REPORT BASED ON QUESTIONNAIRE ANALYSES

-CASE OF MONTENEGRO-

In total 12[1] questionnaires were filled in:
- 8 from University in Podgorica
- 2 from University Mediterranean in Podgorica
- 2 from Ministry of education and sport

There were representatives from Rectorate (2), Faculty of information technology (2), Faculty of business studies (1), Faculty of humanistic studies (1), Faculty of electrical engineering (1), Faculty of economic sciences (1), Faculty of international economics (1), Institute of marine biology (1) and 2 representatives from Ministry, from Department for higher education.

On a scale from 0 to 5, participants rated following <u>features of university</u> in a following way:

Features	M	SD	Support (%)*
1. Comprehensiveness	4.54	0.52	100.0
2. Autonomy	4.58	0.79	83.3
3. Being integrated	4.50	0.79	83.3
4. Quality of research and teaching	4.50	1.17	83.3
5. Right to award PhD degrees	4.73	0.46	100.0
6. Being non-profit	3.18	1.47	45.5
7. Responsiveness to social needs	4.25	0.87	75.0
8. Accessibility	4.00	0.85	83.3

*percent of rates 4 and 5 counted together

Most valued <u>principles</u> are:
- *The development of higher education should be informed by a strategic and long-term vision* (M = 5.00)
- *Governments, higher education institutions, students and other stakeholders throughout the Region should work together in partnership based upon mutual trust and confidence* (M = 4.91)
- *Academic freedom must be safeguarded* (M = 4.83)

---

[1] Sample size doesn't provide reliable results, so any kind of interpretation should be made with caution

The least valued principles are:

- *The role of the external authorities is to check that institutions are well-administered and are preserving the public interest, but in ways that do not damage autonomy and do not involve bureaucratic, paper-driven regulation* (M = 4.27)
- *A paradigm shift is needed from management by rules to the management by goals* (M = 4.33)

58.3% of participants believe that <u>autonomy</u> should be on both faculty and university level, whereas 33.3% believe it should be on university level, and 8.3% - on faculty level. Regarding <u>legal status</u>, 50.0% believe it should be associated to both university and faculty, 41.7% state it should be associated to university, while 8.3% - to faculty.

Regarding the <u>functions</u> that should be assigned to University, Faculty or both, participants responded in following way:

Functions	*Percentages*		
	University	*Faculty*	*Both*
1. Enrolling students	33.3	33.3	33.3
2. Employing staff	33.3	16.7	50.0
3. Deciding on the content of study programmes	/	16.7	83.3
4. Issuing diplomas/degrees	58.3	/	41.7
5. Negotiating with government for funding	83.3	/	16.7
6. Having development fund	33.3	8.4	58.3
7. Having international relations office	41.7	/	58.3
8. Having quality assurance office	58.3	/	41.7
9. Having student support services	41.7		58.3
10. Having information system	41.7	8.3	50.0
11. Having students organizations	41.7	8.3	50.0

In the following table it could be observed that participants value much more efficiency and comprehensiveness of university information system than administrative staff having the highest educational levels. Discrepancy between desired and current situation is not high.

	Mean	Std. Deviation
Importance that key members of university administrative staff have MA/PhD in relevant areas	3.83	0.58
Level of satisfaction with university administrative staff	3.33	1.07
Importance that university has an efficient and comprehensive information system	4.92	0.29
Level of satisfaction with university information system	4.09	0.83

58.3% of participant would opt for information system that is part of coupled network of HE.

Regarding non-state own income that should be allowed to university, participants answered affirmatively for:

- tuition fees – 83.3.%

- administrative fees – 33.3%

- consultancy fees – 100.0%

- earnings from their own assets – 66.7%

- interest from financial investments – 33.3%

- donations – 100.0%

- publishing – 91.7%

- commissioned projects – 83.3%

- other party funding – 33.3%

In the following table results regarding importance of FEATURES of an INTEGRATED university are presented:

Features	M	SD	Support (%)
1. To have central information system	4.50	1.45	91.7
2. To have central services	4.41	0.90	91.7
3. University being only legal entity	3.42	2.15	66.7

	M	SD	Support (%)
4.Rector being appointed by advert and having full power	3.83	1.19	66.7
5. Deans being appointed by rector	3.50	1.24	50.0
6. AS being well qualified and competent	4.92	0.29	100.0
7. AS playing important role in decision making	3.33	0.65	41.7
8. Students unions - single university legal entity	4.17	0.83	75.0
9. Students services - part of central university services	4.25	0.86	91.7
10. Central management with the recourses	4.17	0.94	83.4

.

Concerning advantages/disadvantages of integrated university, 45.5% of participants see some disadvantages, whereas 27.3 don't perceive them or "don't care".

On the scale of 0 to 5, majority of participants rated the level of universities in their countries being integrated with 3 (66.7%), followed by 25.0% who rated it with 5, and 8.3% with 4.

Importance of listed FEATURES of university AUTONOMY:

Features	M	SD	Support (%)
1. Right to restructure themselves internally as they see fit	4.67	0.49	100.0
2. Right to negotiate common positions, projects and programmes with sister institutions, nationally and internationally.	4.67	0.49	100.0
3. Right to employ their own staff	4.75	0.45	100.0
4. Right to vary salary scales and similar remuneration according to institutional needs	4.00	0.95	58.4
5. Right to retain earnings from their own assets or from donations	4.83	0.39	100.0
6. Right to have predictable long term funding framework with multi-year financial planning	4.91	0.29	100.0
7. Right to set up holding companies (alone or with external partners	4.17	1.03	75.0
8. Right to have diversified funding and particularly access to private funding	4.50	0.80	83.4
9. Right to have budgetary autonomy	4.67	0.65	91.7

10. Right to have ownership autonomy	4.58	0.79	83.3
11. Right to have access to private funding	4.25	1.05	75.0
12. Right to withdraw from the state status if they want to	3.75	1.21	50.0
13. Right to define their own strategic and long-term vision	4.75	0.62	91.6
14. Right to respond effectively to increasing domestic and international competition	4.91	0.29	100.0
15. Right to decide about curricula	4.75	0.45	100.0
16. Right to decide about research subjects	4.75	0.45	100.0

Concerning the appointment of university leadership, members of university boards and staff, the participants' preferences are:
- rector should be appointed by board of directors for a fixed term (50.0%)
- deans/heads of departments should be elected from and within local staff (58.3%)
- university personnel should be hired by a body appointed by rector/dean (83.3%)
- posts and tenures in the university should come under legislation on labor contracts (75.0%)
- the board of trustee/governors should be chaired by an external member (50.0%)

Out of 12, 6 participants (50%) stated they are familiar with the concept of buffer bodies, whereas 50.0% stated they have not heard for this concept before. In the table evaluated functions of buffer bodies are presented:

Buffer bodies could	*M*	*SD*	*Support (%)*
Provide detailed steering of HE system, broad policy framework	3.62	0.74	50.0
Facilitate strategic development of the HE sector	3.75	0.89	50.0
Encourage long term strategic planning of the HE system	4.00	0.76	75.0
Promote subsidiary and allow long-term considerations to inform decisions	3.75	0.46	75.0
Safeguard and promote university autonomy	3.87	0.83	62.5
Provide for a separation of functions	4.00	0.53	87.5
Safeguard, help promote and improve academic standards	4.50	0.76	87.5

Limit bureaucratic control and micro management	3.87	0.83	62.5
Limit direct political involvement in HEIs	4.25	1.03	62.5

Almost all the participants believe that regional cooperation offers possibilities for further professionalization and could enhance internal structural reform, as well as that „creation of various and simultaneous cross-border institutionalized frameworks for regional cooperation could help in further convergence to EHEA".

Majority of the participants believes that private HEIs are typical for all the countries (50%), whereas 16.7% believe they are common in Southeast European countries. Regarding interior organization of private university, it should be decided by the law (63.6%) or the owner (27.3%).

The highest level of trust participants have toward not-for-profit universities (M = 3.91), then state universities (M = 3.82), and for-profit universities (M = 2.55). Half of the participants expressed preference for university of excellence (50.0%), 33% for not-for-profit university and 16.7% for state university.

All the participants believe that the title/name of university should be legally protected.

Regarding the concept Foundation-owned university, 66.7% of the participants stated that they knew what that concepts stand for.

Regarding certificates that could provide more confidence concerning the quality of HEI, majority of participants would opt for international accreditation certificate (90.9%). All participants would support usage of rankings oh HEIs for helping to decide how to allocate financial resources.