



Faculty Governance: Opportunities and Challenges after the Egyptian Revolution – The case of the FEPS, Cairo University

Hala H. El Said*

Abstract

Higher education had always been a top priority in Egypt since the 1952 revolution. In this paper, we will have an overview of the higher education system in Egypt highlighting the main challenges facing this system and the possible areas of reform. Governance of the Faculty of Economics and Political Sciences (FEPS) will be discussed as a case study. Finally, a set of recommendations are mentioned to conclude this paper.

Résumé

L'enseignement supérieur a toujours été une priorité absolue en Egypte depuis la révolution de 1952. Dans cette étude, nous aurons un aperçu du système de l'enseignement supérieur égyptien faisant ressortir les principaux défis du système et les possibilités de réforme. La gouvernance de la Faculté des Sciences Economiques et Politiques sera examinée comme étude de cas. Enfin, cette étude se conclut par une série de recommandations.

Introduction

In almost all human communities, education is considered the cornerstone, the most powerful mechanism of social mobility and the navigator guiding us towards the future. Education is the pillar of development and advancement of nations; it is the powerful locomotive of humanity. Worldwide Higher Educa-

* Dean, Faculty of Economics and Political Science, Cairo University.
E-mail: hala.elsaid@feeps.edu.eg

tion – both public and private – comes as a top priority for human development as it constitutes the central hub for creating the mental capabilities that help produce knowledge and make the best use of it. For institutions of higher education to realize and to successfully deliver their educational, research and knowledge functions in the twenty-first century, they should be capable of responding effectively and efficiently to the ever-changing needs of education and training besides keeping in pace with all changes that higher education has witnessed and adopting knowledge-based functional tools and methods .

In this paper we will tackle the governance issue as one of the main components that can help restructure higher education system. Governance does not refer to what institutions do, but rather to how they do it; the ways and means by which an institution sets its directions and organizes itself to fulfil its purpose. Thus, the adopted definition of governance in this paper is ‘the distribution of authority and functions among the units within a larger entity, the modes of communication and control among them, and the conduct of relationships between the entity and the surrounding environment’ (Ricci 1999).

In higher education, the term ‘governance’ is used to describe the different structures, processes and activities involved in the planning and direction of the institutions and people working in tertiary education. Therefore, governance processes deal with multiple dimensions of an institution: how it coheres; how it exercises authority; how it relates to internal members (students and staff); how it relates to external stakeholders (government, business, local community, and international institutions); how it makes decisions; and how far it delegates responsibility for decisions and actions internally. The structure of governance includes the role of institutional governing boards, the procedural rules, the policies for resource allocation, the arrangements for performance management, as well as monitoring and reporting. Good governance facilitates decision making which is rational, informed, transparent, and which leads to organizational efficiency and effectiveness.(Trakman 2008).

Higher Education in Egypt: An Overview

Higher education systems are getting more complex due to the growth in the number of public and private institutions, so that the task of managing and monitoring the sector is becoming more specialized and demanding.

The demand for higher education has grown tremendously in Egypt due to the increase in the number of entrants to universities every year from 1.4 million students to 3 million students between 2000/2001 and 2010/2011. Accordingly, the enrolment rate, higher education has increased in the age group (18-23 years) from 25 per cent in 2001/2001 to around 33 per cent in 2010/2011. The public investment in higher education is L.E 4.1 billion in

the 2012/2013 plan. The trend of the public spending on higher education is represented in Table 1.

Table 1: Public Spending on Higher Education

	Percentage of the Total Public Spending	Percentage of the Total Spending on Education	Percentage of the Gross Domestic Product
2001/2002	5.3	33.1	1.8
2003/2004	5.3	31.3	1.6
2005/2006	3.1	25.4	1.1
2007/2008	3.2	26.8	1
2009/2010	3	24.6	0.9
2011/2012	2.3	21.4	0.72

Source: CAPMAS, *Annual Statistical Book*, 2011.

From Table 1 it becomes quite clear that the demand for higher education continues to grow as governments acknowledge their role in promoting economic development. Public spending on higher education as a percentage of the total spending on education and public spending on higher education as a percentage of the gross domestic product (GDP) keep declining. This definitely has negative implications on the resources available for providing a good education system.

In this context, various national conferences were held to discuss the aspects and strategies of reforming higher education. Furthermore, the World Bank and the OECD allocated grants for reforming the public universities in Egypt through the so-called Higher Education Enhancement Project (HEEP). HEEP aims at laying the foundation for improving the quality of the higher education system in Egypt, through legislative reform, institutional restructuring, the establishment of independent quality assurance mechanisms and monitoring systems. The first component would support government's efforts to restructure the governance and management system, to create the right conditions for improved sector efficiency and quality. The second component would improve the quality and relevance of university education through the establishment of an information technology (IT) integrated computer, network infrastructure and finance in-service training to develop competencies in the application

of computer technology, particularly in teaching methodologies. Finally, the third component would improve the quality and the relevance of mid-level technical education by consolidating middle technical institutes into technical colleges in addition to designing relevant curriculum and training instruction and strengthening academic administration and management.

Vision and Strategy of Higher Education in Egypt

The most important component in the governance of higher education system in Egypt is to try to answer the major questions such as: What is the purpose of higher education? What targets should be set in terms of participation in higher education? How will these targets be achieved? What is the role, if any, of the private sector and the community? It is extremely important to set this vision especially during a transformation process that requires adopting a brand new approach of doing things, especially after the 25 January 2011 revolution and the dawn of a new system.

The vision guiding higher education in the country is mainly based on helping Egyptian universities to rise to a distinguished level that situates them among the most notable international universities (top 250 universities) and maintain their leading stature among Arab universities by promoting the quality and efficacy of higher education. These objectives are to be achieved through technical advancement, establishment of E-universities, activating the role of educational institutions in scientific research in order to build knowledge economy and linking the education output with the requirements of development plans and labour market.

The vision statement of Cairo University, that the Faculty of Economics and Political Science belongs to, is to be one of the best international universities renowned for its authenticity and leadership in the formation, spreading and application of knowledge to enrich the lives of individuals, the society, institutions, and the surrounding environment. Cairo University's mission is to be accomplished through a commitment to international standards of excellence in the fields of education, research and community service as well as the integration of personnel, technology and business systems and the development of the university's human resources.

Autonomy as a Core Pillar in Education Governance

The ability of any university to deliver on its mandate and achieve its objectives depends on its organizational structure. It also depends on the integrity and efficiency of its administrative system, its capability to promote higher education and scientific research and its ability to compete with other higher institutions locally and internationally.

A central consideration in this regard is the relationship of institutional governance to the state, primarily the extent of institutional autonomy and its effect on institutional performance. Institutions necessarily have to develop new capacities for internal governance when the focus of responsibility for decisions about student admission, staffing, curriculum development and the use of financial resources is shifted to the institutional level.

As for relations between the university and the state, it is evident in the literature that different models exist. In 1983, B. R. Clark identified three dimensions that affect the autonomy of the university: state authority, market forces, and academic oligarchy. To J. Enders, the variety of stakeholders that might affect the aspect and degree of reform includes academic heartland, students, central administration, head of the university, boards, society stakeholders, private agencies and the government (Fabrice Hénard, Alexander Mitterle 2010). An OECD publication entitled, 'Education Policy Analysis' (2003) determined four aspects of measuring a university's autonomy: freedom to moderate its internal affairs, reliance on state for funding, efficiency of the higher education system as whole, and the capability of its leaders. The European Union Tempus in February 2010 defined governance according to the sharing of power and responsibilities among involved stakeholders focusing on the legal, policy and reporting frameworks. However, the report shows that the 'regulatory state model' is the dominant model in the EU universities, as the state plays a major role in running higher education institutions (John Reilly and Ard Jongasma 2010). Apparently, there is no best model for governance of universities.

Neave and van Vught (1994) observe a continuum in the relationship of government to higher education institutions from a 'state control' model to a 'state supervising' model, that is a shift from intervening to influencing, or from 'rowing' to 'steering'. Fielden suggests that this shift is made necessary by the larger scale and complexity of contemporary higher education systems (Fielden 2008).

Over the past two decades in OECD member states and other countries, reforms in higher education governance have taken place in the context of generalized changes in public sector management. The dominant trend has been to adopt 'new public management' (NPM) approaches in programmes of public service and higher education reform (Ferlie et al. 1996).

Based on a survey of OECD countries in 2007, Byun Kiyong from the Korean Ministry of Human Resources Development has summarized the recent changes as: (a) Causing a significant change in the role of central government from direct control (by rules and regulations) to indirect involvement ('steering at a distance' using contractual policy and/or an incentive system based

on performance assessment); (b) Increasing procedural autonomy but less substantive economy in terms of strategic priority setting for universities; (c) Strengthening the administrative and leadership functions within universities, thus weakening the traditional 'collegial' principle (shared governance by the academic leadership); (d) Placing greater emphasis on external involvement (i.e. industry, government) in university decision-making so as to introduce a service philosophy; and (e) Placing emphasis on 'competition between service providers' and 'consumer choice' to promote a market orientation of universities (Byun 2008).

It is recognized that the state is not the best arbiter of how individual universities should operate. As a result, the old model of total control from a central Ministry of Education (MOE) is proving unsustainable in the long term and is being replaced throughout the world by other models. The management of very complex academic communities cannot be done effectively by remote civil servants, and the task should be left to institutions themselves. Giving them autonomy recognizes that their management needs are different and allows them full exercise of their academic freedoms.

Management of Higher Education in Egypt

University and Higher Education in Egypt is that type of education provided in universities or higher specialized institutes. The duration of study extends from two years in middle technical institutes to four, five, or six years in university colleges and higher institutions. Master and PhD degrees require at least two and three years of study, respectively.

Higher education in Egypt has a long history which dates back to 998 AD, that is some years after building Al-Azhar mosque in 969 AD. Al-Azhar, founded by the Fatimids, is considered the oldest operating university in the world. Al-Azhar University was initially founded as a university that issued academic degrees and had individual faculties for Islamic Law and Jurisprudence, Arabic Grammar, Islamic Astronomy, Early Islamic Philosophy, and Logic.

At the beginning of the twentieth century, Cairo University was founded as a Civil University on 21 December 1908 and transformed to a Public University in 1925. It was modelled after French universities being divided into separate faculties – initially four – later expanding to 23. Several schools preceded the establishment of the university, which later formed the nucleus of the University. Examples include School Alengkhamp, which was founded in 1816 by Mohamed Ali; School of Medicine, which was one of the first medical schools in Africa and the Middle East.

Up till 1957, there were five universities open to the general public in Egypt; two of which are located in Cairo (Cairo University and Ain Shamas

University). The others are located in Alexandria, Assiut in the Upper Egypt and the last one, a private university, is The American University in Cairo (AUC).

The growth of higher education in Egypt started in 1957, after the establishment of Assiut University to increase access of Upper Egyptians to higher education. Later, in the 1970s, government took further steps to consolidate higher education by opening seven new universities throughout the country. Among these are Al-Minya University, which was a former branch of Assiut University.

In 2009/2010, the total number of students' enrolment in public higher education universities was 1,932,774 while the number of students in the private universities was 60,148. At the same time, there were 77,193 staff members teaching in the public higher institutions as against 3,796 in private institutes (CAPMAS 2011).

The Legal Framework of Higher Education in Egypt

The scope of higher education laws varies according to national policies and priorities. However, there are common basics in all the laws, and they include:

1. The powers of the Ministry of Higher Education (MOHE).
2. The powers and responsibilities of the governing bodies.
3. Statements on accountability and the powers of the ministry.

By analysing the various laws and regulations guiding the Egyptian universities since the first decree was promulgated on 11 March 1925 till the current law number 49 of 1972 and its subsequent amendments, the organizational principles can be stated as follows:

- Each university has its own legal identity.
- Article number 8 states that every university has its own independent budget that is prepared according to the same patterns that are followed in preparing the budgets of other public entities.
- The state guarantees the independence of universities in order to link the university education with the community needs and production.
- The Supreme Council of Universities is an authorized autonomous public body which is responsible for the management of universities. Members of the Supreme Council of Universities are responsible for planning, coordination and supervision of higher education. The Supreme Council of Universities is chaired by the Minister of Higher Education. Its membership is drawn from the Presidents of Egyptian state universities (17 universities) alongside five other members who are highly experienced in matters of university education and public

affairs. These serve for two renewable years by a decree of the Minister of Higher Education. There is also a Secretary of the Supreme Council of Universities.

- The terms of reference of the Supreme Council of Universities are:
 - Delineating and planning the general policy and guidelines for higher education and scientific research in universities, with a strong commitment to realizing the State's needs and meeting its national, social, economic, and scientific objectives.
 - Facilitating, through coordination, the processes of study, exams, and academic degrees in universities.
 - Coordinating the activities of faculties and institutes and corresponding departments in universities.
 - Coordinating among the academic staff through promotion system.
 - Organizing students' admission policy in universities and determining their annual number.
 - Outlining the technical, financial, and administrative regulations related to the accounts of the Research Special Units in universities.
 - Laying down the executive bylaws of universities and the internal regulations of faculties and institutes.
 - Laying down the system related to the university performance adjustment and development.

- The University Council, headed by the University President, is comprised of: the University Vice-presidents, the deans of the faculties and institutes that are affiliated to the university and four members (at most) with profound experience in higher education affairs.
- The University President is responsible for managing the university's scientific, managerial, and financial affairs. S/he is also responsible for executing the university laws and regulations, and the decisions of the University Council and the Supreme Council of Universities within the framework of the laws and regulations. The University president has to submit a report at the end of every academic year to the Minister of Higher Education to enable him assess the educational and research affairs of each university in order to make recommendations for future development and better performance.
- The Faculty Board is headed by the Dean of the faculty along with the membership of the Vice-deans, the Heads of Departments, a Professor from each department, one Associate Professor and one Lecturer if the faculty has 10 departments or less and two Associate Professors and

two Lecturers if the faculty has more than 10 departments. The board should also include three members at most who have special awareness about the subjects that are taught in that faculty or institution.

- According to the law, the university is governed in a decentralized way through its different boards including: the university council, the faculty board, and the department council. However, in practice, the Egyptian universities are governed in a highly centralized way with the Minister of Higher Education on the top of that organizational structure with most of the decisions related to the budget and financial issues being approved by the president of each university, aside the day-to-day running expenses.

Within the aforementioned laws and regulations, there are main challenges in the institutional governance reform in the higher education system, as highlighted below:

- The president used to appoint university presidents by decree based on nominations from MOHE. But after the revolution, another law was passed which allows the election of university presidents through the electoral college.
- The Central Accounting Office (reporting to the President of the Arab Republic) supervises the accounting of financial performance through an official assigned to each institution, but this person does not have the responsibility to inform or assist the institution's leadership in assessing the institution's financial performance.
- Institutions can own lands and equipment, but they are regarded as government property; therefore, the university cannot take a decision to sell or replace a piece of land or building without a prior approval from the Cabinet of Ministers.
- Institutions can spend budgets to achieve objectives but budgets are allocated for specific line of items where the ability to shift from one budget line item to another is very limited specifically since these line items come from diverse resources (e.g. staff cost come from the Ministry of Finance and the investment budget comes from the Ministry of Economic Development).
- Institutions can recommend their academic structure and its executive regulation but the decision rests with MOHE and SCU.
- Universities recommend enrolment levels, but the decisions are taken by the SCU and MOHE. The highly centralized process of student selection and placement severely restricts students' choices and results

in students being assigned to disciplines or professions that bear little relationships to their career aspirations or abilities. Enrolment controls are also the result of the need to manage excessive demand for certain universities (e.g. Cairo University) and an imbalance among faculties and professions.

In such a tightly controlled system, an institution's president and other institutional leaders cannot reasonably be held accountable for an institution's performance. With all the focus on controlling the pieces, no one is held accountable for the performance of the whole. The establishment of Boards of Trustees, as in the recent reform of technical colleges or new accreditation requirements, will have limited impact on institutional operations because the institutional presidents and governing councils do not have sufficient authority to take decisions about even basic issues.

The role of pressure groups in the universities – such as ‘the March 9th Movement for the Independence of Universities’, through the demonstrations and strikes by the faculty, bureaucrats and students – have forced the military rule and the transitional governments to amend the Law of the Organization of Universities of 1972. The main mandate of reform strategies before the revolution was the improvement of human capital and innovation in order to meet the demand of the labour market and to enhance national economic competitiveness. Therefore, these strategies focused on the capabilities of graduates, such as creating study programmes in foreign language and training programmes. University governance, in terms of the selection and the capacity of its academic and administrative leadership and the resources allocation, was not in the core of any previous reform strategies.

In spite of national and international strategies, actual reform has revolved after the revolution of 25 January 2011. The revolution opened a wide spectrum for all segments of the society to express their demands using alternative tools. The pivotal amendment was to usefillthe positions of president of universities, deans, and the heads of departments through elections. This amendment has tremendous impact on university independence as it allows different criteria for managing the academic institutions based on merit and not on political loyalty, which the previous regime applied. Furthermore, competitiveness became a significant principle in the university. For example, candidates for a leadership position must provide in their electoral programmes effective solutions and reliable strategies for overcoming the challenges of their institutions. Also the process of election allows all members in the institutions – faculty members, bureaucrats and students – to openly discuss the ideas and merits of each candidate. What is more important, all leadership positions became

accountable and elected leaders have to keep all members in the institution updated on the aspects and degree of achievements and challenges. However, the election process may lead in large faculties to cronyism; besides, it may cause lead to a measure of hypersensitivity among the staff members.

Towards Good Governance in the Faculty of Economics and Political Science, Cairo University

The Faculty of Economics and Political Science was established in 1960 to serve as the only faculty in Egypt that provides top-quality specialists in economics, statistics and political science. It has three distinctive objectives: (i) Carrying out theoretical and applied researches and studies; (ii) Providing consultative studies and researches on state and society and offering consultations to decision makers; (iii) Participating in community services and helping to develop cultural and environmental awareness.

By applying the electoral process to fill the position of dean in the Faculty of Economics and Political Sciences in August 2011, the candidates provided electoral programmes for the first time, which represented their perspectives in governing the Faculty academically and administratively. Moreover, this method allowed the dean to develop a comprehensive programme to run the Faculty.

By the law, the dean is in charge of managing the affairs of the faculty, including scientific, administrative and financial affairs, according to the law and regulations, and reports directly to the University Council. Apparently, therefore, the law delegates the dean to manage, and NOT to govern the faculty.

The experience of the Faculty of Economics and Political Science is to widen the responsibilities of the dean by investing the gained legitimacy through election and the agreement of the faculty members on the Faculty Development Strategy which depends on three pillars:

1. Modernizing and developing the academic framework to cope with international standards through:
 - (a) Improving the efficiency of the cadres of faculty members, especially the young faculty.
 - (b) Improving the quality of the faculty graduates.
2. Developing administrative and institutional capacity of the faculty.
3. Developing the role of the faculty in the society and increasing its participation.

How to achieve these pillars is critical under the rigid legal framework that allows the state, represented by the University Council, to intervene in academic and financial matters.

To overcome that, it became necessary to start with developing a proper institutional framework that depends mainly on a high degree of participation from all the faculty members at the different levels and a high degree of transparency. Thus, a group of committees were formed to manage and monitor the administrative and financial affairs. These included Committee on the Budget and Financial Matters, Committee on the Development of the Organizational Structure, and the Council of Assistant Lecturers and Teaching Assistants.

For the first time, membership of these committees was made up of faculty members of different age groups and academic specializations from different departments. The method brought different perspectives to every debate and helped to find the best solutions. This helped immensely in enhancing the administrative capabilities and preparing the relatively junior academics.

Additionally, two important committees were formed. The first is the Nominations Committee, which is responsible for setting and reviewing the criteria of occupying the leadership and administration positions in the Faculty. The second is the Governance Committee, which is concerned with: (i) Setting the regulations of governance (including: rights and duties – disclosure and transparency, accountability, avoiding conflict of interests – and responsibilities of the board of directors) criteria that will be enforced in the faculty after the approval of the faculty board; (ii) Setting the rules that regulate practices/code of conduct of students, staff members and faculty administration in all organizational and institutional structures in the faculty (including but not confined to departments, sections, agencies, centres, units, and branches) and to be presented to the faculty board for approval; and (iii) Working to preserve the name and status of the faculty locally and globally. The Nomination and Governance Committees are significant tools for preserving the gains of applying the electoral system in the university and to develop the capacities of the academia and its administration.

With regard to academic affairs, other committees were formed such as the Committee for Development of IT Infrastructure, Committee for the Development of Postgraduate Studies and Committee for the Enhancement of International Publishing of Scientific Researches.

The role of the Faculty of Economics and Political Science has exceeded the academic and research domains. It now involves effective participation in the discussion of domestic environmental causes and problems and helps to create developmental awareness among different classes of people. Moreover, the faculty reinforces a meaningful dialogue process between the university and the society by:

- Participating in building its capacity as an educational institution – as individuals, departments or research centres. Many of the social issues plaguing the Egyptian society are thoroughly discussed – in conferences, seminars and workshops which seek to present documented evidences and recommendations to the authorities concerned.
- Bringing to bear on the societal needs the benefits of scientific researches as a way of guiding the government and its agencies.
- securing the participation of students and the faculty members in volunteer public service activities.

However, there are various challenges that hinder the gained administrative autonomy of the faculty. For instance, the number of new students admitted centrally through the Admission Office of Egyptian Universities every year ignores the faculty's capabilities and market needs for its graduates. Consequently, the Faculty has to accept a large number of students that far exceeds its capacity. This naturally affects the quality of provided education. As a direct consequence of this, the number of unemployed university graduates has been rising above that of any other group as noted between 1997 and 2006. It was the unemployment of this educated class that fired the flames of what is now referred to as 'Arab Spring'. Many are wont to blame this development on two factors: an excess of graduate supply over the demand of the labour market, and over-production of graduates in the social sciences. Lack of financial independence is considered another challenge as the faculty cannot reallocate money to an area of priority once the university has allocated it to a particular item. However, the established committees became able to manage the non-state fund individually and in transparent way but still with some limitations.

In a nutshell, the consequences of the Egyptian revolution have contributed in providing these academic institutions with the most competent people through the election process. However, there is still a great need to increase the autonomy of faculty and to minimize the supervision of the state to maximize the margin of freedom in governing the faculty effectively.

Conclusion and Recommendations

Egypt should take deliberate, gradual and transparent steps to achieve a more effective balance between institutional self-regulation and overall public control of the scale, structure, quality and cost of its higher education system. The direction of reform should involve greater responsibility and discretion for accredited higher institutions, less central regulation and detailed supervision of their activities.

The role of the Supreme Council of Universities should be abolished (as in the developed countries) so as to achieve university autonomy and find an alternative mechanism that provides an appropriate climate for development and innovation.

The administrative ladder should be reduced such that the stages of the decision-making process would be decreased to the greatest possible extent so as to reduce the time, effort, and money needed to take an administrative decision. Thus, the university should be managed in a decentralized way, starting from the Departmental Council, then the Faculty Board, ending with the University Council, which should be on the top of the organizational structure instead of the Supreme Council of Universities and the Minister of Higher Education.

Every university should be free to prepare its own law according to its own circumstances, vision, and objectives which vary from one university to another according to own immediate environment and needs. In addition, every University should have a degree of autonomy to design its own executive regulations. Moreover, the University should be independent not only managerially but also financially according to its own plans and time schedules with the complete coordination between the academic departments and the boards of the faculties.

On coordination between universities, if any university feels that it needs to cooperate with another university in any of the scientific fields, they can have bilateral agreements, and not collective agreements similar to the one imposed by the Supreme Council of Universities.

The Government of Egypt should develop a single legal framework for higher education covering all sectors: public universities, technical colleges, and private institutions (both for-profit and not-for-profit). This legal framework could have responsibility for a range of functions related to achieving responsiveness, coherence and sustainability in Egypt's higher education system. These functions would include: strategic planning; information collection; analysis and reporting; the administration of funding special programmes whether they are national or international, including student scholarships, loans and strategic investment funds aligned with national priorities; advice to the Minister regarding the establishment of new institutions and institutional branches; and the methods of institutional financing and associated accountability reporting. The implementation of these recommendations would lead to consolidation of those functions currently exercised by the Supreme Council for Universities (SCU), the Supreme Council for Private Universities (SCPU), the Supreme Council for Technical Colleges (SCTC) and the functions of the Ministry of Higher Education relating to the operation of institutions. There should also be a single quality assurance and accreditation body.

It is also very important to analyse the specializations and gaps of market needs and set the priorities of establishing faculties, programmes and degrees to fill the gap between graduates and the market needs.

Furthermore, it is important to take a serious decision about rationalizing free education to all and preventing very poor students from enjoying this privilege.

Thus, efforts in the upcoming period should be dedicated to designating a new formula for higher education in the Egyptian universities that agrees with the accelerated changes that Egypt witnessed since the revolution of 25 January, taking into consideration three central pillars. The first one concerns developing the educational process by constantly updating the regulations and curriculum development, keeping in mind the new international trends and labour market requirements. This process should also benefit from distinguished international experiences in this respect and make use of all tools and capabilities that this era can provide. The second pillar must take care of the continuous training and development of the faculty members through advanced technologies to help them acquire new effective methods of improving their occupational and professional skills. The third pillar is concerned with administrative development. In this instance, a comprehensive strategy is needed to impart advanced management methods and tools into current and upcoming leadership of the faculty.

References

- Burke, J., 2004, 'Achieving Accountability in Higher Education: Balancing Public, Academic, and Market Demands', in J. Burke and Associates, eds, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Byun, K., 2008, 'New Public Management in Korean Higher Education: Is It a Reality or Another Fad?', *Asia-Pacific Education Review*, Vol. 9, No. 1, April.
- El Said, Hala Helmy. n.d. 'Election Programme Document', by Prof. Hala Helmy El Said, the Dean of the Faculty of Economics and Political Science at Cairo University (unpublished).
- Fielden, John, 2008, *Global Trends in University Governance*, Washington DC: The World Bank.
- Ashburner, Ferlie, E., Fitzgerald, L., and Pettigrew, A., 1996, *The New Public Management in Action*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hénard, Fabrice and Mitterle, Alexander, 2010, *Governance and Quality Guidelines in Higher Education: A Review on Governance Arrangements and Quality Assurance Guidelines*, Paris: OECD.

- Jongsma, Ard and Reilly, John, 2010, *Changing Rules: A Review of Tempus Support to University Governance*, Issue 1, Brussels: European Commission Tempus.
- Lombardi, John V. et al., 2002, *University Organization, Governance, and Competitiveness: The Top American Research Universities: An Annual Report from the Lombardi Program on Measuring University Performance*, USA: Arizona State University.
- National Authority for Quality Assurance and Accreditation of Education 'NAQAAE', official website <http://en.naqaae.eg/>
- Neave, G. and F. A. van Vught, 1994, *Government and Higher Education Relationships Across Three Continents*, Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation, Economic and Social Plan, 2012/2013, 'The Future Vision of Egypt', November.
- OECD, 2003, *Education Policy Analysis*, Paris: OECD.
- Ricci, A., 1999, College and University Governance in the United States: An Historical Survey. Available at <http://www.newfoundations.com/History/HEGovernance.html>
- Shattock, M., 2008, 'The Change from Private to Public Governance of British Higher Education: Its Consequences for Higher Education Policy Making 1980-2006', *Higher Education Quarterly*, Vol. 62, No. 3, pp. 181-203.
- The Central Agency for Public Mobilization and Statistics (CAPMAS), 2011. *Annual Statistical Book*, Cairo: CAPMAS.
- Trakman, L., 2008, 'Modelling University Governance', *Higher Education Quarterly*, vol. 62, Nos. 1/2, pp. 63-68.