UDC 378.1:37.014.3:005.336.4(100)

INTERNATIONAL EXPERIENCE IN REFORMING THE SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION GOVERNANCE IN TERMS OF INCREASING THE UNIVERSITY AUTONOMY

© 2017 CHMUTOVA I. M., ANDRIICHENKO Z. O.

UDC 378.1:37.014.3:005.336.4(100)

Chmutova I. M., Andriichenko Z. O.

International Experience in Reforming the System of Higher Education Governance in terms of Increasing the University Autonomy

The aim of the article is to summarize the international experience of reforming the system of higher education governance and develop directions that will contribute to increasing the effectiveness of the Ukrainian model for governance of higher education and ensuring its autonomy. There identified common elements and trends in European higher education reforms: greater autonomy for higher education institutions with less direct administrative intervention; greater emphasis on private rather than public funding; emphasis on the quality and effectiveness of education. The tools for implementing reforms in the European higher education system are identified: the New Public Management (NPM) model, governance through networks, and new forms of governance. The changes in the university autonomy of European countries for the period of 2010-2016 are summarized. The content of the reforms in terms of increasing the autonomy of HEIs in the countries of Asia is disclosed. Possible vectors for reforming the system of higher education governance in Ukraine are identified: introduction of a model for funding HEIs on the basis of combining a one-time full budgeting and financing by results; assigning universities ownership of their buildings and their sale in the market; strengthening the decentralization of government control of higher education; development of legislative bases for the self-sufficiency of HEIs; inclusion of external stakeholders in decision-making governing bodies of HEIs; maximum involvement of students in decision-making.

Keywords: *higher education, reforms, external governance, higher education institution (HEI), autonomy.*

Tbl.: *3.* ***Bibl.:*** *19.*

Chmutova Iryna M. *– Doctor of Sciences (Economics), Associate Professor, Professor of the Department of Banking, Simon Kuznets Kharkiv National University of Economics (9a Nauky Ave., Kharkiv, 61166, Ukraine)*

E-mail: *chmutova_i@ukr.net*

Andriichenko Zhanna O. *– Candidate of Sciences (Economics), Associate Professor, Associate Professor of the Department of Financial Services Management, Simon Kuznets Kharkiv National University of Economics (9a Nauky Ave., Kharkiv, 61166, Ukraine)*

E-mail: *azh_ufp@hneu.edu.ua*

УДК 378.1:37.014.3:005.336.4(100)

Чмутова І. М., Андрійченко Ж. О. Міжнародний досвід реформування системи управління вищою освітою у напрямі посилення автономії вищого навчального закладу

Метою статті є узагальнення міжнародного досвіду реформування системи управління вищою освітою та вироблення напрямів, які сприятимуть підвищенню ефективності української моделі управління вищою освітою та забезпеченню її автономії. Визначено спільні елементи та тенденції у європейських реформах вищої освіти: більша автономія для освітніх інституцій з меншим прямим управлінським втручанням; більший акцент на приватне, а не на державне фінансування; наголос на якості й ефективності освіти. Розкрито інструменти реалізації реформ у європейській системі вищої освіти: модель «нового публічного адміністрування» (NPM), мережеве управління, нові форми врядування. Узагальнено зміни університетської автономії європейських країн за 2010–2016 рр. Розкрито зміст реформ у напрямку посилення автономії вищого навчального закладу у країнах Азії. Визначено можливі вектори реформування системи управління вищою освітою в Україні: запровадження моделі фінансування вищого навчального закладу на основі поєднання одноразового повного бюджетування та фінансування за результатами; закріплення за університетами права власності на будівлі та продаж їх на ринку; посилення децентралізації державного управління вищою освітою; розвиток законодавчих засад для самозабезпечення вищого навчального закладу; включення зовнішніх зацікавлених осіб у органи вищого навчального закладу, які приймають рішення; максимальне залучення студентів до прийняття рішень.

Ключові слова: *вища освіта, реформи, зовнішнє управління, вищий навчальний заклад, автономія.*

УДК 378.1:37.014.3:005.336.4(100)

Чмутова И. Н., Андрейченко Ж. О. Международный опыт реформирования системы управления высшим образованием в направлении усиления автономии высшего учебного заведения

Целью статьи является обобщение международного опыта реформирования системы управления высшим образованием и выработка направлений, которые будут способствовать повышению эффективности украинской модели управления высшим образованием и обеспечению его автономии. Определены общие элементы и тенденции в европейских реформах высшего образования: большая автономия для образовательных учреждений с меньшим прямым управленческим вмешательством; больший акцент на частное, а не на государственное финансирование; упор на качество и эффективность образования. Раскрыты инструменты реализации реформ в европейской системе высшего образования: модель «нового публичного администрирования» (NPM), сетевое управление, новые формы управления. Обобщены изменения университетской автономии европейских стран за 2010–2016 гг. Раскрыто содержание реформ в направлении усиления автономии высшего учебного заведения в странах Азии. Определены возможные векторы реформирования системы управления высшим образованием в Украине: внедрение модели финансирования высшего учебного заведения на основе объединения единовременного полного бюджетирования и финансирования по результатам; закрепление за университетами права собственности на здания и продажи их на рынке; усиление децентрализации государственного управления высшим образованием; развитие законодательных основ для самообеспечения высшего учебного заведения; включение внешних заинтересованных лиц в органы управления высшего учебного заведения, которые принимают решения; максимальное привлечение студентов к принятию решений.

Табл.: 3. *Бібл.:* 19.

Чмутова Ірина Миколаївна *– доктор економічних наук, доцент, професор кафедри банківської справи, Харківський національний економічний університет ім. С. Кузнеця (пр. Науки, 9а, Харків, 61166, Україна)*

E-mail: *chmutova_i@ukr.net*

Андрійченко Жанна Олегівна *– кандидат економічних наук, доцент, доцент кафедри управління фінансовими послугами, Харківський національний економічний університет ім. С. Кузнеця (пр. Науки, 9а, Харків, 61166, Україна)*

E-mail: *azh_ufp@hneu.edu.ua*

Ключевые слова: *высшее образование, реформы, внешнее управление, высшее учебное заведение, автономия.*

Табл.: *3.* ***Библ.:*** *19.*

Чмутова Ирина Николаевна *– доктор экономических наук, доцент, профессор кафедры банковского дела, Харьковский национальный экономический университет им. С. Кузнеца (пр. Науки, 9а, Харьков, 61166, Украина)*

E-mail: *chmutova_i@ukr.net*

Андрейченко Жанна Олеговна *– кандидат экономических наук, доцент, доцент кафедры управления финансовыми услугами, Харьковский национальный экономический университет им. С. Кузнеца (пр. Науки, 9а, Харьков, 61166, Украина)*

E-mail: *azh_ufp@hneu.edu.ua*

Introduction. Higher education management is the determining factor in the functioning and quality of higher education systems. At the same time, external governance involves the use of institutional mechanisms at the system level and includes national and higher education policies, central government, and funding mechanisms.

The challenges faced by European higher education require more flexible governance and funding systems which balance greater autonomy for education institutions with accountability to all stakeholders [1]. This thesis applies fully to the Ukrainian system of higher education, especially given the discrepancy between the current state of higher education governance and the priorities of its social development, as well as the discrepancy between the institutional autonomy declared in the Law of Ukraine «On Higher Education» and its real level. In particular, financial autonomy of higher educational institutions (HEIs) does not have practical application due to the norms of the Budget Code and the Law of Ukraine «On the Public Procurement».

The experience of foreign countries in the modernization of higher education governance should be taken into account in the domestic practice, especially in the context of Ukraine's integration into the European educational space. The answer to the question of how foreign experience of higher education reforms can be used in Ukraine will help domestic regulators to better understand the vectors of development of higher education governance and suggest possible solutions that can be useful for the Ukrainian higher education system.

Analysis of recent researches and publications. A significant contribution to the study of reforming higher education governance was carried out by contemporary domestic and foreign specialists: A. Avramović [2]; E. Bengoetxea [3]; N. V. Varghese and M. Martin [4, 5]; B. Jongbloed, H. de Boer, J. Enders, J. File [6]; V. S. Ponomarenko, K. A. Stryzhychenko [7]; O. V. Rayevnyeva, I. V. Aksonova, M. F. Goncharenko [8]; S. A. Kalashnikova, K. O. Zhdanova [9]; I. O. Mariuts [10]; O. M. Shelomovska [11], and others.

In work [2] the experience of governance reforms in higher education is considered using the example of European countries; in [3] differences in the governance reforms in higher education in European countries are examined, the contents of the main EU policy instruments in this area are disclosed, examples of projects aimed at improving institutional governance are presented; in [6] there given a description and comparison of reforms in higher education in European countries with the emphasis on such governance problems as autonomy and financing. Studies [4, 5] focus on institutional autonomy and the role it plays in governance in the context of increasing the effectiveness of a higher education system. S. A. Kalashnikova, K. O. Zhdanova identified the trends in the transformation of governance of modern universities in correspondence with the governance model in European countries [9], O. M. Shelomovska developed the conceptual framework for reforming higher education governance in Ukraine in accordance with the requirements of democratic governance [11].

At the same time, mechanisms for adapting foreign experience in reforming higher education to the domestic conditions have not been sufficiently developed.

The aim of the article is to summarize the international experience of reforming the system of higher education governance and develop directions that will contribute to increasing the effectiveness of the Ukrainian model for governance of higher education and ensuring its autonomy.

Presentation of basic material of the research. According to A. Avramović [2], the European reforms in higher education have three main common elements: 1) greater autonomy for educational institutions with less direct administrative intervention; 2) greater emphasis on personal rather than public funding; 3) emphasis on the quality and effectiveness of education.

At the initial stages of the process of reforming the higher education system in European countries, the New Public Management (NPM) model became popular. It is based on the style of management of the private sector, clear standards and performance measures, monitoring of the final results, greater competition, independence of units, practically directed professional management [2]. In the future, the NPM model was complemented by governance through networks and new forms of governance. Governance through networks is based on the fact that the modern public sector is too complex for hierarchical regulation. As indicated in [12], networks are becoming increasingly important, as the relationship between the various elements of society become more horizontal than vertical. Network governance is aimed at recognizing new actors in the public sector and understanding and managing this new complex relationship between the actors. Network governance is valuable because government control is characterized by too many participants and problems to be solved, therefore,

one government organization is unlikely to be able to independently determine and develop solutions for all issues and coordinate all interested stakeholders [13]. The transition from government to new forms of governance means that there is more than one sphere in society where the existence of institutions that have decision-making powers is possible. New forms of governance may involve the transfer of power to the upper level (for example, to international organizations), the lower level (the level of institutions) or the horizontal level (when independent or private organizations participate in governance).

The European Commission in its study of the governance reforms in higher education in Europe [14] identified the following main trends in this process: adoption of new legislation on higher education; development of quality assurance systems in accordance with the Bologna process benchmarks; increasing the autonomy of universities; change in the legal status of the higher education institution; new internal structures of governance; development of institutional strategies and implementation of multi-year agreements between universities and government agencies; improvement of the accountability mechanism; partnership with business; financial autonomy.

Increasing the autonomy of universities has become and still is the most significant trend in higher education governance in Europe. University autonomy, according to the Lisbon Declaration, is determined by four basic dimensions: financial autonomy, academic autonomy, organizational autonomy and staffing autonomy [15].

To illustrate the main reforms in the European education system, examples of Austria, Finland and the Netherlands are selected in the article. This is due to the fact that each of these countries made a little different way through the governance reforms in the system. Austria was chosen as an example of a country in which reforms began later, but it has moved much more in the changes than some other countries. Finland has implemented reforms in recent years following the basic principles of NPM. The Netherlands, on the contrary, started reforms earlier than others and became the continental European leader in reforming the higher education sector. Since in this work the reformation of the system of higher education governance is considered in terms of increasing the autonomy of universities, the above-mentioned countries were also chosen because of their predominantly «high» and «medium high» degree of institutional autonomy (Tbl. 1).

Table 1

Degree of institutional autonomy of countries selected as an example of reforming the European system of higher education governance in 2016

Country	Score, %			
	organizational autonomy	financial autonomy	staffing autonomy	academic autonomy
Austria	78	59	73	72
Finland	93	67	92	90
The Netherlands	69	77	73	48

Source: developed by the author based on [16]

Thus, the current degree of autonomy of Austrian universities is mainly provided by the second wave of reforms in its higher education. In 2002 the new University Organization and Studies Act was adopted. Its implementation began in 2004 (in 2009 it was amended). It introduced two important changes in external government and relations with the state: 1) declared that universities are independent legal entities within the framework of public law; 2) introduced lump-sum budgeting and performance indicators [17]. Less flexible line-item budgeting was canceled, and now universities receive 20 % of public funding based on the performance indicators. As a result of the implementation of the Act, the degree of organizational autonomy increased: Austrian universities were allowed to determine the internal structure, to have external members in the governing authorities. The degree of financial autonomy grew most — now universities have the right to create reserves, raise funds in the capital markets. Regarding staffing autonomy, changes occurred in terms of abolishing the status of civil servant for university employees. Universities have the right to hire staff and determine the amount of labor costs.

The law of 2002 introduced many changes in the structure of internal management of state universities. First, it granted the rights of the supervisory authority to the council of the university. Half of the members of the council are now elected by the university senate, and the government appoints the other half. The last member of the council is discussed by the senate and the government. The council received a significant decision-making authority. For example, it selects the university rector, approves agreements between the university and the government, approves strategic and organizational plans. In addition, the position of the rector of the university is being strengthened. His functions more resemble those of a CEO, with greater executive duties and the ability to hire and fire university employees. The rector and vice-rector form the rectorate — the highest governing body and the official representative of the university. It prepares the university's charter, development plan, draft agreements, appoints heads of organizational units. The senate of the University is mainly engaged in academic affairs, but has some power in making decisions [17].

In Finland regulation of higher education is carried out on the basis of two main normative documents: the Universities Act of 2009 and the Law on Polytechnic of 2014. The Universities Act changed the system of higher education from direct state control to evaluation and governance. The first important innovation was that universities became independent legal entities. Also, the Universities Act significantly increased the institutional autonomy of universities, including financial autonomy. The formula for funding Finnish universities is based on such performance indicators as the number of graduates, amount of loans, research activities. Universities are allowed to borrow in the capital markets, but they still cannot intro-

duce tuition fees (excluding foreign students outside the EU). The state no longer guarantees the solvency of universities, and in this respect HEIs bear additional responsibility. One of the latest innovations in their financial autonomy is the ability to create reserves. However, as a consequence of the growth of financial freedom, the responsibility of HEIs has also increased. Performance agreements are signed with the ministry, and universities should consider the development plan of the ministry when developing their strategies. The Center for Educational Evaluation conducts an audit of the entire system of higher education. In addition, the management of universities was transformed due to the mandatory presence of external members in the governing structures.

There also observed an increase in other autonomy dimensions. Thus, the organizational autonomy of HEIs has strengthened due to their ability to decide on the internal academic structures and inclusion of external stakeholders in the decision-making bodies (40 % of the members of the university council should be external) [18]. As regards the staffing autonomy, universities today are hiring staff themselves, university employees have lost the status of civil servants. Universities also can independently set the level of staff salaries. The degree of academic autonomy of Finnish HEIs is somewhat higher than that of Austria's, since the former does not support a free access policy. HEIs can select students and set quotas, which facilitates the financial planning.

The Universities Act also introduced an additional restructuring of the internal government. The composition and role of university governing bodies, as well as the procedure for selecting the rector, were changed. The university council remained the main executive body of the university, its status was further strengthened. Some of the new tasks of the university council are: responsibility for governance; organization of control over the accounting system; making decisions on the number of students; selection of the rector [18]. The chairman of the university council is now elected from external members, the rector lost this function. Nevertheless, the rector also received new responsibilities — he is in charge of the day-to-day work of the university. The Act introduced a new collegial body, which has more limited functions than the previous one. It consists of fifty members from among full professors, employees, students, whose role is to supervise the council and represent the entire university community. The functions of the collegial body include the selection and dismissal of the members of the council, adoption of decisions on external members of the council, selection of the accountant, approval of the financial plan [18].

In the Netherlands the reform of higher education began earlier than in many European countries — the Law on Higher Education and Scientific Research, which still operates today, was adopted in 1993. The adoption of this law was only the first step of legislative reforms. The amendment to the Act of 1997, called the Modernizing University Act, ensured the further transformation of the Dutch higher education system. First, the role of the government changed — now its primary responsibility is to ensure the effective use of public resources and quality of educational services. It is also responsible for the effectiveness of the education system and ensuring its accessibility. As a result of the decrease in the role of the state, the university autonomy grew in all dimensions [2].

First, organizational autonomy increased, which is manifested in the fact that universities can independently solve many questions regarding executive management (the term of office of the rector and his necessary qualification), while the determination of academic structures and bodies that are responsible for decision-making is regulated by the Law. Secondly, financial autonomy has also increased. Universities receive state funding in the form of lump-sum budgeting and can decide on the internal distribution of these funds. They can also keep surplus from public funds and borrow funds in capital markets. Universities are the owners of their buildings, they can sell them on the market. They may charge tuition fee, but its amount is determined by the government. The degree of staffing autonomy of universities is also very high — they received the ability to hire their staff and determine the level of salaries. In the area of academic autonomy, though a certain improvement is observed, there still exist a lot of limitations. For example, the ministry plays a role in the development of academic programs paying attention to whether there is a need for a specific program. Finally, the Netherlands practice a free access system, and universities should enroll all qualified students applying.

In accordance with the Law on Higher Education and Scientific Research of the Netherlands, the main body that controls the activities of the University is the supervisory board. Members of the supervisory board are not employees of the university and are appointed by the government. Their main task is to appoint members of the executive board, approve the budget, annual reports and the strategic plan, and also supervise the quality system. Members of the supervisory board carry out this work on a voluntary basis, they do not work either in the Ministry or in any other state agency. They should work independently of any external or internal influences and ensure the development of the university in the right direction. The executive board is in charge of current university affairs, appoints deans, represents the university in the external environment and is directly accountable to the supervisory board. The executive board consists of three members, one of whom is the rector of the university. The third important stakeholder in the internal government is the council of the university, which acts as an advisory body and represents the interests of students, academic and non-academic staff. Students have 50 % seats in the council, and academicians and non-academic staff have the other half. The university council has lost most of its decision-making powers, the last of which is the approval of the university budget.

For the formation of vectors for reforming the system of the Ukrainian higher education, it is also useful to generalize the latest trends in the autonomization of HEIs of the countries discussed above (Tbl. 2).

As can be seen from the table, the last transformations of the university autonomy are mainly related to the financial aspects of the functioning of HEIs and provide for the reduction of the state influence.

Higher education reforms in terms of autonomy are also taking place in Asian countries (Tbl 3). The results of studies conducted in [4, 5] indicate that in less economically developed countries university autonomy focuses mainly on procedural issues, and in more developed countries it is reflected in all major areas.

Table 2

Changes in the university autonomy of the countries selected as an example of reforming the European system of higher education governance for 2010-2016

Country	Directions of changes
Austria	1) extension of restrictions on student number to more subject areas; 2) introduction of institutional accreditation arrangements from 2012; 3) new career paths for academic staff introduced from 2015; 4) simplification of part of the public funding received by universities through the 2012 reform introducing the «Higher Education Structural Funds»
Finland	1) new timeframe for funding projections and targets of HEIs in line with the Government planning period; 2) introduction of tuition fees for international students on Bachelor's and Master's programs taught in English from January 2016; 3) changes to ownership of university buildings with a move to greater university control of their buildings; 4) cuts in public funding and subsequent university job losses
The Netherlands	1) law on «Enhanced Governance Powers» passed in 2016 with increased student involvement in university governance; 2) new student funding system introduced in 2015; 3) «lighter» program accreditation introduced after 2015; 4) law regulating public sector salaries introduced in 2013

Source: developed by the author based on [19]

The general trend of increasing the autonomy of universities in both academic and administrative spheres is observed in all the countries under consideration/case study countries. Political orientation and traditions play an important role in the perception and implementation of autonomy. For example, in countries with an administrative economy, the state continues to exercise decision-making powers in higher education, and reduces the institutional autonomy. Countries with bureaucratic governance systems require more time to adapt to new forms of governance and management structures. In general, the reforms in terms of autonomy of universities were simple to implement in countries with strong traditions of collective decision-making.

Conclusions. The generalization of the directions for reforming higher education in the world has shown a tendency to increase in the level of institutional autonomy of HEIs, with financial autonomy growing most. European countries, whose experience was studied, abandoned the line-item budget for higher education and introduced lump-sum funding. This allowed the universities to allocate funds in accordance with their needs. The share of public funds for higher education is distributed on the basis of performance indicators. By introducing results-based funding, government agencies try to encourage universities to meet certain criteria to receive more from the state. This is a practical example of the concept of steering from a distance, according to which authorities are more interested in the results than in the input parameters. The main problem associated with this model of funding is the creation of adequate indicators of HEI performance.

Based on the foregoing, possible vectors for reforming the system of higher education governance in Ukraine are identified:

- the introduction of a model for financing HEIs by combining lump-sum budgeting and results-based funding. This will help both increase the autonomy of HEIs in making decisions on the internal distribution of funds, and the effectiveness of their activities, since the amount of financial resources provided by the state depends on it;
- recognition of the right of universities to own their buildings and sale them on the market;
- strengthening the decentralization of government control of higher education through the creation of advisory bodies to support the activities of the Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine;
- development of legislative bases for self-sufficiency of HEIs and activation of their entrepreneurial activity;
- inclusion of external stakeholders in decision-making bodies;
- maximum involvement of students in decision-making.

Further research is possible in the area of improving the financing models of Ukrainian universities and justifying a system of performance indicators, which will contribute to the growth of their financial autonomy.

LITERATURE

1. Supporting growth and jobs – an agenda for the modernization of Europe's higher education systems. Communication from the European Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions, Brussels, XXX. – COM (2011) 567/2. {SEC(2011) 1063}. 16 p. URL: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0567:FIN:EN:PDF.

2. Avramović A. Higher Education Governance Reforms in Europe and Serbia. Recommendations for the Way Froward // Master's Thesis for the completion of the Erasmus Mundus program, Master in Research and Innovation in Higher Education (MARIHE): Danube University Krems, 2016. 100 p.

3. Bengoetxea E. Higher Education Governance Reform in Practice. Matching Institutional Implementation Practices and Policies. *Universities and Knowledge Society Journal (RUSC)*. 2012. Vol. 9. No. 2. P. 267–279.

Table 3

Reforms in terms of increasing the autonomy of universities in Asia

Country	Legal and normative support for HEI autonomy	Organizational autonomy	Financial autonomy	Staffing autonomy	Academic autonomy
China	The Outline for Education Reform and Development (1993), the Higher Education Law (1998)	Universities acquired the status of independent legal entities; increased power for governing bodies; more autonomy for organizational structures	More autonomy in performance measures, allocation of block grants, incentives for generation of income of HEIs, more autonomy in the management of buildings and premises	More autonomy in recruitment of academic staff, setting staff salaries	Autonomy in creation of new academic programs, determination of research agenda
Viet Nam	The Education Law (2005), the Higher Education Reform Agenda (HERA) (2005), the Resolution on Fundamental and comprehensive renovation of Viet Nam higher education for 2006–2020, the Resolution on Innovation in Higher Education 2010–2012	Increased power for governing bodies and more autonomy for organizational structures	More autonomy in budget planning	More autonomy in recruitment of academic staff, setting staff salaries	Autonomy in creation of new academic programs
Cambodia	The Royal Decree on the Legal Status of Public Administrative Institutions (1997), the Royal Decree on Education Law (2007), Sub-Decree on University Establishment (2002), Brakas (circular) on Details Criteria on the Establishment of HEIs (2007)	HEIs acquired the status of public administrative institution; increased power for governing bodies; more autonomy for organizational structures	More autonomy in performance measures and allocation of funds generated from fee-paying students as the tuition fee and other services	More autonomy in setting staff salaries	Autonomy in determination of research agenda
Japan	The National University Corporation Law (2004)	HEIs acquired the status of national university corporations; more autonomy in selecting university leaders; external representatives are included to Board of directors; more autonomy for organizational structures	More autonomy in performance measures, allocation of block grants, competitive funding for teaching, and research	More autonomy in recruitment of academic staff, setting staff salaries	Autonomy in creation of new academic programs, determination of research agenda

Source: developed by the author based on [4, 5]

4. Governance reforms in higher education: A study of institutional autonomy in Asian countries/ed. by N. Varghese, M. Martin. International Institute for Educational Planning, 2014. 143 p.

5. Varghese N., Martin M. Governance reforms and university autonomy in Asia. International Institute for Educational Planning, 2013. 50 p.

6. Jongbloed B., Boer H. de, Enders J., File J. Progress in higher education reform across Europe Governance and Funding Reform. Executive Summary main report (Vol. 1). CHEPS, 2010. 156 p.

7. Ponomarenko V., Rayevnyeva O., Stryzhychenko K. Investigation of Demand and Stability of Ukrainian Educational Market. *Asian Journal of Applied Sciences*. 2015. Vol. 3. Issue 1. P. 50–58.

8. Раєвнєва О. В., Гончаренко М. Ф., Аксьонова І. В. Теоретико-методологічні основи формування ефективної системи вищої освіти. *Проблеми економіки.* 2013. № 3. С. 28–33.

9. Калашнікова С. А., Жданова К. О. Врядування у вищій освіті: сутність, виміри, тенденції. *Вища освіта України.* 2013. № 3 (дод. 2). С. 69–74.

10. Маріуц І. Реформування вищої освіти в Румунії: національні здобутки і перспективи для України. URL: http://www.edu-trends.info/romania-hereforms/

11. Шеломовська О. Реформування державного управління вищою освітою в Україні на основі європейського досвіду // Публічне адміністрування: теорія та практика. 2014. Вип. 1. URL: http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Patp_2014_1_15

12. Curry D. Trends for the Future of Public Sector Reform: a Critical Review of Future-Looking Research in Public Administration. Rotterdam, 2014. URL: http://www.cocops.eu/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/TrendsForTheFutureOfPublicSectorReform.pdf

13. Robinson M. From Old Public Administration to the New Public Service Implications for Public Sector Reform in Developing Countries. Singapore, 2015. URL: http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/capacity-building/global-centre-for-public-service-excellence/PS-Reform.html

14. Higher Education Governance in Europe. Policies, structure, funding and academic staff. Brussels: Eurydice, 2008. 147 p.

15. Lisbon Declaration (2007) Europe's Universities Beyond 2010: Diversity With A Common Purpose. URL: http://www.eua.be/fileadmin/user_upload/files/Lisbon_Convention/Lisbon_Declaration.pdf

16. Bennetot P., Estermann T. University Autonomy in Europe III. The Scorecard 2017 // European University Association, 2017. 76 p.

17. University Organisation and Studies Act. University Organisation and Studies Act (2002). Vienna: Federal Ministry of Education, Science and Culture. URL: https://www.uibk.ac.at/index/finanzabteilung/ug2002_englisch.pdf

18. Universities Act. Universities Act (2009). Helsinki: Parliament of Finland. URL: http://www.finlex.fi/en/laki/kaannokset/2009/en20090558.pdf

19. University Autonomy in Europe III. Country profiles // European University Association, 2017. 224 p.

REFERENCES

Avramovic, A. "Higher Education Governance Reforms in Europe and Serbia. Recommendations for the Way Froward": *Master's Thesis for the completion of the Erasmus Mundus program, Master in Research and Innovation in Higher Education (MARIHE): Danube University Krems*, 2016.

Bengoetxea, E. "Higher Education Governance Reform in Practice. Matching Institutional Implementation Practices and Policies" *Universities and Knowledge Society Journal (RUSC)* vol. 9, no. 2 (2012): 267-279.

Bennetot, P., and Estermann, T. *University Autonomy in Europe III. The Scorecard 2017* European University Association, 2017.

Curry, D. "Trends for the Future of Public Sector Reform: a Critical Review of Future-Looking Research in Public Administration" http://www.cocops.eu/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/TrendsForTheFutureOfPublicSectorReform.pdf

Governance reforms in higher education: A study of institutional autonomy in Asian countries International Institute for Educational Planning, 2014.

Higher Education Governance in Europe. Policies, structure, funding and academic staff Brussels: Eurydice, 2008.

Jongbloed, B. *Progress in higher education reform across Europe Governance and Funding Reform. Executive Summary main report*, vol. 1. CHEPS, 2010.

Kalashnikova, S. A., and Zhdanova, K. O. "Vriaduvannia u vyshchii osviti: sutnist, vymiry, tendentsii" [Governance in Higher Education: Essence, Measurements, Trends]. *Vyshcha osvita Ukrainy*, no. 3 (annex 2) (2013): 69-74.

"Lisbon Declaration (2007) Europe's Universities Beyond 2010: Diversity With A Common Purpose" http://www.eua.be/fileadmin/user_upload/files/Lisbon_Convention/Lisbon_Declaration.pdf

Mariuts, I. "Reformuvannia vyshchoi osvity v Rumunii: natsionalni zdobutky i perspektyvy dlia Ukrainy" [Reforming Higher Education in Romania: National Achievements and Prospects for Ukraine]. http://www.edu-trends.info/romania-hereforms/

Ponomarenko, V., Rayevnyeva, O., and Stryzhychenko, K. "Investigation of Demand and Stability of Ukrainian Educational Market" *Asian Journal of Applied Sciences* vol. 3, no. 1 (2015): 50-58.

Raievnieva, O. V., Honcharenko, M. F., and Aksyonova, I. V. "Teoretyko-metodolohichni osnovy formuvannia efektyvnoi systemy vyshchoi osvity" [Theoretical and methodological foundations of the formation of an effective system of higher education]. *Problemy ekonomiky*, no. 3 (2013): 28-33.

Robinson, M. "From Old Public Administration to the New Public Service Implications for Public Sector Reform in Developing Countries" http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/capacity-building/global-centre-for-public-service-excellence/PS-Reform.html

"Supporting growth and jobs - an agenda for the modernization of Europe's higher education systems. Communication from the European Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions, Brussels, XXX. - COM (2011) 567/2. {SEC (2011) 1063}. 16 p. " http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0567:FIN:EN:PDF

Shelomovska, O. "Reformuvannia derzhavnoho upravlinnia vyshchoiu osvitoiu v Ukraini na osnovi yevropeiskoho dosvidu" [Reforming the state administration of higher education in Ukraine on the basis of European experience]. Publichne administruvannia: teoriia ta praktyka. 2014. http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Patp_2014_1_15

"Universities Act. Universities Act (2009). Helsinki: Parliament of Finland" http://www.finlex.fi/en/laki/kaannokset/2009/en20090558.pdf

"University Organisation and Studies Act. University Organisation and Studies Act (2002). Vienna: Federal Ministry of Education, Science and Culture" https://www.uibk.ac.at/index/finanzabteilung/ug2002_englisch.pdf

University Autonomy in Europe III. Country profiles European University Association, 2017.

Varghese, N., and Martin, M. *Governance reforms and university autonomy in Asia* International Institute for Educational Planning, 2013.