



THEORETICAL ASSUMPTIONS TO ANALYZE PUBLIC GOVERNANCE IN HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS

Nicolas Rufino dos Santos¹

Rafael Pereira Ocampo Moré²

summary

This theoretical essay aims to summarize guiding theoretical assumptions for analyzing public governance in higher education institutions. For this, it was necessary to reference the main national and international publications on university governance and structure three dimensions of analysis: accountability; knowledge management and local and regional development. A concept of university governance was delimited and three theoretical assumptions were systematized to observe governance in higher education institutions. As a result, it is concluded that higher education institutions are more involved under the economic dictates of New Public Management and Neoliberalism; that the growing public management technologies have profoundly impacted the perception and structuring of governance in HEIs; what, if, on the one hand, universities enjoy greater financial, managerial and administrative autonomy, on the other hand, they are exposed to more rigorous control systems, also implying a greater framework of responsibilities; and finally, that there is a greater complexity of the university's activities but, on the other hand, a sustainable and efficient governance structure that can contribute to the heterogeneity of the university's institutional activities. The theoretical contribution of this study is to advance the discussion on university governance in the context of higher education institutions, an aspect that contributes to a transparent, democratic and innovative university management, and which sees the citizen as the protagonist of political processes. on the other hand, they are exposed to more rigorous control systems, also implying a greater framework of responsibilities; and finally, that there is a greater complexity of the university's activities but, on the other hand, a sustainable and efficient governance structure that can contribute to the heterogeneity of the university's institutional activities. The theoretical contribution of this study is to advance the discussion on university governance in the context of higher education institutions, an aspect that contributes to a transparent, democratic and innovative university management, and which sees the citizen as the protagonist of political processes. on the other hand, they are exposed to more rigorous control systems, also implying a greater framework of responsibilities; and finally, that there is a greater complexity of the university's activities but, on the other hand, a sustainable and efficient governance structure that can contribute to the heterogeneity of the university's institutional activities. The theoretical contribution of this study is to advance the discussion on university governance in the context of higher education institutions, an aspect that contributes to a transparent, democratic and innovative university management, and which

¹ nicolasrufino4@gmail.com - Master of the Graduate Program in University Administration at the Federal University of Santa Catarina - ORCID 0000-0001-9628-2599 - <http://lattes.cnpq.br/6403932280635465>

² rafamore@gmail.com - Professor of the Graduate Program in University Administration at the Federal University of Santa Catarina - ORCID 0000-0001-8841-2920 - <http://lattes.cnpq.br/4907351560496072>
Santos, NF, Moré, RPO; Theoretical assumptions for analyzing public governance in higher education institutions. Magazine of Entrepreneurship and Management of Micro and Small Enterprises V.5, N°2, p.216-244, Mai / Aug. 2020. Article received on 8/10/2020. Last version received in 08/25/2020. Approved on 25/08/2020.

Theoretical assumptions for analyzing public governance in higher education institutions.

sees the citizen as the protagonist of political processes. that there is a greater complexity of the university's activities but, on the other hand, a sustainable and efficient governance structure that can contribute to the heterogeneity of the university's institutional activities. The theoretical contribution of this study is to advance the discussion on university governance in the context of higher education institutions, an aspect that contributes to a transparent, democratic and innovative university management, and which sees the citizen as the protagonist of political processes. that there is a greater complexity of the university's activities but, on the other hand, a sustainable and efficient governance structure that can contribute to the heterogeneity of the university's institutional activities. The theoretical contribution of this study is to advance the discussion on university governance in the context of higher education institutions, an aspect that contributes to a transparent, democratic and innovative university management, and which sees the citizen as the protagonist of political processes.

Key words: Public Governance; University; Accountability; Knowledge management.

1 INTRODUCTION

The Brazilian Public Administration, composed of a set of agents, institutions, mechanisms and resources available for the State to satisfy the collective interest, is in a dilemma: despite the advances achieved by Brazil in the last decades due to the promulgation of the Federal Constitution of 1988 and the consolidation of the democratic regime, its role in the face of society in the 21st century has been rethought and questioned, given the growing demands presented by society with regard to the reassessment of more efficient and effective forms of public management.

There is a growing need to rethink the role of the State and its relationship with 21st century society, a society composed of multiple actors that coexist in the same public arena and that demand mechanisms capable of designing solutions to complex problems. In this way, the need to equip the State with a management model that is the result of collective development and that enables a new relationship with society is evident (DIAS and CARIO, 2014).

Among the fundamental institutions for the functioning of society are universities, a set of institutions originating in the 11th century responsible for the transmission of knowledge, for the process of formation and which are essential today, since they both reveal their responsibility towards society as well as present as a fundamental institution for the functioning of the democratic regime (CHAUÍ, 2003). Universities are not only constituted as an operational organization turned to itself as a management structure, but as a complex social institution composed of a plurality of

Theoretical assumptions for analyzing public governance in higher education institutions.

social actors capable of unleashing political, economic and social transformations in a region.

Universities bear the responsibility to rethink their role in the face of 21st century society: their challenge is to interpret the transformations and growing demands of contemporary society (RIBEIRO, 2014). These demands come from recommendations of national bodies, such as the Federal Court of Accounts - TCU, and international ones, such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund - IMF, both of which have a common characteristic: the emergency so that organizations constitute management models that enhance the ability to articulate with other structures.

It is a series of challenges with regard to the development of innovative political-administrative mechanisms in the university context, which requires both management practices that transcend traditional mechanistic structures and a paradigm shift about daily management practices in relation to the exercise of power.

To face these challenges, two components can be identified. The first of these is the university manager, who has the role of stimulating changes in the university through the development of strategies that promote efficiency, transparency, responsiveness and citizen participation during the cycle of public policy in Higher Education. This set of actions, if properly applicable, will result not only in efficiency, which is also essential, but in the joint construction of a relationship of trust and cooperation between citizens and the State, contributing to the consolidation of the participatory character in university public management.

As a second component we have public governance, defined by Heidemann and Kissler (2006) as a change in political management, taking care of a new arrangement of forms of management that are parallel hierarchy and the market, based on abstract elements, such as negotiation, communication, trust, alliances and agreements that are expressed through physical representation of a political will for networking. It is understood that public governance is a fundamental instrument regarding the shared exercise of power, since it is a movement that transcends the traditional way of society relating to the State, in which the State itself is the means, and not the end in the relational process (DIAS, 2012).

The growing challenges of articulating actions to make public services more efficient and effective, of promoting transparency and accountability and of improving communication mechanisms in university decision-making bodies open the following

Theoretical assumptions for analyzing public governance in higher education institutions.

question: what are the basic implications for analyzing the phenomenon of governance education in a higher education institution?

Based on this brief contextualization, the objective of this study is to summarize the guiding theoretical principles for analyzing public governance in higher education institutions.

The justification for carrying out this essay is shown by the opportunity to understand how the phenomenon of public governance and the university are interrelated and how the theme has been discussed in different national and international studies. It is intended to contribute, from the mapping and analysis of the main scientific publications related to the subject, with the development of theoretical assumptions for thinking about public governance in higher education institutions, so that, in later studies, efficiency, accountability, control and social dynamics in university management, focusing on the citizen as the protagonist of political decisions.

2 PUBLIC GOVERNANCE IN HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS

Although still inconclusive, but in a process of maturation, the development of administrative science did not happen through a single vision, a single thinker, not even on a single occasion, but since the advent of fragmented and heterogeneous groups that sought to respond to organizational needs in different regions of the world. In this sense, the grouping, whether from historical, ideological and epistemological, was not only responsible for the diffusion of administrative science, but offered conditions for it to develop (LOSCHACK; CHEVALLIER, 1980).

Administrative science seeks to cover various types of organizations, such as churches, hospitals and prisons, and constitutes a social science still in gestation. Your development takes place slowly, and places the particularities of each organization, but the characteristics common to all of them (LOSCHACK; CHEVALLIER, 1980). In addition, the authors themselves show the heterogeneous character of administrative science, since it falls so much in relation to different problems, but also those same problematic are seen with different interpretations.

This caveat about the heterogeneity of management science is justified in reason for this scientific work to be based, among other means, on concepts studied by different fields of science - such as law, political science and history. Not only in

Theoretical assumptions for analyzing public governance in higher education institutions.

regards Public Governance, the central object of this study, but as concepts considered essential to study the public sphere in general.

Target of diverse understandings and applications, and although it does not appear in an area of knowledge, but in different ones, the concept of public governance is not one, but multidimensional. Being able to be synonymous with several phenomena, public governance manifests itself in the most diverse areas of knowledge, such as international relations, development theories, private administration, political sciences and public administration (SECCHI, 2009; DIAS; CARIO, 2014).

Different authors conceive different ways in which public governance emerged. For Secchi (2009), governance first appeared from the 17th century onwards, marked by the decline of the current state model of international relations, so that the establishment of horizontal collaboration mechanisms between state and non-state actors for the solution of public problems³, such as terrorism and drug trafficking. Regardless of the conceptual conflict over the way in which governance emerged in the scientific field of international relations, it is certain that its demands and effects have been enhanced by increasing the demand for new patterns of world economic relations (DIAS; CARIO, 2014).

The World Bank, in the document *Governance and Development*, defines public governance as the exercise of authority, control, administration, and government power. It refers to the way in which power is exercised in the administration with the aim of developing a national territory. In this sense, the concept of public governance transits the capacity of governments to plan, formulate and implement public policies. The report also demonstrates that public policies must take into account the factors of power distribution in the negotiation and bargaining process, informal elements present in the institutions and that are determinant in the success or failure of the implementation of the policies. For the World Bank, governance is the process by which state and non-state actors interact to design and implement public policies within a given set of informal rules that shape and are shaped by the exercise of power.

³The public problem is the difference between the current situation and an ideal situation possible for the public reality. For the problem to be considered "public", there must be a set of consequences relevant to the quantity or quality of individuals, a variable that depends on certain interpretations by the public policy maker (SECCHI, 2013).

Theoretical assumptions for analyzing public governance in higher education institutions.

Thus, depending on the context, state actors will play a greater or lesser role than non-state actors, such as civil society organizations or business lobbying.

Denhardt and Denhardt (2015) define Public Governance as:

Governance can be defined as the traditions, institutions and processes that determine the exercise of power in society, including how decisions are made about issues of public interest and how citizens are able to have a say in decisions public. Governance is about how society actually makes choices, allocates resources and creates shared values; addresses corporate decision-making and content creation in the public sphere (DENHARDT; DENHARDT, 2015, p. 134).

In turn, Ronconi (2011) conceptualizes Public Governance as:

A type of institutional governmental arrangement that, by articulating the economic-financial, institutional-administrative and socio-political dimensions and establishing partnerships with civil society and the market, seeks innovative solutions to social problems and the deepening of democracy. (RONCONI, 2011, p. 22).

For Bliacheriene (2013) public governance is seen as a management process that favors serving citizens rather than transforming them into customers, a characteristic that requires certain circumstances for its consolidation: social participation in decision-making, enforcement and policy control stages public; legitimacy of the exercise of power; and accountability.

For Heidemman and Kissler (2006) governance public it is constituted from the prioritization of certain abstract elements, such as cooperation, negotiation, communication, trust, alliances and agreements, in which they are expressed through the physical representation of a political will to articulate in a network from the articulation new forms of engagement between citizens and the state.

Governance requires public review mechanisms the current model of State action in solving public problems, so that a less hierarchical and bureaucratic and more decentralized model is developed for the delivery of public services. In this way, governance public it is attentive to raise the importance of participatory deliberation mechanisms for the solution of public problems, so that it constitutes a new way of enhancing the capacities of the State to articulate with society itself (SECCHI, 2009; DIAS; CARIO, 2014) .

The concept of public governance requires a breakdown in certain analytical structures: administrative, political, economic, social, environmental and legal, in such

Theoretical assumptions for analyzing public governance in higher education institutions.

a way that there is a search for consensus in ensuring that the results intended by the interested parties are defined and achieved.

Public governance refers to the system that conditions the management of an organization, covering formal and informal dimensions, in addition to determining the balance of power between those involved - citizens, elected representatives (governors), senior management, managers and employees - with a view to allow the common good to prevail over the interests of people or groups (MATIAS-PEREIRA, 2010).

When analyzed from the perspective of public policies, governance public acquires a new dimension in its definition. The Federal Court of Accounts, through the Reference Framework for the Evaluation of Governance in Public Policies (TCU, 2018, p. 32), defines governance as:

A set of institutional arrangements that condition the way in which policies are formulated, implemented and evaluated, for the benefit of society. These institutional arrangements are based on the structures, processes, mechanisms, principles, rules and norms defined by the organization and which influence governance in public policy (TCU, 2018, p. 32).

TCU (2018) defines governance as a system by which organizations are directed, monitored and encouraged, involving the relationships between society, senior management, employees or employees and control bodies. The body, furthermore, defines the functions of governance. They are: (a) defining the strategic direction; (b) supervising management; (c) involve stakeholders; (d) manage strategic risks; (e) manage internal conflicts; (f) audit and evaluate the management and control system; and (g) promoting accountability and transparency.

According to Alcântara, Pereira and Silva (2015) public governance is seen as a management model capable of surpassing the managerial public administration model. However, Dias and Cario (2014) propose a new perspective: public governance as a movement, given the theoretical-conceptual immaturity in its assumptions:

(...) we recognize that public governance is still immature to be considered a new model of public administration. For showing signs of being a trend, however, it is still worth recognizing only as a movement, since its debate points to assumptions that are still maturing, trying to avoid, in this way, that its adoption will support another purely theoretical and aesthetic (DIAS E CARIO, 2014, p. 93).

Theoretical assumptions for analyzing public governance in higher education institutions.

Dias and Cario (2014) do not recognize public governance as a management model, but as a movement, given that the discussions on the subject are recent. For the authors, public governance focuses on involving the public in the construction of the development strategy between the State and society, using democratic mechanisms to implement solutions to the current growing demands.

For Dias (2012), this is a movement, and not a management model, which presents itself at different levels and scales of power, from international bodies to community associations, creating a complex network of relations between social actors

Therefore, Dias and Cario (2014) propose a set of characteristics that characterize the change from government to governance:

Figure 01: matrix of elements that characterize the genesis of the change movement for Public Governance.

Elements of Public Governance	
E1	Co-production of development through cooperation between the State, the market and civil society.
E2	State coordination of the cooperation process, with the State acting as a mediator of relations.
E3	Delegation of state authority in three directions: downward, outward and upward, recognizing the potential and encouraging the role of networks.
E4	Emphasis on efficiency and effectiveness associating them with mechanisms of deliberative democracy and direct democracy in the search for responsive results.
E5	Development planning based on equity criteria.

Source: Dias and Cario (2014).

Bonavides (2000) states that:

the forms of government are constituted as the organization and functioning of the state power, according to certain criteria adopted to determine its nature. They are: (a) the number of holders of sovereign power; b) the separation of powers, with strict establishment or fixation of their respective relationships; (c) the essential principles that animate the government and consequent limited exercise or state power. (BONAVIDES, 2000, P. 247).

Dallari (2005) states that the concept of government is of such importance that the author considers it as the nucleus of the idea of a Democratic State.

Theoretical assumptions for analyzing public governance in higher education institutions.

The theoretical and conceptual differences exposed here reveal, therefore, that public governance differs from the concept of government, since it is no longer sufficient to face the complex issues of contemporary public management. Consequently, the efficiency of public policies increasingly requires mechanisms for joint articulation between public and private actors in the process of coordination and cooperation.

2.2 The Requirement of Governance Mechanisms in Public Organizations

The World Bank, through the World Development Report: Governance and the Law (2017), maintains that there are frequent situations in which governments are unable to formulate public policies that are capable of achieving an acceptable level of economic development, and a one of the reasons why policies fail is governance. The report states that history is replete with examples of societies that have improved their norms, institutions and mechanisms to achieve the objectives proposed by public development policies.

Public policies are built within certain political and social contexts, and one of the reasons why they fail is that individuals and groups with unequal power interact within the public arena from rules that change as they seek achieve conflicting interests. It should be noted that power, of course, has always been distributed unevenly in societies, and that asymmetric occurrences of power do not necessarily mean harmful relationships. Putting governance at the center of the development debate is, therefore, indispensable to promote sustained economic growth and encourage more equitable and peaceful societies (BANCO MUNDIAL, 2017).

The public policy negotiation arena, called by Dias and Cario (2014) as spaces of articulation in which diverse interests coexist and are engaged in the formation of an agenda for society, take different forms:

From formal arenas (parliaments, courts, intergovernmental organizations, government agencies), through traditional arenas (councils of elders) to more informal arenas (backroom agreements, networks of influence or clubs of long-standing acquaintances) (BANCO MUNDIAL, 2017, p. 1).

Consequently, the actors who articulate and participate in decision-making bodies are of crucial importance, since this determines not only the success of the selection and implementation of policies, but also their impacts on development (BANCO MUNDIAL, 2017).

Theoretical assumptions for analyzing public governance in higher education institutions.

The World Bank itself, in the document "Governance and Development", reinforces this idea, stating that, on the one hand, global growth and productivity are in a process of deceleration, on the other hand, an increase in demands for improving services, infrastructure and institutions has been identified. However, given the scarcity of resources for the provision of such services, institutions are required to analyze the processes and mechanisms of articulation between state and private actors for the implementation of public policies. Thus, the document concludes that it is essential to place governance at the center of development policies.

For Secchi (2009), good governance consists of the combination of a set of good public management practices that are required and promoted by international institutions, such as the IMF and the World Bank. Such practices are seen by these institutions not only as fundamental, but as "[...] requirements for developing countries to receive economic resources and technical support" (SECCHI, 2009, p. 358).

Decree No. 9,203, published by the Federal Government on November 22, 2017, which provides for the governance policy for the direct, autonomous and foundational federal public administration and establishes the concept of public governance, in addition to establishing principles, guidelines and mechanisms for its exercise. The rule also establishes that the bodies and entities that are part of the direct, autarchic and foundational federal public administration must implement the public governance policy, in order to incorporate the principles and guidelines defined thereand recommendations from manuals, guides and resolutions.

After analyzing its concepts and its importance today, it is observed that governance as a viable alternative for institutions, in which it presents itself at different levels and scales of power, from international bodies to community associations, creating a complex network of actors social.

3 DIMENSIONS OF UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE

Universities are complex systems that have deficiencies in their articulations with other structures (STEFANO, 2016; SARTORI et al, 2016). In view of this context of increasing challenges regarding the incorporation of governance mechanisms in Higher Education Institutions, it is necessary to summarize a set of theoretical assumptions so that later recommendations on the construction of governance policies for each HEI may be proposed. These theoretical assumptions are fundamental, since

they assist us in the process of analyzing possible existences and absences of governance mechanisms in Brazilian HEIs.

However, it is necessary to develop an outline of the concept of public governance that is applicable to HEIs. Governance in higher education institutions, also called university governance, is understood here as a system of principles, strategies, and mechanisms, covering the formal and informal aspects of the institution, situating the balance of powers of the actors that articulate in the public arena in the central axis of the elaboration and execution of public higher education policies.

The concept of higher education institution presupposes dialogue between political actors in the public arena. The core of the university structure is linked to essential elements of governance. This is because the exercise of governance in HEIs is predicted by the fact that higher education institutions enjoy administrative, didactic-scientific and financial autonomy.

However, the application of governance within these institutions is difficult, as higher education institutions are large, complex and heterogeneous in their structure. The number and typology of actors is wide, therefore, there are several interests to be analyzed to solve the problems of public higher education policies promptly.

Foletto and Tavares (2013) summarize the necessary dimensions that a university governance structure must cover. There are prisms that the university manager must consider in the process of building a governance policy in a higher education institution:

Figure 02: Dimensions of a university governance structure.



Source: Foletto e Tavares (2013) (adapted).

The first dimension refers to the decision-making process in university management. Second authors, participation must take place through representative collegiate bodies, decentralized. The structuring of the university decision-making process must balance a series elements, including power, responsibility and risk management (FOLLETO and TAVARES, 2013).

University autonomy, according to the authors, appears as a consequence of the mission from university to society, that is, as "the essence of fulfilling the mission and the transparency with which management needs to demonstrate "(FOLETTTO and TAVARES, 2013, p. 160).

The dimensions "university autonomy" and "political dimension of the university" have direct relationship with each other. While the political dimension of the university refers to a set of historical characteristics that require special attention, and that differentiate the university from other organizations in the public sphere.

Institutional performance, contrary to what one might think, is not limited to the mere search for efficiency in the university, but covers the need for society to observe that the services provided by the university in fact meet its real demands. This dimension is related to qualitative and quantitative indicators, considering that

Theoretical assumptions for analyzing public governance in higher education institutions.

"university governance must also be guided by presenting numbers that demonstrate the dimension of its management". (FOLETTTO and TAVARES, 2013, p. 161).

The so-called "institutional and social control" relates to some principles mentioned in this chapter, such as accountability, that is, it is up to the university to appreciate the responsibilities to the university community, composed of "managers, collaborators, teachers, students, people from society that will be part of the various institutional bodies that will show the diversity of these agents "(FOLETTTO and TAVARES, 2013, p. 150). It is a dimension that transcends transparency in management, and reaches the responsibility of the actors in the exercise of university management acts.

Financing is also a dimension of governance university, and refers to the university's need to use different means of financing or partnerships that can financially supply public services that meet the demands of the public interest, including "the less favored classes without this impacting the economic balance -financial that the institution needs to demonstrate, including to meet the tenth dimension of the SINAES Law "(FOLETTTO and TAVARES, 2013, p. 150).

This dimension dialogues with the long-term perspective, which concerns the university administrative activities and risk management aimed at medium and long term, based on planning involving university governance. These dimensions are related to inseparability, that is, "the harmony of work between the academic and administrative areas" (FOLETTTO and TAVARES, 2013, p. 160).

It is, therefore, about the synchronism between two major areas of the university, "after all, the academic is the end of a certain major institutional objective; however, this object cannot be reached without administrative health and processes" (FOLETTTO and TAVARES, 2013, p. 150).

The penultimate dimension, entitled "difference and diversity", dialogues directly with the democratic molds involved in the university. According to Foletto and Tavares (2013), it is up to university managers to recognize that the actors that make up the university community will often have different thoughts and opinions about the same object.

Therefore, "the university is a locus of conflict, since the production of knowledge requires the cultivation of ideas that transmit between doubt and dogma" (FOLETTTO and TAVARES, 2013, p. 150). It is up to the manager, therefore, to develop the ability to solve problems arising from organizational conflicts.

Theoretical assumptions for analyzing public governance in higher education institutions.

The training of university managers is the last and most complex dimension proposed by Foletto and Tavares (2013) and is linked to the previous dimension, as it is attentive to the emergence of constant development of individuals who are able to guide the university in a direction based on good practices, "from the members of the board of directors to even the academic and administrative leaders who understand the university life and have academic and scientific competence" (FOLETTTO and TAVARES, 2013, p. 163). These competencies also include capacities for political articulation and social skills to achieve the goals of university governance.

Finally, Foletto and Tavares (2013) state that university governance should not be constituted in isolation, but as a component of the high strategy of university management.

4 GUIDING THEORETICAL ASSUMPTIONS FOR ANALYSIS OF PUBLIC GOVERNANCE IN HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS

This framework is presented as a set of theoretical contributions to deepen the discussion on governance in higher education institutions, in order to identify the essential implications of current studies involving governance at the university expressed by different areas of knowledge. Consequently, national and international publications defined for analysis were selected based on their representativeness in their respective scientific fields.

The guiding theoretical assumptions presented in this paper seek to investigate the phenomenon of governance in higher education institutions from three dimensions of analysis: (a) university governance and accountability; (b) university governance and its impacts on knowledge management; (c) and university governance as to its role in local and regional development.

The theoretical-conceptual assumptions seek to answer the following question: to what extent is university governance related to these three dimensions of analysis?

3.1. The Requirements for Accountability Mechanisms in the Governance Structures of Higher Education Institutions

Theoretical assumptions for analyzing public governance in higher education institutions.

Shore (2008), in his study "Culture of Audit and Illiberal Governance: Universities and the Policy of Accountability" assesses certain economic and social phenomena and their effects on contemporary British universities since 1990, in addition to analyzing new governance mechanisms that are being built from the perspective of auditing and accountability systems in UK universities, resulting in the advent of a concept called "audit culture".

The term "audit culture" has recently emerged and does not seek to designate a society, but a "condition shaped by the use of modern financial auditing techniques and principles, but in very distant contexts from the world of financial accounting" (SHORE, 2008, p. 27). Accounting techniques, such as "benchmarking" and "performance indicators", which used to be details in the workplace, have now reached a new level in the intra-organizational activities of public administration, becoming "a central organizing principle of governance and human conduct" , which creates new types of relationships, habits and social practices "(SHORE, 2008 p 27).

The term "audit" first appeared in accounting and soon expanded to several areas of knowledge, and today there are "environmental audits", "waste management audits", among others, an aspect that impacts several public organizations, which include public universities. It means that the audit is not a simple technique, but an idea, a process, a set of management techniques. According to Shore (2008, p. 29), "audits are being used to measure and monitor virtually all aspects of social and professional life". The culture of auditing, then, serves to increase transparency and accountability, and universities , for having undergone reforms after the 1990s, are targets of this context.

Audits, as well as performance indicators, management by goals and periodic reviews of teaching quality, are technologies that contribute to the expansion of new methods of public management in the governance of universities.

Shore (2008) places universities within a context in which neoliberalism is mixed with the characteristic tools of New Public Management, which are increasingly used in public organizations:

In the UK today, more than 600,000 corporations, in addition to hospitals, universities, local authorities, pension funds, schools, unions, housing associations and charities, need to have their financial statements audited by professionally qualified auditors. The "mission of these audit bodies is to promote accountability, transparency and" good governance "(SHORE, 2008, p. 287).

Shore (2008) states that accountability implies transparency and accountability and accountability. In turn, Campos (1990) notes that the quality of relations between government agencies, bureaucracy and service users determine the practice of accountability. Furthermore, Campos (1990) analyzes that the practice of accountability is not defined only by the organization of the State and its way of exercising power towards citizens, but by the way citizens define themselves before the State:

Only by organizing citizens who are vigilant and aware of their rights will there be a condition for accountability. There will be no such condition as long as the people define themselves as tutors and the State as tutors "(CAMPOS, p. 6, 1990).

Depending on the author, the possibility of public administration becoming less prone to political controls would be related to the chances of the following occurrences: organization of citizens to exercise political control over the government; decentralization and transparency of the government apparatus; replacement of traditional values by emerging social values (CAMPOS, p. 48, 1990).

Regarding the institutional and social control of a university governance structure, Foletto and Tavares (2013) maintain that "the institution must assess legitimate responsibilities to managers, collaborators, teachers, students, people from society who will be part of the various institutional bodies that they will show the diversity of these agents. (...) This collegiality is necessary not only for the transparency of management, but also to share responsibility as the agents involved "(FOLLETO, TAVARES, 2013, p. 161).

In view of the theoretical aspects presented, the following problem question is considered: how is university governance related to accountability mechanisms? To answer this question, the First Principle of guiding theoretical aspects is presented.

Theoretical assumptions guiding the relationship between university governance and accountability mechanisms.

University administration is involved under the economic dictates of New Public Management and Neoliberalism. The growing public management technologies have profoundly impacted the governance of higher education institutions in order to professionalize university management based on management tools that satisfy the criteria defined by audit bodies and accountability systems.

If, on the one hand, the audit culture implies a greater requirement for public organizations to constitute management tools that make intra-organizational activities of public administration more effective, on the other hand, the adoption and application of these tools implies an increase in transparency, responsiveness and accountability.

Accountability is considered a guiding principle of governance in higher education institutions. A university governance structure must consider, first, that the public policy negotiation arena within the higher education institutions is plural, heterogeneous and composed of several actors that articulate and present conflicting interests. Second, that governance is one of the main reasons why public policies are not reaching a satisfactory level of development. Por last, that there is provision for legitimate accountability of managers, employees, teachers, students and people from society that make up the university community.

With regard to the dimensions of a university governance structure proposed by Foletto and Tavares (2013), the requirements for accountability mechanisms in the university governance structure fit with the fifth dimension, called "Institutional and social control". The authors state that "this collegiality is necessary not only for the transparency of management, but also to share responsibility with the agents involved" (FOLLETO E TAVARES, 2013, p. 161).

A governance structure in a higher education institution must, in addition to other factors, comply with the requirements of accountability mechanisms, in order to adapt to the dictates of New Public Management and Neoliberalism, since they are fundamental requirements for achieving the efficiency of public policy.

3.2. University Governance and its Role in Local and Regional Development

Ka-Ho Mok (2005) identifies a change from a governance model of higher education, called interventionist, to an accelerationist model from the study of a macro-

Theoretical assumptions for analyzing public governance in higher education institutions.

process of structural change in Chinese higher education institutions in the sense of adapting to the phenomenon of globalization, in view of the growing pressure suffered by governments to adhere to the demands arising from these phenomena. The macro challenge was to make public organizations more efficient and effective in the face of complex and urgent demands, given that the world has become more competitive and with scarce resources.

The Chinese government has identified globalization as a set of geopolitical and driving phenomena for modern national states to restructure their administrative apparatus, which include, in addition to other structures, their governance systems. From then on, a series of profound administrative reforms began in his higher education through certain techniques: restructuring (*huazhuan*), development (*goingjian*), alliances (*hebing*) and cooperation (*hezuo*).

Therefore, a governance system was established based on the division of labor between central and provincial governments based on the implementation of a set of decentralization policies for Chinese universities, so that they, previously under the command of the Central Ministries, were transferred to Departments of Education at provincial and regional level.

According to Ka-Ho Mok (2005), in 1998, the administration of 151 universities originally commanded by the Central Ministry of the Chinese State Council was transferred to local governments, and 81 of them were transferred to central and local administration, together. This allowed universities to get closer to the private spheres of society, including the market, individuals, families and local communities, which generated an interdependence of State bodies with non-state actors and a greater involvement of academics in research and financing. Thus, the Chinese government used other certain techniques, such as cooperation (*hezuo*), to improve its governance systems. According to the author, in 1995, in Beijing, Peking University and Peking Medical University have reached an agreement for a cooperation project. As a result, students are able to choose their courses freely and credits are mutually recognized. Students at both universities also share library resources and other facilities. These cooperation projects are found in other parts of the country.

Ka-Ho Mok (2005) states that the restructuring of higher education institutions indicated a fundamental change in Chinese education governance systems. Thus, there was a change from an Interventionist State to an Accelerationist State, the first being characterized by strong centralization and monopolized control by the Central

Theoretical assumptions for analyzing public governance in higher education institutions.

Government, and the second focused on the entrepreneurial, flexible and competitive university, strongly adapted to the dictates demanded by the phenomenon of globalization.

Christensen (2011) states that governance reforms at universities are a reflection of broader ones originating from New Public Management, in which they emphasize the search for greater efficiency in public organizations. Their studies demonstrate that universities are using reforms in their governance structures to ensure more autonomy and flexibility, disintegrating from their higher and central ministries. However, there are still unresolved issues regarding university autonomy and the impacts that new governance structures have on the dimension of these institutions.

The theoretical elements presented seek to answer the following question-problem: how is university governance related to regional and local development processes? To answer this question, the Second Principle of guiding theoretical aspects is presented.

Theoretical assumptions guiding the relationship between university governance and regional and local development processes.

The transition from the Interventionist State to the Accelerationist, a phenomenon driven by the phenomena of globalization and Neoliberalism, instituted a situation that involved profound changes in the governance structures in universities, which is not to be confused with the discard of the role of the State in the deliberation of political processes of higher education.

Universities are in a context of adaptation with regard to the elaboration of efficient and effective university management mechanisms arising from the demands demanded by the phenomenon of globalization and Neoliberalism, therefore, they are more detached from their Higher Ministries, that is, from central donors.

A sustainable university governance structure, aligned with the current geopolitical context, allows the State to gradually withdraw, and not totally, from its centralizing role in the political processes of higher education. This allows greater

approximation of public problems from regional and local approaches through the delegation of powers and through a greater appreciation of the dynamics between the actors and social forces that operate in a given socioeconomic context.

If, on the one hand, this context allows universities to enjoy greater financial, managerial and administrative autonomy - and, therefore, become more entrepreneurial, flexible and less dependent on their central financiers -, on the other hand, they are exposed to stricter control systems. , implying a greater framework of responsibilities to achieve social and regional development efficiently.

In this way, universities can be seen as key players in local and regional development processes.

The present guiding theoretical principle sought to answer the question of the relationship between university governance and the role of universities in the face of growing challenges in terms of regional and local development. These are, therefore, assumptions that must make up a governance policy with regard to regional and local development processes.

3.3. University Governance and its Impact on the Knowledge Management of Universities

The last 30 years have been marked by a context of valorization of university institutions due to the growing importance of knowledge as a requirement for the production of efficient goods and services (GEUNA E MUSCIO, 2009). Thus, the author is concerned with analyzing the urgency for the creation of a governance structure focused on knowledge transfer (KT) from the university-industry relationship.

There are three reasons that justify the increasing importance of universities in contemporary society: (a) the widespread / popularization of higher education; (b) increasing the scope and scope of university research; (c) the growing role of knowledge in the process of producing goods and services (GEUNA E MUSCIO, 2009).

Geuna and Muscio (2009) assess that governance in the knowledge management and transfer process in universities is a new phenomenon as university-business relations become increasingly institutionalized and demanded in the UK

Theoretical assumptions for analyzing public governance in higher education institutions.

context, which brings the need to create a governance system capable of dealing with the increasing complexity of the university's functions and activities.

Blackman and Kennedy (2009) claim that it is possible to identify relationships between governance and knowledge management in the sense that effective governance depends on knowledge manipulation activities. The author focuses on the importance of understanding the role of governing boards and knowledge sharing.

Antonelli (2008) states that the university has a central role in this context, since it is a cornerstone in the new way in which governance impacts the dissemination of knowledge. Thus, one of the challenges is to identify governance models for university-business interaction, which is not a simple challenge.

For Geuna and Muscio (2009), there are several forms of KT, from collaborative research projects involving universities and companies, such as "softer" forms, such as participation in conferences, lectures and courses. So, there is a diversity in the way of transferring knowledge between areas of society.

Contemporary universities face the challenge of expanding their activities to a market and industrial level. It is a set of challenges that require thinking about governance models focused on the transfer of knowledge (KT) between university and company. If, on the one hand, the heterogeneity of universities makes this process difficult, on the other, there are enormous gains if it is carried out, such as the regional economic development itself.

Finally, the theoretical aspects identified seek to answer the following question-problem: how is university governance related to knowledge management processes?

Theoretical assumptions guiding the relationship between university governance and knowledge management processes.

Universities have a central role as agents that produce and disseminate knowledge in contemporary times, since knowledge, in the 21st century, is considered an essential capital for the production of efficient goods and services.

In this way, higher education institutions are becoming increasingly important in contemporary societies due to three justifications: the popularization of higher education; the increase in the scope and scope of university research and the growing role of knowledge in the process of producing goods and services.

Governance in higher education institutions is also aligned with the knowledge transfer process (Knowledge Transfer - KT). If, on the one hand, there is a greater complexity of university activities - mainly due to the opening of the scope of university research - on the other hand, a sustainable and efficient governance structure can contribute to the heterogeneity of the university's institutional activities.

From the analysis of the phenomenon of governance in Higher Education Institutions - which involved studying its concepts, forming elements, fundamental principles - and in order to develop new management models capable of bringing innovative solutions to the growing demands of civil society , we sought to answer the following question: how is university governance related to these three proposed dimensions?

Taking as a principle the activity of rethinking new forms of articulation of the different social actors in the political-administrative system and of the university's own position vis-à-vis the various stakeholders connected with it, we sought to compose a set of theoretical assumptions guiding a structure of governance, that can compose a governance policy within a Higher Education Institution (IEs), so that it can contribute both to the development of scientific knowledge and to the consolidation of efficiency, transparency and responsiveness, so that establish accountability, control and social dynamics in a university management model.

4 FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

The objective of this theoretical essay was to present a set of theoretical assumptions guiding governance in higher education institutions. Although we recognize that this set of assumptions has not been finalized, we believe that this is an important stage of research to advance the discussion on the theme of governance in HEIs.

It drew our attention that, in addition to articulating with several areas of knowledge, governance is presented as an unfinished movement, gradually emerging

Theoretical assumptions for analyzing public governance in higher education institutions.

and demanded by several international organizations. If, on the one hand, higher education institutions enjoy greater financial, managerial and administrative autonomy, on the other hand, they are exposed to more rigorous control systems, also implying a greater framework of responsibilities, many of which can be served by sustainable governance structures and efficient.

If there is, moreover, a complicating aspect for the incorporation of innovation in the practice of university management - the fact that historically the university has deficiencies in its articulations with other structures - there is, on the other hand, an aspect that facilitates innovation in universities: the fact there is a notorious concentration of intellectual capital within the university structure, produced and disseminated by potential entrepreneurs present in the university community: students, teachers, university managers, employees and representatives of civil society (RIBEIRO, 2014).

The incorporation of governance in university management can contribute for the university institution to present a more transparent, democratic and innovative management model, which sees the citizen as the protagonist of political processes and increasingly closer to decision-making bodies.

Theoretical assumptions for analyzing public governance in higher education institutions.

REFERENCES

- ABRUCIO, Fernando Luiz; LOUREIRO, Maria Rita. Public finance, democracy and accountability. In: ARVATE, Paulo Roberto; BIDERMAN, Ciro. Public Sector Economics in Brazil. Rio de Janeiro: Elsevier, 2005.
- ALCÂNTARA, VC; PEREIRA, JR; SILVA,?. AF Social Management and Public Governance: Approaches and (De) Theoretical-Conceptual Limitations. Journal of Administration Sciences, v. 17, n. Special Ed., P. 11-29, 2015.
- ANTONELLI, Cristiano. The new economics of the university: A knowledge governance approach. The Journal of Technology Transfer, v. 33, n. 1, p. 1-22, 2008.
- WORLD BANK. World Development Report 2017: Governance and the Law. Available at: <https://www.worldbank.org/en/publication/wdr2017>. Accessed on: 2 dez. 2019
- BRAZIL. Constitution (1988). Constitution of the Federative Republic of Brazil. Brasília, DF: Federal Senate: Centro Gráfico, 1988. 292 p.
- BRAZIL. Decree No. 9,203, of 22 November 2017. Provides for the governance policy of the direct, autarchic and foundational federal public administration. Official Gazette, Brasília, DF, 22 nov. 2017. Section 1, p. 1.
- BONAVIDES, Paulo. Political science. São Paulo: Malheiros Editores, 2000.
- BLACKMAN, Deborah; KENNEDY, Monica. Knowledge management and effective university governance. Journal of Knowledge Management, 2009.
- BLIACHERIENE, Ana Carla; RIBEIRO, Renato Jorge Brown; FUNARI, Marcos Hime. Public governance, efficiency and transparency in public administration. Public Management and Contracting Forum, Belo Horizonte, Vol. 12, n. 133, Jan. 2013. Available at: <<http://bdjur.stj.jus.br/dspace/handle/2011/52513>>.
- BRESSER-PEREIRA, LC From bureaucratic public administration to management. Public Service Magazine, Brasília, year 47, v. 120, n. 1, Jan-Apr 1996.
- BÚRIGO, CCD; JACOBSEN, AL; WIGGERS, L. Professional Master's in University Administration: challenges and perspectives in the university management process. Navus Revista de Gestão e Tecnologia, v. 06, p. 68-78, 2016.
- BÚRIGO, CCD; RAMOS, CNS The process of managing public space development at the university: an educational and social practice. Gestao Universitaria Magazine in Latin America - GUAL, v. 7, p. 43, 2014.
- BÚRIGO, CCD; PERARDT, S. The conception of the university and the interrelation with the university management process. FAE Magazine, Vol. 19, p. 80-93, 2016.
- CAMPOS, AM Accountability: When can we translate it into Portuguese? Public Administration Magazine. vol. 24, n. 2, p. 30-50, Feb./Apr. nineteen ninety.

Theoretical assumptions for analyzing public governance in higher education institutions.

CHAUÍ, Marilena. The university under a new perspective. *Brazilian Journal of Education*, Rio de Janeiro, n.24, p. 5-15, Sept. / Dec. 2003.

CHEVALLIER, Jacques. LOSCHAK, Danièle. *Administrative Science*. Lisbon: Europe-America Publications, 1980.

CHRISTENSEN, Tom. University governance reforms: potential problems of more autonomy? *Higher education*, v. 62, n. 4, p. 503-517, 2011.

DALLARI, Dalmo de Abreu. *Elements of general state theory*. São Paulo: Saraiva, 2005.

DIAS, T. **Public Governance: a theoretical-analytical conception applied in the government of State of Santa Catarina after the implementation of the Development Secretariats Regional. 2012. 356 f. Thesis (Doctorate in Administration) - Federal University of Santa Catarina, Florianópolis.**

_____; CARIO, Silvio Antonio Ferras. **Public governance: rehearsing a conception. Accounting, Management and Governance. V. 17. n. 3, 2014.**

DENHARDT, Robert B .; DENHARDT, Janet Vinzant. *The New Public Service: Serving Rather than Steering*. *Public Administration Review*, v. 60, n. 6, Nov./Dec. 2000.

_____. *Theories of Public Administration*. São Paulo: Cengage Learning, 2012.

_____. *General Theory of Public Organizations*. 4. ed. São Paulo: Cengage Learning, 2004

DENHARDT, RB; DENHARDT, JV *The New Public Service: serving, not steering*. New York: ME Sharp, 2003.

_____; DENHARDT, JV *The New Public Service: serving, not steering*. New York: ME Sharp, 2015

FOLETTTO, Paulo Renato; TAVARES, Sergio Marcus Nogueira. Specificities of university governance: some aspects. In: COLOMBO, Sonia Simões. *University Management: the Paths to Excellence*. Porto Alegre: Penso, 2013. p. 153-166.

GAVENTA, John. *Towards participatory local governance: Six propositions for discussion*. *Currents*, v. 28, p. 29-35, 2002.

HEIDEMANN, Francisco Gabriel, SALM, José Francisco (orgs.), *Public policy and development*. Brasília: Editora da UnB, 2009.

GEUNA, Aldo; MUSCIO, Alessandro. *The governance of university knowledge transfer: A critical review of the literature*. *Minerva*, v. 47, n. 1, p. 93-114, 2009.

Theoretical assumptions for analyzing public governance in higher education institutions.

KISSELER, Leo; HEIDEMANN, Francisco G. Public governance: a new regulatory model for relations between the State, the market and society ?. *Rev. Adm. Pública* [online]. 2006, vol.40, n.3, pp.479-499.

LENZA, Pedro. *Schematic Constitutional Law*. São Paulo, Method, 2007;

LÖFFLER, Elke. Governance: Die neue Generation von Staats- und Verwaltungsmodernisierung. *Verwaltung + Management*, v. 7, n. 4, p. 212-215, 2001.

MATIAS-PEREIRA, J. *Governance in the public sector*. Sao Paulo: Atlas, 2010

MOISÉS, José Alvaro. Democratization and mass political culture in Brazil. *Lua Nova: Magazine of Culture and Politics*, N. 26, p. 03-03, 1992.

MOISES, JA The distrust of democratic institutions. *Public Opinion*, vol. XI, n 1, p.33-63, 2005a.

MOISÉS, José Álvaro. Political culture, institutions and democracy: lessons from the Brazilian experience. *Brazilian Journal of Social Sciences*, Vol. 23, n.66, p. 11-43, 2008

MOK, Ka-ho. Globalization and educational restructuring: University merging and changing governance in China. *Higher education*, v. 50, n. 1, p. 57-88, 2005

MORÉ, Rafael Pereira Ocampo .; GONÇALO, CR; VARGAS, SML; BUCCIOR, ER; CEMBRANEL, P.. Absorptive capacity in the context of innovation: A bibliometric study. *Develops - Unilasalle Management Magazine*, v. 3, p. 113-126, 2014.

RIBEIRO, Raimunda Maria da Cunha. The contemporary challenges of university management: politically constructed discourses. *IV Ibero-American Congress on Education Policy and Administration / VII Luso-Brazilian Congress on Education Policy and Administration on April 14, 15 and 16, 2014*.

RONCONI, LFA *Public governance: a challenge to democracy*. *Emancipation Magazine*. State University of Ponta Grossa, PR: Editora UEPG, v. 1, n. 1, 2011, p.21-34

ROSENAU, James N. "Governance, Order and Transformation in World Politics". In: Rosenau, James N. and Czempiel, Ernst-Otto. *Governance without government: order and transformation in world politics*. Brasília: Ed. Unb and São Paulo: State Official Press, 2000. pp. 11-46.

SECCHI, Leonardo. Organizational models and public administration reforms. *Rev. Adm. Pública* [online]. 2009, vol.43, n.2, pp.347-369. ISSN 0034-7612.

SECCHI, Leonardo. *Public policies: concepts, categories of analysis, practical cases*. 2.ed São Paulo: Cengage, 2013.

SCHWARCZ, Lilia M .; STARLING, Heloísa M. *Brasil: a biography*. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2015.

Theoretical assumptions for analyzing public governance in higher education institutions.

SHORE, Cris. Audit culture and Illiberal governance Universities and the politics of accountability. *Anthopological Theory*: p. 278-298. 2008.

SOUSA, Ana Maria Costa de. Current academic management. IN: COLOMBO, Sonia Simões and RODRIGUES, Gabriel Mario. *Challenges of contemporary university management*. Porto Alegre: Artmed, 2011, p. 97-110.

STEFANO, NM; SARTORI, S .; LAUX, RO Elements of innovation and entrepreneurship in university management: bibliographic portfolio and bibliometric analysis of literature. *ESPACIOS Magazine*, Vol. 38, N. 14, 2017.

SPELLER, Paulo, ROBL, Fabiane; MENEGHEL, Stela Maria. *Challenges and perspectives of Brazilian higher education for the next decade*. Brasília: UNESCO, CNE, MEC, 2012. 164 p.

TAVARES, Sergio Marcus Nogueira. Governance in private higher education. IN: COLOMBO, Sonia Simões and RODRIGUES, Gabriel Mario. *Challenges of contemporary university management*. Porto Alegre: Artmed, 2011, p. 175-190.

COURT UNION ACCOUNTS. *Benchmark for Governance Evaluation in Public Policies*. 1. Ed. Brasília. Available at: <<http://portal.tcu.gov.br/biblioteca-digital/referencial-para-avaliacao-de-governanca-em-politicas-publicas.htm>>. Accessed on: April 25, 2018.

TRIVINÕS, A. *Introduction to Social Science Research: Qualitative research in education: Positivism, phenomenology, Marxism*. São Paulo: Atlas, 1989.