedmihradská, L. Budget Transparency in Czech Local Government. Procedia Economics and Finance. 2015.

[24] Mardiasmo. Akuntansi Sektor Publik. Yogyakarta: Pen-erbit Andi. 2002.

[25] Turner, M., Hulme, D. Governance, Administration, and Development: Making The State Work. London: MacMillan Press Ltd. 1997.