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This paper is a descriptive qualitative multi-case comparative study of the higher education governance systems of the Philippines and Belgium, which have different government structures and diverse geographically, politically, socially, and economically. It described and analyzed their higher education governance systems using the set of five governance dimensions of state regulation, managerial self-governance, academic self-governance, stakeholder guidance, and competition as the analytical tool to reflect the ongoing changes and the evolving relationships between the policy actors in the higher education system. It focused on five governance mechanisms of funding, quality assurance, academic staff, curriculum, and research.

Data came from a range of existing sources which were complimented by the responses from the survey questionnaire gathered from eight (8) key actors in higher education institutions of both countries.

The findings revealed that in both higher education governance systems, the governance dimensions of state regulation, managerial self-governance, academic self-governance, stakeholder guidance, and
competition not only exist but compete with each other. Further, each country has similarities and differences in the national and institutional level and manifests distinct weaknesses and strengths in some aspects of the governance mechanisms included in this study. Finally, it proposed educational reforms for both countries.

The study concludes that in the Philippines, state regulation exerted a large degree of involvement and influence on the higher education governance system on the kinds and number of government regulations. Managerial self-governance, academic self-governance, and stakeholder guidance also showed large degree of involvement and influence during accreditation, curriculum preparation, conduct of research, and management of academic staff. The influence and involvement of competition were seen in the differentiated tuition fees and in the institutionalization of rewards and incentives. The modes of system coordination of state regulation, academic self-governance, and stakeholder guidance exhibited large increase of change; while managerial self-governance and competition only showed some increase of change for the last ten years.

In Belgium, state regulation is involved to a large degree and showed extreme large influence in terms of its regulations and decrees. Managerial self-governance is also involved and showed influence to a large degree in terms of the autonomy given to their HEI management. There is a strong involvement of academic self-governance in curriculum and research and
some degree of involvement on quality assurance and academic staff. The participation of external members in the advisory bodies and research funding received from industry and business sector indicate a strong influence and large involvement of stakeholder guidance and competition. The modes of system coordination of state regulation, managerial self-governance, and stakeholder guidance only showed some increase of change; while competition changed to a large degree. For the past ten years, academic self-governance did not exhibit any change at all.
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