The Experience and Enlightenment of the List System of University Governance Power in Foreign Countries

Yong Liao[1,a], Yi Wang[2,b,*]

[1]Party Administration Office, Zhaoqing University, Zhaoqing 526061, Guangdong, China

[2]Economics and Management College, Zhaoqing University, Zhaoqing 526061, Guangdong, China

[a]969555708@qq.com, [b]wangyi@zqu.edu.cn

[*]Corresponding author

Keywords: University Governance, Power List System, Governance Structure, Modernization of Governance System

Abstract: This paper deeply analyzes the practical experience and enlightenment of the power list system of university governance in foreign countries. Taking the United States, Britain and Germany as typical cases, it discusses its effectiveness in clarifying the boundaries of power, promoting the transparency of decision-making and guaranteeing academic freedom. The research shows that by establishing and improving the power list system, these countries have effectively improved the efficiency of university governance, and promoted the double improvement of scientific research output and teaching quality. Drawing on the international advanced experience, Chinese universities should base on the national conditions, establish and improve the power list system in line with their own characteristics, strengthen the internal and external supervision mechanism, and promote the modernization of the governance system, in order to cope with the challenges and opportunities in the context of higher education internationalization.

1. Introduction

In the context of the increasing internationalization of global higher education, the optimization and innovation of university governance structures have become crucial for enhancing educational quality and competitiveness. With the vigorous development of the knowledge economy, universities, as core institutions for knowledge innovation and dissemination, have their governance efficiency directly impacting the construction of national innovation systems and the enhancement of global competitiveness. Therefore, a deep analysis of foreign university governance power listing systems not only serves as a reference for international advanced governance experiences but also addresses the urgent need for the modernization transformation of China's university governance system.

In recent years, scholars both domestically and internationally have conducted extensive and deep research on university governance issues. In terms of foreign countries, developed nations represented by the United States, the United Kingdom, and Germany have formed unique university governance power listing systems through long-term practice. These systems have achieved significant results in defining power boundaries, promoting decision-making transparency, and ensuring academic freedom. According to statistics, universities that have implemented power listing systems have experienced improvements in research output efficiency (Zhu Zili et al., 2017) [1], and there has been a notable increase in teacher and student satisfaction (Li Conghao, 2019) [2]. This not only demonstrates the positive role of power listing systems in enhancing university governance efficiency but also provides robust empirical support for university governance reforms.

In contrast, while China's higher education sector has achieved considerable development in recent years, it still faces numerous challenges in the field of university governance. The core of university governance lies in balancing various interests and powers to ensure the fulfillment of universities' functions in talent cultivation, scientific research, and societal service. In the existing university governance structure, issues such as blurred power boundaries, opaque decision-making mechanisms, and inadequate supervision mechanisms severely constrain the enhancement of China's university governance efficiency. Therefore, drawing on international advanced experiences and improving China's university governance structure have become one of the important tasks in the current reform of higher education. By introducing a power listing system, the powers and responsibilities of various governance entities can be clarified, decision-making processes can be made more transparent and democratic, and trust and support from teachers, students, and various sectors of society can be enhanced. This, in turn, provides a strong guarantee for the optimization of China's university governance structure.

2. Case Analysis of the Governance Power List System in Typical Foreign Universities

2.1. The United States: A Model of Decentralization and Autonomy

2.1.1. Role Division between the Federal Government and State Governments

In the governance system of American universities, the role division between the federal government and state governments constitutes its unique and complex power structure. The federal government provides macro guidance and support for higher education mainly through legislation and fund allocation. For example, federal laws such as the Higher Education Act provide a legal framework and financial assistance for universities, promoting the popularization and quality improvement of higher education. State governments, on the other hand, play a more direct and specific role. They are not only responsible for overseeing universities within their states but also deeply influence the governance structure and operating model of universities by formulating education policies and allocating educational resources.

Taking California as an example, the state government establishes institutions such as the California Post-secondary Education Commission (CPEC) to uniformly plan and coordinate higher education institutions across the state. CPEC is responsible for collecting and analyzing higher education data and providing recommendations to the state government on issues such as education policies and resource allocation (Xu Lang, Wang Jianhua, 2017) [3]. This mechanism ensures the dominant position of state governments in higher education governance while also promoting cooperation and resource sharing among universities.

On the other hand, the federal government encourages universities to conduct scientific research and provide social services by providing financial support in forms such as research funding and scholarships. For instance, the National Science Foundation (NSF) provides billions of dollars in

research funding annually to universities and research institutions, supporting basic and applied research (Zhang Lina, 2021) [4]. This financial support not only promotes the enhancement of universities' research capabilities but also strengthens cooperation and exchanges between universities, the government, and enterprises.

It is noteworthy that the roles of the federal government and state governments in university governance are not isolated but intertwined and interactive. Cooperation and coordination between them are crucial for maintaining the stability and effectiveness of university governance. As former Harvard University President Derek Bok stated, "The success of university governance depends not only on the efforts within the university but also on the good interaction between the university and the government and society."

In summary, the federal government and state governments play indispensable roles in the governance of American universities. Through legislation, fund allocation, policy formulation, and other means, they jointly shape the landscape of American higher education. This decentralized and autonomous governance model not only safeguards the academic freedom and independence of universities but also promotes the diversification and internationalization of higher education.

2.1.2. Power Allocation in the Internal Governance Structure of Universities

In the power allocation within the internal governance structure of universities, a notable feature is the joint participation and checks and balances of multiple entities. Internal governance of American universities follows the "presidential system under the leadership of the board of trustees," which ensures the dispersion and balance of power. As the highest decision-making body, the board of trustees is responsible for strategic planning, resource allocation, and decision-making on major matters of the university. Its membership includes experts from inside and outside the university, alumni, and community representatives. This diversified composition promotes democratic and scientific decision-making. According to statistics, in top American universities, the proportion of external members on the board of trustees generally exceeds half (Zhang Binxian, Zhang Chi, 2002) [5], which intuitively reflects the important role of external forces in university governance.

In the specific practice of power allocation, American universities also emphasize the balance between academic power and administrative power. As representatives of academic power, the faculty council or academic committee has important say in curriculum design, teaching evaluation, research project initiation, and other aspects, ensuring academic freedom and quality (Li Mu, Guan Shuaifeng, 2019) [6]. At the same time, the president and the administrative team are responsible for daily management, resource allocation, and implementing board decisions. They collaborate and supervise each other, jointly driving the development of the university. Harvard University's governance model is a typical example, where its faculty council enjoys high autonomy in academic matters, while the president ensures effective implementation of decisions through an efficient administrative system.

Furthermore, transparency in power allocation and accountability mechanisms are also key to internal university governance (Guan Baoying, 2015) [7]. American universities generally formulate detailed power lists, clarifying the responsibility scope and power boundaries of management bodies and individuals at all levels, and accept supervision from teachers, students, and all sectors of society through information disclosure and regular reporting. This approach not only enhances the transparency of governance but also improves governance efficiency and credibility. The power allocation in internal university governance needs to stimulate the enthusiasm and creativity of all stakeholders and jointly contribute to the development of the university.

2.2. UK: The Fusion of Tradition and Modernity

2.2.1. The Autonomous Tradition of Ancient Universities

The autonomous tradition of ancient universities, as a shining gem in the history of Western higher education, has had profound impacts not only on the inheritance of academic freedom and the spirit of independence but also on providing valuable historical reference for the construction of modern university governance power list systems (Tian Enshun, 2022) [8]. Taking the University of Oxford as an example, this institution, established in the 12th century, traces its autonomous tradition back to the medieval interplay between church and secular powers. Through the form of "scholars' guilds," Oxford gradually established the principles of academic autonomy and self-governance, which not only ensured a free space for academic research but also promoted knowledge innovation and academic prosperity.

In Oxford's governance structure, the Council and the Congregation, as core bodies, jointly maintain the university's autonomy. The Council is responsible for the overall operation and decision-making of the university, while the Congregation represents the broad academic community and participates in decision-making on major matters through voting. This "dual-track" governance model embodies both administrative efficiency and academic democracy, laying a solid foundation for the implementation of the power list system (Liu Yan, Wang Yunlong, 2022) [9]. According to statistics, over 80% of the proposals reviewed annually by the Congregation involve academic policies and resource allocation, fully demonstrating the vitality of the autonomous tradition in modern university governance.

Furthermore, the autonomous tradition of ancient universities is also reflected in their cautious attitude towards external interventions. As the famous British educator Michael Shattock stated, "University autonomy is a necessary condition for academic freedom, protecting scholars from undue external interference so that they can freely explore truth" (Sun Guicong, 2006) [10]. While maintaining autonomy, Oxford actively establishes cooperative relationships with the government and various sectors of society, ensuring that while enjoying autonomous rights, the university can also bear social responsibilities and contributions through consultation and dialogue mechanisms.

2.2.2. Practice of Power List in Governance of Modern City Universities

In the governance of modern city universities in the UK, the practice of power lists has become a key measure to enhance university governance effectiveness and promote academic freedom and knowledge innovation. City universities have clarified the central position of the council in the governance structure and the role of external forces in governance, forming a governance structure model led by scholars or academics (Gan Yongtao, 2007) [11]. By implementing a detailed power list system, clear boundaries and responsibility divisions between the board of trustees, the president's office, various colleges, and academic committees are defined. This system not only ensures the core status of academic power, guarantees the efficiency and transparency of academic decision-making processes, but also promotes optimal allocation of resources. Surveys have shown that since the implementation of the power list system, city universities have achieved significant improvements in research output, teaching quality, and international reputation, fully verifying the effectiveness of this system.

Specifically, the power list system of UK city universities lists in detail the exercising entities, scopes, procedures, and supervision mechanisms of various powers, ensuring that every decision can be attributed to a clear responsibility. For example, in academic matters, the professorial body enjoys high autonomy and is responsible for core affairs such as curriculum design, academic evaluation, and approval of research projects, while the board of trustees is mainly responsible for

macro-level work such as strategic planning, resource allocation, and external relationship coordination (Zhang Guowei, 2022) [12]. This division and collaboration model not only safeguards academic freedom but also improves decision-making efficiency.

2.3. Germany: Emphasizing Both Academic Freedom and Responsibility

2.3.1. Tradition and Evolution of Professor-Governed Universities

In the German higher education system, the tradition of professor-governed universities has a long history. This system has not only profoundly influenced the governance model of German universities but also provided valuable experience for global higher education governance. The tradition of professor-governed universities is rooted in the Humboldtian reform era, emphasizing academic freedom and the dominant role of professors in academic matters. This tradition has continuously evolved in subsequent historical processes, retaining its core values while gradually adapting to the needs of modern higher education development.

Traditionally, professors at German universities have had a high degree of autonomy. They are not only responsible for teaching and research but also widely participate in university management and decision-making. This institutional design ensures the maximization of academic freedom, enabling professors to promote disciplinary development based on their professional judgment. For example, at historic institutions such as the University of Berlin, the Fakultässenat, an important decision-making body primarily composed of professors, is responsible for reviewing key matters such as academic policies and curriculum design (Hu Juan, 2021) [13]. This governance model effectively promotes academic innovation and knowledge accumulation.

However, with the accelerated advancement of internationalization and globalization in higher education, the tradition of professor-governed universities is also facing new challenges and changes. On the one hand, modern universities need to respond more efficiently to rapid changes in the external environment, which requires a more flexible and open university governance structure. On the other hand, with the rise of diverse stakeholders such as students and faculty, internal university governance also needs to focus more on democratic participation and interest coordination. In this context, German universities have begun exploring the modern transformation of the professor-governed system.

Taking the Technical University of Munich as an example, while preserving the dominant role of professors in academic matters, the university actively introduces diverse stakeholders such as student representatives and faculty representatives to participate in university governance. By establishing decision-making bodies such as the Universitätsrat, a diversified and balanced power structure has been achieved (Wu Wei et al., 2010) [14]. This governance model safeguards academic freedom and the dominant position of professors while enhancing the democracy and transparency of university governance. Additionally, the Technical University of Munich emphasizes the use of modern information technology to improve governance efficiency and decision-making quality, such as establishing online decision support systems and promoting electronic voting. The tradition and evolution of professor-governed universities not only reflect the profound heritage and unique charm of German higher education governance but also provide useful insights for improving the governance system of Chinese universities.

2.3.2. Protection of Academic Freedom through the Power List System

German universities, combining their profound tradition of professor-governed universities with the power list system, provide a solid institutional guarantee for academic freedom. Through a clear power list, German universities stipulate the scope of authority of various management bodies in

academic matters. For example, the professorial body has the final decision-making power in curriculum design and academic evaluation. This institutional arrangement not only defines the dominant position of professors in teaching and research, effectively preventing the encroachment of administrative power on academic freedom, but also ensures that academic decision-making is immune from improper external interference, allowing scholars to conduct research based on academic standards and professional judgment.

Furthermore, German universities enhance the openness and transparency of power operation through a transparent information disclosure mechanism. The universities regularly publish the implementation status of the power list, accepting supervision from teachers, students, and all sectors of society. This supervisory mechanism not only promotes the normative exercise of power but also further consolidates the foundation of academic freedom (Song Lihui, 2007) [15]. For example, before introducing a new academic policy, a top German university extensively seeks opinions from teachers and students and openly discusses the decision-making process. The final policy document details the rights and responsibilities of all parties, ensuring that academic freedom is fully respected in policy implementation.

3. Successful Experience of the Power List System in University Governance in Foreign Countries

3.1. Clear Definition of Power Boundaries and Responsibility Allocation

When discussing the successful experience of the power list system in university governance in foreign countries, one of its core elements is undoubtedly the clear definition of power boundaries and responsibility allocation. Taking the United States as an example, its power distribution mechanism in the higher education system can be regarded as a model. Through the Constitution and laws, the federal government and state governments have clearly defined their respective responsibilities in the field of education, forming a governance structure that is both decentralized and collaborative. The federal government is mainly responsible for formulating macro policies and allocating financial funds, while state governments have direct management authority over public universities, including formulating educational policies and approving university budgets. This clear definition of power boundaries ensures the effective allocation of educational resources and enhances governance efficiency.

Within universities, American universities generally adopt a president-led governance structure under the leadership of a board of trustees. As the highest decision-making body, the board of trustees is responsible for determining the university's mission, vision, and strategic planning, while also overseeing the work of the president and management. The president is responsible for implementing board decisions and leading the university's daily operations. Additionally, internal organizations such as faculty councils and student representative assemblies also have clear powers and responsibilities. For example, faculty councils are responsible for decision-making on academic matters, while student representative assemblies represent student interests in university management (Pang Wei, Feng Jingbo, 2023) [16]. This power structure not only safeguards the balance of interests of all parties but also promotes scientific and democratic decision-making.

Specifically, regarding the formulation of the power list, American universities typically provide detailed listings of the attribution, exercise methods, and supervision mechanisms of various powers, ensuring that every decision can be attributed to a clear responsible entity. For instance, the University of California system has formulated a detailed "University Governance Handbook," which clearly stipulates the powers, responsibilities, decision-making procedures, and supervision mechanisms of the board of trustees, president, deans of various colleges, faculty councils, and other institutions. This institutional design effectively avoids power rent-seeking and

decision-making errors, enhancing the transparency and credibility of governance (Fan Guorui, 2023) [17].

The clear definition of power boundaries and responsibility allocation not only provides a stable development environment for universities but also creates a space for teachers, students, and staff to freely explore and innovate. Therefore, when constructing China's university governance system, we should fully draw on international advanced experience, establish and improve the power list system, clarify the powers and responsibilities of all parties, and promote the modernization process of university governance.

3.2. Efficient Decision-Making and Supervision Mechanisms

Efficient decision-making and supervision mechanisms are another important characteristic of the successful experience of the power list system in university governance in foreign countries. Taking the United States as an example, universities in its higher education system generally adopt a president-led governance structure under the leadership of a board of trustees, which ensures efficient decision-making. Board members typically include elites from various sectors both within and outside the university. They not only possess rich management experience and professional knowledge but also provide strategic guidance for the university's development from diverse perspectives. This diversified decision-making body structure effectively avoids the limitations of a single perspective, making decisions more scientific and reasonable. At the same time, American universities also emphasize the transparency of decision-making processes, allowing teachers, students, alumni, and all sectors of society to understand the decision-making process through open meetings, report releases, and other means, thereby enhancing the credibility and execution of decisions.

In terms of supervision mechanisms, American universities have established comprehensive internal and external supervision systems. Internal supervision is mainly undertaken by institutions such as academic committees and faculty congresses, which are responsible for supervising the university's teaching, research, and administrative activities to ensure that decisions are effectively implemented. External supervision includes various forms such as government regulation, social supervision, and third-party evaluations. For example, the U.S. Department of Education provides macro guidance and supervision to universities through the formulation of relevant regulations and policies, while social media and public opinion constitute a powerful external supervisory force, prompting universities to continuously improve and enhance their governance standards. Additionally, American universities actively introduce third-party evaluation agencies to provide objective assessments of the university's educational quality and research level, providing a scientific basis for the university's development.

According to relevant research, American universities that implement efficient decision-making and supervision mechanisms excel in research output, teaching quality, and student satisfaction. For example, as one of the world's top universities, Stanford University's efficient decision-making mechanism allows it to quickly respond to market demands and technological changes, constantly adjusting and optimizing its disciplinary layout and research directions, thereby maintaining its leading position in the global higher education sector (Wang Xia, 2022) [18]. At the same time, Stanford University has also established a strict supervision mechanism to ensure that decisions are effectively implemented and regularly assesses and provides feedback on the effectiveness of its educational operations, providing a strong guarantee for continuous improvement.

As former Harvard University President Derek Bok said, "The core of university governance lies in balancing power and responsibility, and efficient decision-making and supervision mechanisms are key to achieving this balance." This viewpoint profoundly reveals the importance of efficient

decision-making and supervision in university governance and also provides useful insights for improving China's university governance system.

3.3. Broad Participation and Transparent Information Disclosure

Broad participation and transparent information disclosure are another core elements of the successful experience of the power list system in university governance in foreign countries. Taking the United States as an example, the power list system in its higher education system not only clarifies the power boundaries of governance bodies at all levels but also ensures the democratic and scientific nature of decision-making through broad participation mechanisms. For instance, the University of California system has established diverse governance bodies such as boards of trustees and academic councils, incorporating broad participation from students, teachers, alumni, and representatives from all sectors of society, making the decision-making process more transparent and inclusive (Li Hujun, Shi Lianhai, 2023) [19]. This participation mechanism not only enhances the rationality and acceptability of decisions but also promotes comprehensive information disclosure and transparency.

In terms of information disclosure, foreign universities generally have established comprehensive information disclosure systems, promptly and accurately publishing key information such as the university's financial status, teaching quality, research outcomes, admissions, and employment through various channels such as official websites, annual reports, and social media. This transparent information disclosure mechanism not only enhances the university's credibility and social image but also strengthens the trust and support of teachers, students, and all sectors of society. For example, the University of Oxford provides detailed information on its governance structure, policy documents, financial reports, and other substantial information on its official website for public access and supervision. Broad participation and transparent information disclosure also facilitate the supervision and accountability of university governance. When the power list system is strictly implemented and relevant information is fully disclosed, any violations or improper decisions are difficult to conceal (Lu Tinghao, 2023) [20]. This supervision and accountability mechanism not only helps maintain the university's reputation and interests but also promotes continuous improvement and optimization of the governance system.

Furthermore, foreign universities have further enhanced the transparency and participation of governance by introducing third-party evaluation agencies and establishing teacher-student feedback mechanisms. These measures not only improve governance efficiency and quality but also promote positive interactions and common development between universities and society.

4. Implications and Challenges for University Governance in China

4.1. Learn from International Experience to Improve China's University Governance System

4.1.1. Establish and Improve the Power List System

To establish and improve the power list system, as a key measure to improve the effectiveness of university governance, its core is to clearly define the power boundary and scope of responsibility of management subjects at all levels. In the American higher education system, the reasonable division of responsibilities between the federal government and the state government ensures the effective implementation and supervision of educational policies. Specifically, the federal government is mainly responsible for the formulation of macro policies and allocation of funds, while the state governments formulate specific educational regulations and standards according to their own conditions. This decentralization model not only improves the flexibility of policy implementation,

but also promotes the rational allocation of educational resources (Jiang Hongchi, 2010) [21]. According to statistics, about 50% of the higher education funding in the United States comes from the state government, which directly reflects the important position of the state government in higher education governance and the implementation effect of the power list system.

In the United Kingdom, ancient universities such as Oxford University and Cambridge University, through long-term historical accumulation, have formed a unique internal governance structure, in which academic organizations such as professorships occupy a core position in decision-making. In recent years, with the introduction of the concept of modern university governance, these institutions have gradually incorporated the power list system into their governance system, clearly defining the powers and responsibilities of various management bodies such as the president, the faculty council and the university Council. This measure not only enhances the transparency of university governance, but also improves the scientific and democratic nature of decision-making (Chen Pengyong, 2010) [22].

In China, the establishment and perfection of the power list system of university governance needs to fully draw on the international advanced experience and combine with the actual situation of China's higher education. Specifically, it can start from the following aspects: First, clearly define the power boundary of the main body of management at all levels, including the power allocation of different levels such as government, school, college and department. Second, establish and improve the decision-making mechanism and supervision mechanism, ensure the scientific and democratic nature of the decision-making process, and strengthen the supervision and restriction on the exercise of power. The third is to promote the openness and transparency of information, and improve the transparency and credibility of university governance through the establishment of the power list publicity system. In addition, third-party evaluation institutions can be introduced to regularly evaluate and feedback on the implementation effect of the university governance power list system, so as to timely adjust and optimize.

4.1.2. Strengthen the Internal and External Supervision Mechanism

In the process of improving the governance system of Chinese universities, strengthening the internal and external supervision mechanism is an indispensable part. In terms of external supervision, we can learn from the model of the UK's Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA) and establish an independent third-party assessment body to conduct a comprehensive review of university governance on a regular basis. For example, through the introduction of ISO 9001 quality management system certification, it will not only raise the level of standardization in university governance, but also ensure the effective implementation of the list of powers system. According to statistics, since the implementation of QAA in the United Kingdom, the transparency and efficiency of university governance have been significantly improved, and student satisfaction and trust in higher education from all walks of life have also increased significantly (Xu Shanwei, Gao Tianyu, 2023) [23].

To strengthen the internal supervision mechanism, it is necessary to start from the system design to ensure that each item in the power list has a clear responsibility subject and accountability mechanism. We can learn from the "faculty governance" and "academic committee" systems of German universities, and establish independent academic supervision bodies, such as "academic ethics committee", to conduct all-round supervision of academic power. At the same time, the use of modern information technology means, such as the establishment of big data monitoring platform, real-time tracking and data analysis of the power operation process, timely detection and correction of deviations. Universities need a power check and balance mechanism that can protect academic freedom while preventing the abuse of power.

In addition, to strengthen internal and external supervision, attention should be paid to information disclosure and transparency. Many top universities in the US, such as Stanford University, publish detailed lists of powers, decision-making processes and results on their official websites for public supervision. This practice not only enhances the public's trust in university governance, but also promotes self-improvement within universities. Therefore, when establishing the power list system, Chinese universities should clearly specify the scope, method and time of information disclosure to ensure that all stakeholders can obtain relevant information in a timely manner, participate in supervision, and effectively prevent the abuse of power and corruption. It provides a strong guarantee for the sustainable and healthy development of higher education in China.

4.2. The Challenges and Coping Strategies We Face

4.2.1. Cultural Differences and Institutional Adaptability

When discussing the inspirations of foreign university governance power list system to Chinese universities, the problem of cultural differences and system adaptability cannot be ignored. Take the United States as an example, its governance model of decentralization and autonomy is rooted in the deep tradition of democracy and rule of law. Universities enjoy a high degree of autonomy, and the power list system can be effectively implemented (Wang Yingjie, 2007) [24]. However, China's university governance system is deeply influenced by Confucian culture and emphasizes collectivism and authority management, which to some extent is different from the principles of power balance and transparency.Therefore, when learning from the experience of European and American countries, it is necessary to fully consider this cultural difference to avoid the "acculturation" caused by simple transplantation.

Specifically, the cultural differences may lead to many challenges in the implementation of the power list system in Chinese universities. For example, in the internal governance structure of Chinese universities, administrative power is often concentrated while academic power is relatively weak. This difference in power structure makes it necessary to balance the interests of all parties more carefully when demarcating power boundaries and responsibilities to ensure that the reform can promote academic freedom while maintaining university stability. In addition, Chinese universities also have deficiencies in information disclosure and public participation, which require us to not only establish and improve the power list system, but also strengthen internal and external supervision mechanisms and improve governance transparency when learning from foreign experience.

In order to overcome the problems of institutional adaptability brought about by cultural differences, we can draw on the analytical methods of international comparative studies, such as the "institutional transplantation and localization" model. This model emphasizes that when learning from advanced foreign systems, we should pay attention to the adaptability and transformation of the local environment, and realize the localization of the system through institutional innovation. As for the system of university governance power list, we can combine the actual situation of university governance in China to screen, transform and integrate foreign experience. We should not only respect the historical tradition and cultural deposits, but also have the courage to innovate and practice, so as to form a university governance system in line with China's national conditions.

4.2.2. Interest Coordination and Reform Resistance

When discussing the reform of university governance system in China, interest coordination and reform resistance become the key factors that cannot be ignored. As a highland of knowledge innovation and talent training, universities involve multiple stakeholders, including government, school management, teachers, students and all walks of life. These stakeholders often have different

demands and expectations in the process of reform. How to effectively coordinate these interests has become an important challenge to promote the power list system of university governance.

Taking a provincial university as an example, in the early stage of trying to introduce the power list system, it encountered strong reactions from different interest groups on campus. Faculty members feared the new system would weaken their academic freedom and autonomy, while students wanted more participation in the decision-making process. At the same time, school administrators are struggling to find a balance between maintaining administrative efficiency and increasing transparency. According to an internal survey, more than 60 percent of teachers have reservations about the new system, while more than 80 percent of students expressed willingness to participate in school governance but lack effective ways (Zhou Guangli, 2021) [25].

To overcome these resistance to reform, the school has taken several measures. First of all, by organizing a series of seminars and symposia, the university invited representatives of various interest groups to participate in discussions, fully listened to the opinions of all parties, and formed a broad consensus through effective communication and coordination mechanisms. Secondly, drawing on international advanced experience and combining with the actual situation of the university, a detailed list of powers and responsibilities has been formulated, clarifying the rights and obligations of each interest subject, and enhancing the operability and transparency of the system. In addition, a multi-level supervision mechanism has been established, including the campus supervision committee, the faculty and students' congress, etc., to ensure that power is exercised in the sunshine. After a year of hard work, the university's power list system has gradually been recognized and supported by teachers and students, and the efficiency and transparency of the university's governance have been significantly improved, providing useful references for other universities.

5. Conclusion and Prospect

Through the in-depth analysis of the foreign university governance power list system, this study reveals its remarkable effect in improving the efficiency of university governance and promoting academic freedom and responsibility. The research finds that the implementation of the power list system and the clear demarcation of power and responsibility are one of the key factors for the success of university governance in these countries. In addition, efficient decision-making and supervision mechanism promotes the separation and balance of decision-making power and supervision power, extensive participation and transparent information disclosure, which are also the main experiences of successful university governance in foreign countries. These successful experiences provide valuable inspirations for university governance in China. In the process of learning from international experience, we need to base on national conditions, keep an open mind, overcome cultural differences and local adaptability problems, and combine with the actual situation of China's higher education to establish and perfect the power list system in line with China's national conditions.

Looking to the future, with the wide application of cutting-edge technologies such as big data and artificial intelligence, university governance will enter a new digital era. The power list system of university governance will not only be a static document, but will become a dynamic and interactive governance platform to reflect the operation of power within the university in real time and provide immediate and accurate data support for decision-making. At the same time, through empirical research methods such as questionnaire survey and in-depth interview, the actual operation data of the university governance power list system at home and abroad are collected, and analysis models such as statistical analysis and case comparison are used to design a set of multi-dimensional power list implementation effect evaluation index system, which is supported by data to improve the transparency and credibility of university governance. Constantly promote the improvement and

development of the university governance system in China.

Funding

References

[1] Zhu Zili, Li Chunyan, Qing Wenjie. Research on the management of scientific research funds in universities. Acta Hunan College of Finance and Economics, 2017, 33 (06): 70-76.

[2] Li Conghao. The Constitution of a university is the internal basis for making the list of administrative power of a university. Chinese higher education, 2019 (2): 3.

[3] Xu Lang, Wang Jianhua. On inventory management in the construction of world-class universities. Modern University education, 2017 (3): 7.

[4] Zhang Lina. How to improve the efficiency of university governance: A Comparative analysis based on the key elements of governance of four world-class research university. Chinese higher education research, 2021 (5): 7.

[5] Zhang Binxian, Zhang Chi. The occupational composition of board members of American universities and colleges——"Case studies" of 10 famous universities. Comparative Education Research, 2002, (12): 23-27.

[6] Li Mu, Guan Shuaifeng. A probe into the power list system of colleges and universities from the perspective of rule of law. Journal of Jianghan University: Social Sciences edition, 2019, 36 (2): 12.

[7] Guan Baoying. Study on the value of the list of powers in administrative law. Kong Hon Forum, 2015, 000 (001): 114-121.

[8] Tian Enshun. A new exploration of the modernization of the university governance system in our country ——a review of "Research on the list system of university administrative power". Acta South Central University for Nationalities: Humanities and Social Sciences, 2022, 42 (11): f0003.

[9] Liu Yan, Wang Yunlong. Lauder Charter and the modernization of governance at Oxford University. Foreign Education Research, 2022, 49 (1): 74-86.

[10] Sun Guicong. British university charter and its governance implications. Comparative Education Research, 2006, (01): 12-16.

[11] Gan Yongtao. The evolution of the governance structure of British Universities. Higher Education Research, 2007, (09): 88-92.

[12] Zhang Guowei. Four models of continuing education in top universities in the United States and their implications: taking Harvard University and Stanford University as examples. Acta University of Jinan: Social Sciences, 2022, 32 (2): 8.

[13] Hu Juan. Rationality and autonomy: the modernization of German university governance from a historical perspective. Education Research, 2021 (3): 13.

[14] Wu Wei, Zou Xiaodong, Lu Xufeng. The transformation of German research university into entrepreneurial universities: A Technical University of Munich analysis. Education Development Research, 2010 (13): 5.

[15] Song Lihui. The enlightenment from German university students participating in university management——on the improvement of teaching quality in our country' universities from the perspective of students participating in university management. Teaching in Chinese universities, 2007 (4): 4.

[16] Pang Wei, Feng Jingbo. The status quo, characteristics and enlightenment of the two-level power operation mechanism in American state universities——taking the University of California as an example. Acta Shangqiu Normal University, 2023, 39 (11): 98-104.

[17] Fan Guorui. Knowledge and power in education -- stepping into the world of Popokowitz's thoughts. Journal of East China Normal University: Education Science, 2023, 41 (2): 117-130.

[18] Wang Xia. The characteristics and challenges of co-governance in American universities. Higher Education Development and evaluation, 2022, 38 (3): 10.

[19] Li Hujun, Shi Lianhai. Contracts and checks and balances of Rights: An Analysis of the effectiveness of charter enforcement in American private research university. Journal of the National Institute of Education Administration, 2023 (11): 86 -95.

[20] Lu Tinghao. A study on the operation mode of the power of student participation in university governance——a review of "Growing Up: a study of the power of student participation in university governance". Chinese Journal of Education, 2023 (7): i0020-i0020.

[21] Jiang Hongchi. A case study of the conflict between academic power and administrative power in American universities. Modern University education, 2010 (4): 4.

[22] Chen pengyong, Zheng Wen, Fu Xiaoping. University power in Britain: History and present. Academic Research, 2010 (6): 7.

[23] Xu Shanwei, Gao Tianyu. A tentative study of the office of the President of Oxford University in the Middle Ages. Ancient civilizations, 2023, 17 (2): 70-79.

[24] Wang Yingjie. An analysis of the conflict between academic power and administrative power in universities from a cultural perspective. Education Review of Peking University, 2007, 5 (1): 11.

[25] Zhou Guangli. Institutional Logic of university governance reform in China. Research on new liberal arts education, 2021 (1): 9.