



Corresponding to Authors

Teresa Dib Zambon Atvars
E-mail: tatvars@unicamp.br
Universidade Estadual de Campinas
CV Lattes
<http://lattes.cnpq.br/8194698455004359>

Milena Pavan Serafim
E-mail: mpserafim@unicamp.br
Universidade Estadual de Campinas
CV Lattes
<http://lattes.cnpq.br/0394606527784711>

Ana Maria Alves Carneiro da Silva
E-mail: anamacs@unicamp.br
Universidade Estadual de Campinas
CV Lattes
<http://lattes.cnpq.br/9302537730701238>

Submitted: 30 aug. 2023
Accepted: 21 feb. 2024
Published: 29 mar. 2024

[doi> 10.20396/riesup.v11i00.8674421](https://doi.org/10.20396/riesup.v11i00.8674421)

e-location: e025041
ISSN 2446-9424

Antiplagiarism Check



Distributed under



Interplay among governance, management, administrative program and strategic planning in higher education institutions: UNICAMP experience report

Teresa Dib Zambon Atvars  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7471-3730>

Milena Pavan Serafim  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7541-4182>

Ana Maria Alves Carneiro da Silva  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6688-1881>

ABSTRACT

Objectives: This article analyzes the relationship between governance and planning in a public higher education institution and strategic planning, seeking to correlate these processes with the effective implementation of strategic actions and projects. **Methodology:** This analysis includes a specific case, the University of Campinas (UNICAMP), of accounting the results of two successive strategic cycles, in line with the international trends of using strategic planning as a tool to guide some of institutional actions. For development of the work, bibliographical references related to themes of strategic planning, strategic management, descriptive documents and institutional reports were used. **Results:** This paper reports on some of the institutional achievements directly linked to the two planning cycles, seeking for some essential governance and organizational structure standards to enable the execution of planning. Among them, strategic management is one of the most important factors; without the commitment of leaders and without the monitoring and dissemination of actions, planning does not produce results. **Conclusion:** This work showed that an adequate institutional structure and governance are necessary for strategic management; that the planning culture is widespread in the institution, but not all bodies develop organizational transformation projects that generate a more efficient institution. Nevertheless, governance challenges are remaining, such as the dissonance between the strategic management that enables the strategic objectives and the management plan of the leaders; a wider dissemination of the strategic objectives and their results are not very comprehensive; and there are coordination difficulties to involve the entire community in this form of administration.

KEYWORDS

Brazilian public universities. Higher education. Strategic planning. University governance. Strategic management. Institutional improvements.

Interrelacionamento entre governança, gestão estratégica, administração e planejamento estratégico em instituições de ensino superior: relato de experiência da UNICAMP

RESUMO

Objetivos: Esse artigo procura analisar as relações entre governança e planejamento em uma instituição de ensino superior pública, buscando correlacionar esses processos com a efetiva implantação de ações e projetos estratégicos. **Metodologia:** Essa análise contempla um estudo de caso, o da Universidade Estadual de Campinas (UNICAMP), com resultados de dois ciclos de planejamento estratégico, alinhando-se às tendências internacionais de utilizar planejamento estratégico para orientar parte das ações institucionais. Para o desenvolvimento do trabalho foram utilizadas referências bibliográficas relacionadas aos temas Planejamento estratégico. Governança universitária. Gestão Estratégica, bem como documentos e relatórios descritivos do caso. **Resultados:** Esse trabalho relata alguns dos avanços institucionais diretamente vinculados aos dois ciclos de planejamentos, procurando identificar alguns padrões de governança e de estrutura organizacional essenciais para viabilizar a execução do planejamento. Dentre eles, a gestão estratégica é um dos fatores mais importantes; sem o comprometimento das lideranças e sem o acompanhamento e a divulgação das ações, o planejamento não produz resultados. **Conclusões:** O trabalho mostrou que são necessárias uma estrutura e uma governança institucional adequadas à gestão estratégica; que a cultura de planejamento está disseminada na instituição, porém nem todos os órgãos desenvolvem projetos de transformação organizacional que geram uma instituição mais eficiente. Portanto, permanecem desafios de governança, tais como a dissonância entre a gestão estratégica que viabiliza os objetivos estratégicos e o plano da administração das lideranças; a ampla divulgação dos objetivos estratégicos e de seus resultados ainda é pouco abrangente; e há dificuldades de coordenação para envolver toda a comunidade nessa forma de administração.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE

Universidades públicas brasileiras. Educação superior. Planejamento estratégico. Governança universitária. Gestão estratégica. Resultados institucionais.

Inter-relacionamiento entre gobernanza, gestión estratégica, administración y planeamiento estratégico em instituciones de enseñanza superiores: relato de experiência de la UNICAMP

RESUMEN

Objetivos: Esta obra analiza la relación entre la gobernanza y la planificación en una institución de educación superior pública, y correlaciona estos procesos con la implementación efectiva de acciones y proyectos estratégicos. **Metodología:** Incluye un estudio de caso, con resultados de dos ciclos de planificación estratégica, en línea con las tendencias internacionales para orientar parte las acciones institucionales. Para el desarrollo del trabajo se utilizaron bibliografías referidas a los temas de Planificación estratégica, Gobernanza universitaria, Gestión Estratégica e informes descriptivos de casos. **Resultados:** Este artículo relata algunos avances institucionales directamente vinculados a los dos ciclos de planificación, buscándose identificar estándares esenciales de gobernanza, de estructura organizacional y del gobierno para permitir la ejecución de la planificación. Se demuestra que la gestión estratégica es uno de los factores más importantes; sin el compromiso de los líderes y sin el seguimiento y difusión de las acciones, la planificación no produce resultados. **Conclusión:** El trabajo demostró que una estructura institucional y una gobernanza adecuadas son necesarias para la gestión estratégica; que la cultura de planificación debe difundirse en la institución, pero no todos los órganos desarrollan proyectos de transformación organizacional que generen una institución más eficiente. Sin embargo, persisten desafíos de gobernanza, como la disonancia entre la gestión estratégica que posibilita los objetivos estratégicos y el plan de gestión de los líderes; la amplia difusión de los objetivos estratégicos y sus resultados aún no es muy exhaustiva; y existen dificultades de coordinación para involucrar a toda la comunidad en esta forma de administración.

PALABRAS CLAVE

Universidades públicas brasileiras. Educación superior. Planificación estratégica. Gobernanza universitária. Gestión estratégica. Avances institucionales.

CRedit

- **Acknowledgments:** Not applicable.
- **Funding:** Not applicable.
- **Conflicts of interest:** Authors certify that they have no commercial or associational interest that represents a conflict of interest with respect to the manuscript.
- **Ethical approval:** Not applicable.
- **Availability of data and material:** Not applicable.
- **Authors' contributions:** Writing - original draft: Atvars, T.D.Z.; Conceptualization, Methodology, Writing - proofreading & editing, Formal Analysis, Data Curation, Investigation, Visualization: Atvars, T.D.Z, Serafim, M.P., Silva, A.M.A.C.
- **Translation:** Silvia Iacovacci – MEI.

Section Editors: Rodrigo Pivetta Werlang, Maria de Lourdes Pinto de Almeida.

1 Introduction

In recent decades, society has undergone significant transformations due to social, cultural, and political movements, technological advancements, and changes in the market and professional profiles. These transformations were evident even before the COVID-19 pandemic, but they have undoubtedly been further intensified and expanded by it. The regulations at both national and transnational levels have significantly impacted Higher Education Institutions (HEIs), affecting their internal operations and external relationships with various stakeholders. In several countries, the need for a new management structure has compelled HEIs to modify their administrative and governance processes, which can create internal tensions in social, professional, cultural, and power relations between academics and administrators (Diogo, Barboza, & Carvalho, 2019; Favero & Bray, 2010). HEIs are adapting to new realities by implementing new forms of governance, expanding their activities and spheres of influence, adopting innovative ways of recruiting employees and students, and innovating in educational methodologies and technologies (Bernasconi & Celis, 2017; Donina & Paleari, 2019; Huisman & Stensaker, 2022; Sarrico *et al.*, 2013; Staub, 2019).

It is essential to analyze the connection between the governance and strategic management of the HEI and the leader's management program to understand the interrelationships that either facilitate or hinder change. It is crucial to define clearly the scope and limitations of each. Differentiating these concepts is a significant theoretical and practical challenge because a HEI, particularly a comprehensive university, is inherently complex, with multiple activities and diverse interactions with various stakeholders. In Brazil, the way leaders are chosen adds to this complexity. Therefore, HEIs are constantly striving to achieve a balance between the democratic demands necessary for effective and efficient academic and administrative processes, the compatibility between bureaucracy and academic dynamism, the exercise of university autonomy and self-management within the restrictions imposed by state regulations, the compatibility of society's demands with budgetary constraints, guaranteeing academic freedom while respecting the institutional mission, mediating between the dynamics of power relations established politically and the viability of final activities, and prioritizing the work plan defined by the administration. The execution of the work plan is limited to the mandate, while the strategic plan's actions tend to transcend the duration of the mandate.

This article aims to report on the governance and strategic management experience of the State University of Campinas (Unicamp) within this complex context. Additionally, it aims to analyze some results of two successive five-year cycles of institutional evaluation and strategic planning. The goal is to stimulate good governance and management practices in public HEIs. Reported results are based on a survey applied to the institution's internal evaluation committees, showing that strategic planning is widely disseminated and that they implemented priority themes made feasible through projects and action plans.

2 Theoretical reference

The Federal Court of Auditors (Brasil, 2014, p. 32) differentiates between governance and management as follows:

While management is inherent and integrated into organizational processes, being responsible for planning, execution, control, and action, in short, the management of resources and powers placed at the disposal of bodies and entities to achieve their objectives, whereas governance provides direction, monitors, supervises and evaluates the performance of management, intending to meet the needs and expectations of citizens and other stakeholders.

Ranieri (2021, n.p.) points out the conceptual complexity between governance in public HEIs and their administration:

University governance involves establishing decision-making processes that ensure the best outcomes. There is no one-size-fits-all approach to governance, as different processes may be necessary depending on the circumstances. It is important to prioritize continuity, updating, evolution, and preservation of values. Evaluating university governance requires answering at least three fundamental questions: Are the decision-making processes adequate to guide the institution? Are they sufficient to plan for the future? Can they deal with social, cultural, scientific, technological, and economic challenges?

External regulations define legal rules, but their internal dynamics and ethical principles determine the effective governance of a HEI. Therefore, it is not possible to establish a universal framework for HEI governance, as each institution has its culture and is subject to unique contexts and circumstances. Therefore, implementing strategic management in public HEIs requires several prerequisites. These include formalizing and systematizing academic, administrative, and managerial processes, having adequate information systems to monitor institutional development, and balancing the visions advocated by bureaucratic managerial processes (Donina; Paleari, 2019) with those of the academic area, which require agility and flexibility, among other requirements. However, governance should always be based on the institutional mission and identity, which are fundamental elements for institutional development and are present in all strategic planning. These elements should systematically guide strategic actions (Mintzberg, 1984).

The relationship between governance and planning is characterized by a set of leadership, strategy, and control mechanisms established to assess, direct, and monitor management performance. The ultimate goal is implementing public policies and providing services that benefit society (Brasil, 2014, p. 25). Therefore, public HEIs face an additional complexity beyond the differentiation between governance and management: the existence of a management program proposed by the head of the institution with a four-year mandate. The management program of the leader may or may not be related to the objectives of strategic planning, whose macro-strategies are defined and delimited by the Higher Councils, which are generally collegiate decision-making bodies. When a leader commits to planning, it aligns

with the principles of good public governance, as they seek to execute and continue the institutionally and collegiately defined strategies.

Furthermore, when analyzing governance processes in public universities, it is necessary to consider additional inherent complexities. The process of selecting leaders involves profiles and management projects that are periodically changed, which can lead to discontinuity in ongoing projects and actions (Birnbaum, 1992). Additionally, there are collegiate processes through which academic and administrative decisions are made that are only sometimes well grounded technically by a broad and in-depth risk analysis. Furthermore, there is a coexistence of decentralized bodies with great autonomy, especially academic ones, through which many finalist actions are carried out that need to be aligned with strategic objectives. Due to these complexities, governance aiming and enabling major strategies of HEIs is still an emerging subject in Brazil (Gesser *et al.*, 2021). Some authors characterize governance in HEIs as organized anarchy, or the garbage can model (Balbachevsky; Kohtamäkim, 2019, p. 237). The TCU guidelines state that good governance requires adequate training of senior and operational manager bodies. This training process should be carried out when appointed to new positions or when necessary (Brasil, 2014, p. 54). The increasing demands for inclusion, diversity, and equity, as opposed to budgetary difficulties, require public university administrators to exhibit ever more professionalism due to their growing complexity.

Among the conditions for good governance in public HEIs are the creation of mechanisms that guarantee the execution of a medium/long-term strategic plan; monitoring the evolution of performance indicators in both academic and administrative areas; personnel management appropriate to the strategic objectives; and financial and budgetary sustainability. For this reason, as in other organizations, the main requirement for good public governance is strategic planning, which "corresponds to the first and most important of the administrative functions (planning, organizing, directing, evaluating), and consists of an articulated and rational process to determine in advance the objectives and the means to achieve them (projects, actions, methods, techniques, etc.)" (Paludo; Oliveira, 2021, p. 71). It is an institutional document that should, therefore, guide management, administration, and the actions of all the institution's players (Paludo; Oliveira, 2021, p. 111).

The exercise of planning is quite common in HEIs worldwide (George; Walter; Monster, 2019; Bruschi; Casartelli, 2017). It appears either as an Institutional Development Plan (IDP) or a strategic plan containing the Institutional Identity, the Strategic Objectives, and the Goals to be achieved. Although strategic planning is a successful practice worldwide, a meta-evaluation study indicated that the impact on institutional development is conditioned to the formalization of its monitoring (George; Walter; Monster, 2019).

Good organisational administrative practices show that leadership responsibility is splitting strategies into action plans, projects, and programs, achieving pre-established objectives, and reporting and disseminating the results to the decision-making bodies and the entire institution. According to the Ministry of Planning's Management Secretariat, "Good

public management is that which achieves results, regardless of meritorious efforts and intentions. It is therefore not enough just to define the results well, because they are not self-executing. Therefore, implementation becomes the critical variable." (Brasil, 2009, p. 6).

Considering the conceptual frameworks and the requirements of governance and strategic management, the OECD's analysis of the Brazilian case shows that the PDI demanded by the National Higher Education Evaluation System (SINAES) (Lemaitre *et al.*, 2018, p. 43) has not been used as a driver of university management since university leaders do not assume the commitment to implement. This diagnosis led the Federal Court of Auditors, within its sphere of competence, to define a management evaluation model applicable to public bodies, including federal HEIs, in which commitment to planning and results is a relevant aspect (Brasil, 2020, 2021). For example, the model highlights the first governance criterion: "senior management promotes the monitoring and dissemination of institutional performance with a focus on strategic results or established priorities".

The work plan at Brazilian public universities is generally conditioned by political processes for choosing the rector, as agreed with internal stakeholders. As mentioned, this adds additional complexity in the case of comprehensive public universities, as it does not necessarily create a natural convergence between strategic planning and the administration's project. The dichotomy between governance/strategic management and the exercise of politically oriented administrative projects often creates discontinuities in fulfilling longer-term goals. By presenting the case of strategic management at Unicamp, a public state university with management autonomy and budget ties established by State Decree N° 29.598 de 02 of february 1989, this paper seeks to address the interdependence between governance and management for the effective implementation of planning and the possible tensions with the administrative project of the leadership.

3 Governance and Planning at Unicamp

Strategic planning is the main instrument that guides an institution's governance and strategic management. Understanding where the university is (internal environment analysis), how and where it fits in (external environment analysis), what its purpose is, and where it wants to go (Vision of the Future) are fundamental management steps. Seeking to institutionalize a new form of governance and strategic management at Unicamp, the University Council (Consu) created the Institutional Strategic Planning Commission (Copei)¹ in 2001, initially with the task of approving the distribution of resources and later on with the task of coordinating the university's strategic planning and institutional evaluation. The coordination of institutional evaluation is carried out centrally by Copei, except for the evaluation of the Interdisciplinary Research Centers and Nuclei (C&N), whose process is

¹ Copei created by Consu-A-04/2001 resolution. Available in: <https://www.pg.unicamp.br/norma/2698/1>. Accessed on: Oct. 5th, 2023

coordinated by the Interdisciplinary Activities Commission (CAI)². The C&N are academic bodies dedicated to research and extension activities that collaborate with the Teaching and Research Units (TRU) in teaching activities. Copei coordinates, articulates, and monitors strategic planning, assuming that evaluation and planning are part of the quality system: evaluation diagnoses problems and weaknesses, while planning addresses weaknesses and takes advantage of opportunities. This body also approves planning and strategic projects and reports the results annually to the Consu. In this way, evaluation, planning, and strategic management are linked.

Copei is a statutory collegiate body made up of a subset of Consu, chaired by the University's General Coordinator ("UGC"). It is, therefore, an integral part of the strategic level of university administration. It has representation from the directors of the TURs, Technical Colleges (TC) and C&N, teaching staff, technical-administrative staff and students, and includes the participation of the pro-rectors. With a plural composition of representatives, Copei acts with a strategic outlook, and in this sense, it can be said that Unicamp satisfies Zimmerman's proposal for strategic management (2015, p. 47) by having: "a unit responsible for conducting, monitoring and evaluating strategic planning". A multidisciplinary committee that can involve the organization's leaders and the coordinators of the various projects included in the plan".

Unicamp's first reasonably structured planning cycle, which produced some results, took place in 2004 and was called PLANES/2004. In subsequent cycles, the planning methodology was improved, new strategies and projects were implemented that produced results. At the same time, the number of bodies with their plans and with some level of monitoring of implementation increased. This type of evolution is characteristic of the learning process in a complex organization. The plans of the central administration bodies were initially articulated by the Provost for University Development (PRDU) and later by Copei when it was set up in 2002. In the beginning, institutional evaluations and planning were independent processes, and only since 2015 have they been linked (Monticelli *et al.*, 2021).

During the 2011-2017 period, public universities in São Paulo faced a severe budget crisis. The causes of this crisis, including a continuous decrease in revenue and political instability, were not addressed on time. As a result, subsequent measures were required to improve university governance (Agopyan; Toneto, 2015; Buccelli *et al.*, 2020; Knobel; Brandão, 2021). Among several implemented measures implemented in 2017 by Unicamp to contain expenses unrelated to the transfer of resources from the state treasury (RTE), one was that only the Consu should exercise decisions on all financial and human resources management issues. This has helped to prevent the expansion of such expenses. With the

² CAI is a regimental commission initially regulated by the Consu-A-15/1989 resolution. Available in: <https://www.pg.unicamp.br/norma/2396/1>. Accessed on: 5th oct. 2023. Is composed by directors of TURs, coordinators of C&N and some professors-members of the University Council, under the presidency of the C&N Coordinator.

assistance of the Budget and Assets Committee (COP)³ and Copei, a new form of governance was established. Expenditure decisions are no longer made by a single person (the rector), but rather by collegially within the scope of Consu. Copei now presents periodic reports on projects and their results to monitor the execution of planning to the Consu, as established by good public governance practices. With this new governance, demands that require increased expenditure are now assessed based on detailed risk analysis. The implementation of structuring projects has been used to meet these demands. For instance, since 2017, projects have undergone a thorough analysis of their short, medium, and long-term impact. They are monitored, publicized, and all documentation is recorded and made available through a simple and user-friendly system called GePlanes⁴. Monitoring and dissemination are crucial for successful planning implementation and are part of good public management practices (George; Walter; Monster; 2019).

The link between evaluation and planning has resulted in actions more aligned with the diagnoses produced by the Institutional Assessment (IA) cycles from 2009 to 2013 and 2014 to 2018. Projects were implemented to acquire knowledge for actions where the university lacked readiness. These projects aimed to change the organizational culture and test alternatives for better results. Planning has become crucial to meet social demands and make the university more diverse and inclusive, with a focus on stakeholders and results, as advocated by good public governance. Some administrative bodies have responded positively to the PDCA cycle (plan, execute, evaluate, disseminate, and act) with several successful transformative projects (Atvars; Serafim; Carneiro, 2022). However, assessing the extent to which planning is integrated into the institution and disseminated among the main players is necessary. This is one of the objectives of this work.

4 Methodology

The methodology used in this study was descriptive research based on a literature review and a case study. A search for articles, publications, and reports on the themes of governance, strategic planning, organizational structure and planning, public management, and strategic management related to public HEIs was conducted on Google Scholar. The search covered the period between 2000 and 2023. The analysis aimed to identify evidence of results and common challenges. The search results reveal significant literature on federal institutions, from which we have chosen a few examples. However, there is limited information on state institutions, and we could not find any reports on experiences and outcomes related to universities in São Paulo state, which are the only ones with autonomy and a budget link. Regarding the São Paulo HEIs, the publications concentrate on diagnoses and strategies to overcome the financial crisis. Similarly, while several publications were found related to the TCU's recommendations for improving the management of federal HEIs,

³ Attributions of the COP are established by the CONSU-A-18 of July 30th 2002.

⁴ GePlanes System is available at: <https://www.geplanes.cgu.unicamp.br/geplanes/>. Accessed on: Oct. 5th, 2023.

no works were found with recommendations for improving management drawn up by the São Paulo State Court of Auditors (TCE-SP).

The case study includes two cycles of institutional evaluation, from 2009 to 2013 (IA/2009-2013) and from 2014 to 2018 (IA/2014-2018)⁵ as well as strategic planning, from 2011 to 2015 (PLANES/2011-2015) and at 2016 to 2020 (PLANES/2016-2020)⁶ at Unicamp. Through document analysis and internal community evaluation, we aim to describe and analyze institutional governance, including that of Unicamp's strategic planning and its outcomes, and present some challenges that must be addressed. In addition to the final public reports approved by the Consu and forwarded to the São Paulo State Education Council (CEE-SP), available on the university's website, we consulted internal documents on the intranet. These included reports from internal and external evaluation committees and documents consolidated by the pro-rectors. CGU granted access to these documents.

Chart 1 shows the responses of each academic unit regarding the existence and importance of planning within the organization. The percentages of responses were computed based on the total number of PSUs evaluated, allowing for a comparison of the evolution of this perception over two periods. The agencies presented the main results of the strategic projects and the main demands related to the strategic objectives. The responses were organized by theme associated with each of the strategic objectives in the plans. No statistical analysis of the frequency of appearance of each theme was conducted due to the different characteristics and priorities of the evaluated bodies.

5 Results

Unicamp's institutional evaluations and strategic planning use their methodologies and instruments. Chronologically, the IA/2009-2013 was completed in 2015, while the planning review resulted in PLANES/2016-2020; the IA/2014-2018 was completed at the end of 2020, and the planning review generated PLANES/2021-2025 between August 2020 and March 2021. Consu approved both plans and the institutional evaluation reports. There were differences in the sequence of steps between the IA/2014-2018 and IA/2009-2013 processes. Firstly, the internal evaluation was conducted by commissions from each teaching and research unit, C&N, and TC. Secondly, the consolidation of these reports was carried out by a single commission at the university's strategic level, generating a final report. Finally, this report was evaluated by two commissions: a Brazilian one that evaluated TC and non-university education and an international one that evaluated the TUR, C&N, and administration results. This last process allowed external commissions to evaluate the

⁵ Institutional Evaluation Reports of Unicamp. Available in: <https://www.cgu.unicamp.br/avaliacao>. Accessed on: Oct. 5th, 2023.

⁶ Planejamentos Estratégicos da Unicamp. Disponível em: https://www.cgu.unicamp.br/planejamento_estrategico. Accessed on: Oct. 5th, 2023.

institution's performance as a whole rather than assessing each unit individually (Atvars; Serafim; Carneiro, 2022).

The internal evaluation was conducted by all 23 TURs in the IA/2009-2013 and 24 units in the IA/2014-2018. It covered all university activities, including Undergraduate Education, Graduate Education, Research, Extension and Culture, Innovation, Internationalization, and Management. In 2015 and 2020, as part of the evaluation, the TURs answered 9 and 11 objective questions regarding their strategic projects. Additionally, they presented proposals for future projects related to strategic planning. Consequently, the university now possesses a portfolio of implemented and demanded projects included in institutional evaluation reports, providing potential guidance for strategic decisions.

To show how much and in what way strategic planning has been incorporated into the organizational routine, the responses from the internal committees of both the IA/2009-2013 and IA/2014-2018 evaluations have been tabulated in **Chart 1**. The sample comprised 100% of the TURs in 2013 (n = 23) and 2019 (n = 24). The analysis of the responses revealed that the percentage of PSUs that formalized planning increased from 52% in 2015 to 71% in 2020 (question a). The method of assessing the significance of planning for the C&N in the IA/2009-2013 and IA/2014-2020 processes differed. Each C&N was required to submit a well-organized plan. As a result, 19 C&N (90%) submitted their plans, and two indicated they were preparing them. These results and those of the TURs indicate that planning is a prevalent topic within the institution. The TURs stated that the planning and implementation of projects have expanded in several dimensions. These include creating strategies to enhance research, teaching, and fundraising (question b); promoting the professional development of teachers (d) and staff (i); improving undergraduate education (e); and enhancing communication with society (f) and the university's international visibility (h).

Chart 1. Percentage of positive responses to the questions posed to the internal committees in the Institutional Evaluations at the TURs: 2015 (IA/2009-2013) and 2020 (IA/2014-2018)

Questions	2015	2020
a. Is there a formal, participatory process for drawing up the strategic plan, which is documented and periodically evaluated?	52%	71%
b. Are there strategies for strengthening research areas, improving teaching and fundraising?	76%	88%
c. Are there strategies for improving the process of selecting, hiring and qualifying teaching staff to carry out the unit's current and future activities?	64%	46%
d. Are there strategies to encourage teachers to participate in post-doctoral programs outside the university?	56%	63%
e. Are there strategies to encourage the qualification of undergraduate teaching activity?	64%	88%
f. Are there any strategies to improve communication between the internal and external communities?	72%	88%
g. Are there strategies for improving how the internal and external communities are informed about the Unit: its activities, organizational structure and output?	72%	50%
h. Are there strategies to improve the international visibility of the Unit's activities, including, for example, the availability of the website in English and announcements of opportunities (post-graduate, post-doctoral or hiring)?	60%	83%
i. Are there strategies to improve the qualifications of staff supporting the unit's	72%	88%

core activities?		
j. Are there strategies for strengthening extension and cultural activities?	n/a	75%
h. Do you take the results of extension activities into account when making decisions in the areas of teaching and research?	n/a	46%

Source: Prepared by the authors based on the IA/2009-2013 and IA/2014-2018 forms.
 Note: n/a - questions not asked.

The responses to question c (strategies for improving the process of hiring teaching staff) indicate a remarkable decrease in the number of units that have implemented improvements (from 64% to 46%). One possible explanation for this decline is that there was a reduction in the replacement of teaching and staff positions between 2019 and 2020 due to the budget crisis, during which the evaluation was conducted. Regarding question g on communication strategies, the percentage of units implementing communication actions decreased from 72% to 50%. This could be due to the units acknowledging the significance of internal and external communication and implementing projects to enhance dissemination starting in 2013. As a result, additional projects may no longer be required. However, it is important to highlight the issue of communication. The Parliamentary Commission of Inquiry created by Act 32/2019 of the São Paulo Legislative Assembly⁷ observed that these external stakeholders generally have limited knowledge about the activities and functioning of São Paulo's public universities. Several communication projects were developed in line with PLANES/2016-2020, such as 'Minuto Cocen'⁸ and 'Minuto Unidades'⁹ (**Chart 3**).

The IA/2014-2018 instrument included two new questions (**j** and **h - Chart 1**) related to extension and cultural activities. The questions were introduced due to national discussions on the 'curricularization of extension', indicating that the university is responsive to changes in the external environment and that planning can be a flexible tool to incorporate new challenges. According to the data, 75% of TURs strengthen extension and cultural activities, influencing other final activities in 46% of the units.

As previously mentioned, more than planning is required. It is crucial for plans to be executed and actions to result in measurable organizational changes. **Charts 2 and 3** provide some examples of outcomes achieved by implementing actions related to the strategic objectives of PLANES/2011-2015 and PLANES/2016-2020, respectively. These outcomes are quoted verbatim from the Institutional Evaluation Reports. In these cases, the approach is entirely qualitative, based on the reports of the provosts, without quantitative data on how many units were involved in each project. Assessing the impact of implemented actions is one of the critical planning points that still needs to be resolved at Unicamp.

⁷ The CPI was implemented when “Gestão das Universidades Públicas” was created by the President of the Assembly in order to investigate management irregularities related to the public budget of the public universities of the São Paulo State. It occurred between April and November.

⁸ Set of short videos describing the C&N activities and results. Available in: <https://www.cocen.unicamp.br/videos/list/5/41/minuto-cocen>

⁹ Similar set of videos of TURs. Available in: <https://www.cocen.unicamp.br/videos/list/6/102/minuto-unidades>

Chart 2. Portfolio of actions carried out as a result of PLANES/2011-2015 described in the IA report/2009-2013

Strategic Objectives	Some types of projects
Undergraduate Education	Curricular improvement; improvements in infrastructure (secretariats, classrooms, communication network and student computer labs); studies on dropouts stimulated by the Undergraduate Provost Office; programs to monitor newcomers; valuing extra-class activities; use of technology in teaching; accreditation of courses by international institutions.
Graduate Education	Improvement of courses with a concept below Unicamp's average; improvement of the Teaching Internship Program.
Research and Innovation	Encouraging scientific production in higher impact media; improving the dissemination of artistic production; upgrading animal facilities.
Extension	Increase in the number of offered courses.
Internationalization	Dual diploma agreements; foreign language training for staff; incentives for visiting professors; implementation of marker space; creation of subject catalogues in English.
ICT	Expansion of the Wi-Fi network; implementation of video conference rooms; modernization of ICT processes and infrastructure.
Culture	Implementation of local cultural agendas.
Communication	Improvements to the portals and dissemination of courses; creation of alumni networks.
Sustainability	Implementation of energy efficiency actions; solid waste management.
Building infrastructure	Completion of buildings and expansion of laboratories; building refurbishment, revitalization of external areas, implementation of common-use laboratories and facilities; creation of student support spaces; improvements to energy supply networks.
Administrative processes	Reorganization and improvement of administrative structures; review of processes; staff training; creation of shared technical services.

Source: Prepared by the authors based on PLANES/2011-2015 and the IA/2009-2013 reports (Atvars; Carneiro, 2020).

Chart 3. Portfolio of some actions carried out as a result of PLANES/2016-2020 described in the IA/2014-2018 Report

Strategic Objectives*	Examples of projects implemented
1. Improving access, permanence and academic, professional and personal development as a mechanism for promoting equality and diversity	Permanence - Review of scholarship policies and permanence benefits; Access - implementation of admission through quotas, indigenous entrance exams and admission for Olympic talents.
2. Taking a leading role in relations with the public and private spheres	Implementing the Executive Directorate for Human Rights and the first Human Rights policy.
3. Improvement of corporate governance to promote transparency and accountability	Integrated data management and institutional and strategic indicators in compliance with the Law on

	Access to Information (LAI) and the General Data Protection Law ("GDPL").
4. Improve educational methods, making them more flexible, contemporary and student-centered.	GRAD Advisor - advisory program for training teachers in teaching activities
5. Promote the inclusion of innovation and entrepreneurship in the institution, extending to society	Consolidation and Expansion of the Science and Technology Park (PCT-Vértice), with 100% occupancy by startups.
6. Disseminate the knowledge produced by society	Integrated C&N Communication Project - Minuto COCEN and Minuto Unidades videos.
7. Increase the national and international impact of research	Research data management.
8. Update the physical and technological infrastructure of the academic area	Creation of the Multiuser Laboratories Portal with large instruments and how to access them
9. Expand internationalization with teachers, students, researchers, and staff.	Unicamp's Internationalization Plan with the definition of strategic areas
10. Intensify partnerships with different sectors of society	Partnerships with graduated students - implementation of the Alumni System.
11. Ensure Unicamp's budgetary and financial sustainability	Unicamp free and full electricity customer with the implementation of a monitoring and management system.
12. Increase the efficiency of work processes with technological support	IT Governance - implementation of strategic IT management at the University
13. Matching staff availability to process and service needs	Sizing of the non-teaching vacancy chart based on objective indicators
14. Encourage personal and professional development.	Matching staff competence to the needs of work processes.
15. Optimize campus spaces' infrastructure, services, and use to ensure a healthy, green, safe and accessible environment.	Preparation of the first Integrated Master Plan, based on internationally recommended guidelines and adhering to the SDGs.

Source: Prepared by the authors based on the Objectives described in the Strategy Map (Ferri *et al.*, 2020, p 168) and consultation of the IA/2014-2018 report (Atvars; Carneiro, 2020).

These examples show that planning resulting from an institutional evaluation process can produce results if both requirements are fulfilled, an adequate governance structure for the decision-making process and a leadership committed to choosing and implementing strategic projects, making them viable by allocating financial and human resources. In the case of Unicamp, the deployment of the strategies was carried out by CGU/Copei, stimulating and approving the projects, allocating the financial resources and people needed to carry them out, monitoring the implementation of each project, resolving the critical nodes imposed by a bureaucratic and inefficient administration, and acting flexibly to make the necessary course corrections tempestively. In addition, annual planning monitoring reports were presented to

the Consu between 2017 and 2020, as recommended by good governance and strategic management practices (George; Walter; Monster, 2019; Paludo; Oliveira, 2021).

The effectiveness of strategic planning at Unicamp was recognized by the university's international evaluation commission in the IA/2014-2018:

[...] we can assume that a substantial effort is being made in the period to develop the 2016-2020 plan. The report indicates that although this PLANES is based on the 2009-2013 evaluation, it maintains a direct relationship with self-evaluation and external evaluation and builds a solid foundation for the development of institutional strategies. The strategic planning documents show a strong conceptual understanding of the elements of strategic planning, the need for monitoring and benchmarking (Bazhanov *et al.*, 2020, p. 736).

When evaluating the university, this international commission recommended implementing several strategic actions, some of which are exemplified in **Chart 4**.

Chart 4. Some recommendations of the IA/2014-2018 International Evaluation Commission

Lines of Action	Recommendations
Inclusion and diversity	Develop strategies to expand diversity and inclusion at all university levels (p. 741). Attract more young women to the exact sciences and technology programs (p. 703)
Curriculum reviews	Updating curricula, introducing subjects on new technologies, culture and ethics, without neglecting the need for basic concepts (p. 703)
Learning	Put more emphasis on models that strengthen teaching and learning (p. 741)
Research	Create a major interface between local and global problems (p. 741)
Extension and internationalization	Emphasize relations with other Latin American universities (p. 728)
Communication	Establish more effective communication with the various types of internal and external stakeholders (p. 742)
Budget	Diversify sources and continue efforts to rationalize expenses (p. 742)
ICT	Seek more centralized operations (p. 742)
Planning	Focus strategic planning efforts more selectively, with more extensive responses, aided by benchmarking, and aligned with IA results (p. 742) Design projects related to the strategic objectives in a more cooperative and participatory way with the academic units (p. 738)
Administration	Focus priorities on strategic areas, ensuring that the university's standards are raised. Be selective, with well-defined target areas (p. 740) that result in more extensive institutional benefits (p. 742).

Source: Prepared by the authors based on the IA/2014-2018 report (Atvars; Carneiro, 2020).

To implement the new agenda after AI/20014-2018, Unicamp revised its institutional identity (Mission, Future Vision, Principles, and Values), redefined the Strategic Objectives, updated the Strategy Map, defined indicators for monitoring results and generated PLANES/2021-2025 (Atvars; Serafim; Rodrigues, 2021). Several innovations were made in this new process, such as a clearer definition of each strategic objective and a description of the main lines of action. The main indicators for measuring results were defined for each line of action. However, targets were not set at that time. The members of the Consu and guests from the administration took part in drawing up this plan.

As seen in **Chart 5**, the vast majority of the 13 strategic objectives of PLANES/2021-2025 and the 35 lines of action associated with these objectives are completely aligned with the recommendations of the international evaluation commission (Bazhanov *et al.*, 2020). For example, the commission recognized that Unicamp is becoming increasingly diverse and proposes that this process be continued, which is made explicit in action line number 5 of Strategic Objective 01. Additional initiatives to the period of institutional evaluation were taken in the 2017-2021 administration with the institution of quotas for Secondary and Technical Education within the scope of the Technical Colleges (Cotil and Cotuca) and for public competitions for the university's technical-administrative staff, following what was proposed by PLANES/2016-2020 (Knobel; Brandão, 2021).

Another innovation of PLANES/2021-2025 was linking each objective and line of action to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) of the United Nations (UN)¹⁰ 2030 Agenda, as shown in **Chart 5**. The need to link the Strategic Objectives to the SDGs has become a priority for universities, and Unicamp has already made several institutional decisions: joining the Global Climate Letter¹¹; joining the UI GreenMetric World University Ranking¹²; joining the Network of Universities for Sustainable Development (NUSD)¹³; creating the International Hub for Sustainable Development (IHSD)¹⁴; and consolidating the actions of the Sustainable Campus - energy¹⁵. These strategic decisions require a lot of investment, and by adhering to this agenda, the university is committing to the requirements of good public governance beyond those expressed by conventional (accounting) accountability, seeking to expand the institution's social impact.

¹⁰ Available at: <https://brasil.un.org/pt-br/sdgs>. Accessed on: Oct. 5th, 2023.
¹¹ Available at: <https://www.unicamp.br/unicamp/noticias/2020/12/10/unicamp-e-nova-signataria-da-global-climate-letter-carta-de-emergencia>. Accessed on: Oct. 5th, 2023.
¹² Available at: <http://www.depi.unicamp.br/ui-greenmetric-2020/>. Accessed on: Oct. 5th, 2023.
¹³ Available at: <https://www.unicamp.br/unicamp/noticias/2021/07/06/unicamp-passa-fazer-parte-da-rede-de-universidades-para-o-desenvolvimento>. Access on: 05th oct 2023.
¹⁴ Available at: <http://www.hids.unicamp.br/>. Accessed on: Oct. 5th, 2023.
¹⁵ Available at: <https://www.campus-sustentavel.unicamp.br/>. Accessed on: Oct. 5th, 2023.

Chart 5. Correlation between the recommendations of the International Commission for Institutional Assessment 2014-2018, the Strategic Objectives of PLANES/2021-2025 and the SDGs set out in the 2030 Agenda.

Summary of Recommendations from the IA External Committee/2014-2018	Strategic Objectives 2021-2025/Lines of Action
<p>Undergraduate and postgraduate education:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Expand courses, carry out a curriculum review at all levels with a reduction in redundancies, ● Make curricula more flexible with an increase in elective subjects and greater integration between areas ● Strengthening support programs to reduce the time it takes to get a degree ● Developing strategies to attract young women ● - Encouraging student evaluation of courses and teachers ● Crediting extension activities ● Discussing the changes implemented and their results with the community. ● Discuss and encourage diversity at all educational levels ● Expand opportunities for English language proficiency <p>Postgraduate, Research, and Internationalization:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Revitalize all graduate programs with Capes grades 3 and 4 ● Encourage combined undergraduate/master's and doctoral programs ● Introduce discussions with the participation of the entire community on issues related to interdisciplinary interfaces between social and local problems and global issues (health and infectious diseases, water resources, food security, environmental degradation, and conservation), mainly concerning Latin America and the Caribbean. ● Implement practices to evaluate the effectiveness of quality assurance activities in teaching and research to improve educational and research processes; ● Carry out internationalization efforts to bring students to Unicamp, including the internationalization of the curriculum 	<p>Strategic Objective 01: Expand access and diversity of the university community and policies for inclusion, permanence and academic support.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Availability of admission places 2. Academic support 3. Effectiveness in training students, accompanied by educational guidance and mentoring 4. Resources for permanence 5. Diversity 6. Mental health <p>Linked SDGs: SDG 1 - Health and well-being; SDG 4 - Quality education; SDG 5 - Gender equality; SDG 16 - Peace, justice and effective institutions.</p> <hr/> <p>Strategic Objective 05: Increase the visibility of teaching programs, at all levels, so that more students are attracted to Unicamp's educational experience.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Attracting students 2. Attracting teachers and researchers 3. (Inter)nationalization of curricula <p>Linked SDGs: SDG 4 - Quality Education</p> <hr/> <p>Strategic Objective 06: To have updated, flexible, student-centered curricula that use technological resources and incorporate extracurricular, co-curricular and extension activities at all levels of education.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Updating and making the curriculum more flexible 2. Incorporation of technological resources into teaching 3. Student-centeredness <p>Linked SDGs: SDG 4 - Quality Education; SDG 13 - Action against global climate change.</p> <hr/> <p>Strategic Objective 07: Promote integrated research in order to take a leading role in facing the challenges of contemporary society.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Qualification of scientific production 2. Agreements and Research Projects <p>SDGs linked: SDG 9 - Industry, Innovation, and Infrastructure</p> <hr/> <p>Strategic Objective 03: Develop a culture of interaction with graduates, contributing to the enhancement of the university.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. interaction with graduates 2. Updating the curriculum <p>Linked SDGs: SDG 4 - Quality Education</p>
<p>Graduates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Getting closer to the graduates, seeking complementary information to that existing in the Annual Social Information Registry (RAIS) database to better measure the educational impact ● Publicizing Unicamp graduates by sharing information and creating an Alumnae Association and volunteer mentoring programs. ● Creating Endowment Funds to provide additional resources for institutional development 	<p>Strategic Objective 03: Develop a culture of interaction with graduates, contributing to the enhancement of the university.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. interaction with graduates 2. Updating the curriculum <p>Linked SDGs: SDG 4 - Quality Education</p>

<p>Extension and Culture; Social and Technological Innovation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Encourage students to participate in extension activities with the community ● Better align PROEC's activities with strategic planning, more clearly defining the concepts of extension, including service learning, community engagement, continuing education, collaborative partnerships and technology transfer ● Encourage joint work between faculties in extension and cultural activities ● Include sports activities as cultural practices with links to the community ● Create cultural leadership programs ● Evaluate Unicamp's impact with the development of appropriate indicators, carrying this out regularly and with quality benchmarking ● Involve all departments and faculties in Extension, Culture, and Innovation activities. ● - Create effective mechanisms to reward extension, culture, and innovation activities. 	<p>Strategic Objective 02: Promote innovation, culture and knowledge transfer, intensifying dialogic cooperation with public authorities and society, in line with the Sustainable Development Goals.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Patents 2. Jobs generated 3. Spin-offs 4. Business incubation 5. Science and Technology Park 6. Projects with the community 7. Work with external bodies 8. Artistic, cultural and scientific events 9. Extension courses 10. Health care activities <p>Linked SDGs: SDG 04 - Quality education; SDG 08 - Decent work and economic growth; SDG 09 - Industry, innovation, and infrastructure; SDG 16 - Peace, justice, and effective institutions.</p> <hr/> <p>Strategic Objective 08: Recognize and value extension activities in the teaching career and in the student academic environment.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Qualification of Extension 2. Involvement with Extension. <p>Linked SDGs: SDG 4 - Quality Education</p>
<p>Management/Funding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Devise strategies to diversify sources of funding for postgraduate studies and research ● Optimize the use of research facilities and multi-user laboratories ● Better alignment of financial rebalancing with the growing need for resources to support permanence ● Updating teaching projects ● - Maintaining good equipment and infrastructure conditions. 	<p>Strategic Objective 09: Intensify partnerships with different sectors of society as a way of diversifying the sources of national and international funding for research.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Partnerships and agreements 2. Sources of funding <p>Linked SDGs: SDG 4 - Quality Education; SDG 09 - Industry, Innovation, and Infrastructure</p> <hr/> <p>Strategic Objective 11: Ensure the University's budgetary, financial, operational and infrastructure sustainability</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Financial and budgetary sustainability 2. Chart of civil servants 3. Extra-budgetary resources 4. Infrastructure and enterprise management 5. Training people 6. Accessibility <p>Linked SDGs: SDG 16 - Peace, Justice and Effective Institutions</p> <hr/> <p>Strategic Objective 13: Establish a sustainable financial and administrative management model for the health area.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. People management in healthcare 2. Management of resources, inputs, and assets 3. Sustainable management of agreements 4. Costing and investments <p>Related SDGs: SDG 16 - Peace, Justice and Effective Institutions</p>

<p>Management/People</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better preparation for managing people and financial resources • Faster replacement of teaching staff due to the high rate of retirements • Attracting younger professionals at the beginning of their professional lives as a way of recomposing the teaching chart with quality • Implement incentives to reduce teacher turnover 	<p>Strategic Objective 10: Improve the attractiveness of the University's careers to preserve high-level staff consistent with Unicamp's mission and vision for the future.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Training people 2. Attracting talent 3. Organizational climate 4. Recognition and professional merit <p>Linked SDGs: SDG 4 - Quality Education; SDG 8 - Decent Work and Economic Growth.</p>
<p>Management/administrative innovation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Working to improve management, reducing bureaucracy and infrastructure, recording activities and using management indicators, including monitoring the trajectory of former students in their professional activity • Looking for new ways to generate and collect data, monitor the evolution of administrative and academic processes, and better assess the impact of their missions. 	<p>Strategic Objective 12: Improve and modernize the administrative and academic management model that ensures the proper development of the University's core activities.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Computer systems (IT) 2. Contract management 3. Debureaucratization 4. Process management 5. User satisfaction <p>Linked SDGs: SDG 16 - Peace, Justice and Effective Institutions</p>
<p>Management/Communication:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To disseminate widely and regularly the research results developed and the value of postgraduate education for the sustainable growth of the economy, targeting non-academic audiences (employers and society). 	<p>Strategic Objective 04: Expand and strengthen effective communication with the various sectors of society, seeking to give visibility to our activities and their impacts.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Unicamp's leading role 2. Communication and relations with society 3. Extension and cultural activities <p>Linked SDGs: SDG 4 - Quality Education; SDG 9 - Industry, Innovation, and Infrastructure</p> <p>Strategic Objective 05: Increase the visibility of teaching programs, at all levels, so that more students are attracted to Unicamp's educational experience.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Attracting students 2. Attracting teachers and researchers 3. (Inter)nationalization of curricula <p>Linked SDGs: SDG 4 - Quality Education</p>
<p>Management/leadership, governance and planning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The rector should set the Consu an agenda of actions to guide everyone's participation in the issues resulting from institutional evaluation, with an assessment of participation and progress using impact indicators. • Planning efforts should provide the institution with priority, high-impact and long-term projects, with a guarantee of continuity, monitoring and benchmarking. • Encourage the retention of administrative leaders in key positions 	<p>Strategic Objective 12: Improve and modernize the administrative and academic management model that ensures the proper development of the University's core activities.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Computer systems (IT) 2. Contract management 3. Debureaucratization 4. Process management 5. User satisfaction <p>Linked SDGs: SDG 16 - Peace, Justice and Effective Institutions</p>

Source: Adapted by the authors from Bazhanov *et al.* (2020) and Atvars; Serafim (2020).

Universities that have committed to the 2030 Agenda report the need for significant investment to ensure the effectiveness of their actions. This highlights the importance of maintaining projects with a high capacity for transformation. This is particularly challenging

in a country with a volatile economy (Traumann, 2021). The impact of the country's economic activity on ICMS tax collection, which defines Unicamp's budget, highlights the importance of long-term planning to achieve strategic objectives. Acknowledging the challenges involved in implementing PLANES/2021-2025 is crucial, including short-, medium-, and long-term actions. Therefore, governance and strategic management should not be limited by the duration of mandates set by an administration's project. Over ten years, two planning cycles have resulted in transformative projects that have outlasted the duration of a rector's mandate. The institution has also adopted lessons learned in strategic management, leading to successive improvements in institutional evaluation methodology, planning preparation and execution, and project monitoring.

According to the GePlanes project management system records linked to PLANES/2016-2020, 72 projects were submitted on spontaneous demand. Of these, 66 have been completed, five are still in progress, and one has not started due to administrative reasons. In addition, it is shown that two consecutive calls for Qualified Support for the Unicamp Library System were proposed to induce special projects with peer review of merit. All projects that started in September 2018 (Call 1) were completed by October 2020, and 82% of those that started in October 2019 (Call 2) were also completed. In 2018, a call for proposals was made to revitalize laboratories and implement new undergraduate teaching strategies. The proposals were evaluated based on merit by peers, and 90% of the projects have been completed. Between 2017 and May 2021, 99 projects were submitted, and 82% were completed by May 2021. All projects were made public.

However, there was no uniform participation by the administration bodies. Six bodies coordinated 64% of the projects. One possible interpretation of this result is that structured projects with action plans, implementation commitments, presentation of results, and institutional follow-up are not yet standard practice. This is despite planning being apparently embedded in the organizational culture. The need to improve coordination between various bodies is evidenced by the finding that many successful strategic actions, such as those associated with the university's financial and budgetary sustainability (Strategic Objective 11) (FERRY et al., 2020), were not included in the project portfolio. These actions were successfully carried out under the coordination of the PRDU/COP (Knobel; Brandão, 2021).

Regarding PLANES/2021-2025, approved by Consu in March 2021, it can be seen that: (1) between May 2021 and August 2022, no projects were presented; (2) between September 2022 and June 2023, 37 projects were presented, of which 7 were not started and none were completed by June 2023; no special calls for proposals to induce strategic actions were presented to Copei; and there is little synergy between these projects and the objectives and lines of strategic action defined in PLANES/2021-2025 (**Chart 5**) and with the results of the IA/2014-2018. No reports on strategic management have appeared on Consu agendas since December 2020. The sharp reduction in the number of projects, the absence of inductive projects, and the lack of new institutional reports indicate that strategic planning is no longer a driver of the university's actions, resulting in a discontinuity in strategic management that the existing governance system was unable to prevent.

6 Conclusions

This work reports on Unicamp's experience of governance and strategic management, based mainly on the implementation of PLANES/2016-2020, with the presentation of various examples of results linked to both the strategic objectives and the recommendations of the institutional evaluation committees. The responses from the internal institutional evaluation committees of Unicamp's academic bodies showed that there is a growing perception of the importance of strategic planning and that it is incorporated into the organizational culture of these units. The strategic objectives of PLANES/2021-2025 were also presented, as well as their link to the recommendations of the international evaluation commission for the 2014-2018 period.

An attempt was made to discuss the governance requirements for strategic management and the execution of institutional planning. Among the requirements critical to long-term planning success is that the institution must have an organizational structure with a clear definition of duties, leaders with public governance, and the ability to articulate among the various stakeholders. In the case of Unicamp, Consu, Copei and COP are the main statutory governance bodies that make up the institution's strategic level and enable strategic management. Therefore, the university's leaders are part of these bodies and can liaise with the tactical and operational levels to make the strategic agenda defined by planning feasible. In the case of PLANES/2016-2020, this organizational structure acted in the selection, prioritization, monitoring of projects and actions, approval of the necessary resources, and evaluation of the results of the projects carried out, demonstrating that the university is structured to carry out strategic management compatible with good public administration practices. This has led to a portfolio of executed and completed projects consistent with the results of the institutional evaluation. The work also showed that, after May 2021, there was a loss of prominence for strategic management concerning the administrative projects of the new managers, demonstrating that meeting the requirements above is necessary but insufficient for strategic management.

In addition, the work showed that the risks of discontinuity in long-term actions/projects are always present in vertical hierarchical structures, as is the case at the top of the organization's decision-making chain, which does not assume strategic planning as a driver of institutional decisions. Good public governance requires that the management plan establishes **how** to achieve the goals related to the strategic objectives, reporting periodically to the collegiate bodies. In other words, the administration should align the administration's plan with that of strategic management. The execution of the plan should be an exercise that permeates all hierarchical levels of the institution: the strategic level executing the planning, prioritizing the projects and demanding results; the tactical and operational hierarchical levels assuming the deployment of the strategies and executing the action plans; the collegiate bodies being informed of the results and periodically reviewing the plan; and the control

bodies (in particular the courts of auditors), demanding results. Therefore, for good governance, it is not enough to have adequate organizational structures and methodologies, it is necessary to incorporate strategic planning as an integral part of management and, for this, the articulating role of university leaders is essential.

Paludo and Oliveira (2021) argue that effective public governance necessitates capable leaders and facilitators for public management who can engage the community and middle management to implement transformative actions synergistically. Similarly, Marcovitch (2017, p. 18) emphasizes that academic leaders must possess strong knowledge of their area of responsibility and a comprehensive understanding of the university. They should be capable of creating a collective vision for the future that extends beyond their term of office. In certain instances, strategic management challenges can be addressed through training individuals and providing methodology, infrastructure, and resources. However, in other cases, these challenges arise from intricate internal social processes that involve senior management and conflicts of interest among various stakeholders. To reconcile the various interests, it is necessary to have high-level managerial qualifications and a greater level of maturity to adopt a new form of management. This new form of management should be based on strategies, measurable results, and periodic monitoring of targets. The federal control bodies have already included this conceptual change in their agenda and are demanding that the federal direct administration and autonomous bodies achieve results beyond accounting and procedural ones (Paludo; Oliveira, 2021). In this sense, federal HEIs are also adapting to this new reality. The study revealed that while Unicamp has widely implemented strategic planning and linked it to institutional evaluation results, it has not yet established strategic management as one of the best practices in public governance.

Another important aspect of this work is that the results of strategic management should encourage good governance and management practices in public higher education institutions. Truly transformative projects can have an impact beyond the duration of mandates. An obvious example is financial sustainability, which was included as a strategic objective in PLANES/2016-2020 and maintained in PLANES/2021-2025. Payroll expenses have accounted for around 85% of state treasury transfers (RTE) for decades. Budget deficits since 2011 have led São Paulo state universities to face the most serious financial crisis since the autonomy decree. The universities' image has been damaged due to budget deficits resulting from high-risk decisions not thoroughly analyzed by the high-level managers. This has had long-term consequences, as seen during the Parliamentary Commission of Inquiry of the Legislative Assembly of the State of São Paulo. Therefore, good public governance requires responsible accountability, which was provided for in Unicamp's plans, although some leaders ignored it. Another issue is the case of diversity actions at the university. The impact of decisions, such as quotas, can only be effectively measured after several years, as is the case with this decision that has transcended several administrations. This issue was also addressed in both PLANES/2016-2020 and PLANES/2021-2025. By including these new segments of the population in the university through various mechanisms, new demands arise. Fulfilling these demands requires new contextual analyses to guide the most appropriate,

sustainable, and high-impact decisions. In short, well-designed and well-executed planning produces results, changes the scenario, and requires new assessments in a virtuous development cycle. Poorly executed planning can frustrate expectations, lead to suboptimal decisions, and make it difficult to revisit the issue later. It is important to plan effectively to avoid these issues.

References

AGOPYAN, Vahan; TONETO Jr., Rudinei. O desequilíbrio financeiro da Universidade de São Paulo: origens e medidas de ajuste. **Revista da USP**, São Paulo, v. 105, p.19-32, 2015. Disponível em: <https://www.revistas.usp.br/revusp/article/view/106677>. Acesso em: 03 abr. 2022.

ATVARS, Teresa Dib Zambon; SERAFIM, Milena Pavan; CARNEIRO, Ana Maria. Os desafios da gestão da qualidade numa universidade pública brasileira: a experiência da Unicamp. **Revista de Gestão e Avaliação Educacional**, Campinas/Sorocaba, v. 11, p. 1-24, 2022. Disponível em: <https://periodicos.ufsm.br/regae/article/view/70275>. Acesso em: 01 maio 2023.

ATVARS, Teresa Dib Zambon; CARNEIRO, Ana Maria (Org.) **Relatório final de avaliação institucional UNICAMP 2014-2018**. Campinas, SP:BCCL/UNICAMP, 2020, 816p. recurso digital: il. e-ISBN 978-65-5093-007-3.

BAHIA, Leandro Oliveira. **Guia referencial**: construindo e analisando indicadores. Brasília: ENAP, 2021, 43 p.: il. color. ISBN: 978-65-87791-19-7.

BALBACHEVSKY, Elizabeth; KOHTAMÄKI, Vuokko. Autonomia e Governança Universitária: uma Abordagem Comparativa USP (Brasil) e UTA (Finlândia). In: MARCOVITCH, Jacques (Ed.). **Repensar a Universidade II: Impactos para a Sociedade**. São Paulo: Editora Com Arte, 2019, p. 235. ISBN 978-85-7166-195-0.

BAZHANOV, Valentin A. *et al.* External Institutional Evaluation for period 2014-2018. In: ATVARS, Teresa Dib Zambon; CARNEIRO, Ana Maria (Org.) **Relatório final de avaliação institucional UNICAMP 2014-2018**. Campinas, SP:BCCL/UNICAMP, 2020, p.695-744. recurso digital: il. e-ISBN 978-65-5093-007-3.

BERNASCONI, Andrés; CELIS, Sergio. Higher education reforms: Latin America in comparative perspective. **Education Policy Analysis Archives**, Arizona, v. 25, n. 67, p. 1-11, 2017. Disponível em: <https://epaa.asu.edu/index.php/epaa/article/view/3240>. Acesso em: 08 fev. 2023.

BIRNBAUM, Robert. **How Academic Leadership Works**: Understanding success and failure in the College Presidency. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers; 1992. 252 p. ISBN 1-55542-466-X.

BRASIL. Produto 4. **Guia Referencial para Medição de Desempenho e Manual de Construção de Indicadores (40-70)**. Brasília: ENAP, 2009. Disponível em:

https://bibliotecadigital.economia.gov.br/bitstream/777/613/1/guia_indicadores_jun2010.pdf. Acesso em: 10 fev. 2023.

BRASIL. Tribunal de Contas da União (TCU). **Referencial Básico de Governança Aplicável a Órgãos e Entidades da Administração Pública**. 2^o Ed. Brasília: TCU, 80 p., 2014. Disponível em:

https://portal.tcu.gov.br/data/files/FA/B6/EA/85/1CD4671023455957E18818A8/Referencial_basico_governanca_2_edicao.PDF. Acesso em: 20 nov. 2022.

BRASIL. Tribunal de Contas da União (TCU). **Referencial Básico de Governança Organizacional**: para organizações públicas e outros entes jurisdicionados ao TCU. 3^o Ed. Brasília: TCU, 2020, 240 p. Disponível em:

<https://portal.tcu.gov.br/governanca/governancapublica/organizacional/levantamento-de-governanca/levantamento-de-governanca.htm>. Acesso em: 24 agosto 2023.

BRASIL. Tribunal de Contas da União (TCU). **Dez passos para a boa governança**. 2^o Ed. Brasília: TCU, 2021, 44 p. Disponível em: www.gov.br/plataformamaisbrasil/pt-br/modelo-de-governanca-e-gestao/sobre-o-gestaogov/modelo-e-guia-do-gestaogov/guia-do-img-100-pontos.pd. Acesso em: 24 agosto 2023.

BRUSCHI, Giovana Fernanda Justino; CASARTELLI, Alam de Oliveira. A articulação entre a autoavaliação e os processos de planejamento em instituições de educação superior no estado do Rio Grande do Sul. **Educação Por Escrito**, Porto Alegre, v. 8, n. 2, p. 171-188, 2017. Disponível em:

<https://revistaseletronicas.pucrs.br/ojs/index.php/poescrito/article/view/28002>. Acesso em: 08 fev. 2023.

BUCCELLI, Rogerio Luiz; *et al.* Desafios para a sustentabilidade financeira das universidades estaduais paulistas e superação da recente crise orçamentária e financeira da Unesp. In: VALENTINI, Sandro Roberto; NOBRE, Sergio Roberto. **Universidade em Transformação – Lições das Crises**. São Paulo: Editora da Unesp, 2020, p. 51-81. ISBN 978-65-5711-006-5.

DIOGO, Sara Margarida Alpendre; BARBOZA, Milka Alves Correia; CARVALHO, Maria Teresa Geraldo. An international comparative perspective on higher education institution's governance and management – Portugal, Finland and Brazil. **Intercultural Studies in Higher Education, Intercultural Studies in Education**, p. 109-133, 2019. Disponível em: https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-030-15758-6_5. Acesso em: 08 fev. 2023.

DONINA, Davide; PALEARI, Stefano. New public management: global reform script or conceptual stretching? Analysis of university governance structures in the Napoleonic administrative tradition. **Higher Education**, v. 78, p. 193-219, 2019. Disponível em: <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10734-018-0338-y>. Acesso em: 15 out. 2022.

FAVERO, Marietta; BRAY, Nathaniel. In: SMART, J. C. (Ed.). Herding cats and big dogs: tensions in the faculty-administrator relationship. **Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research**, v. 25, p. 477-541, 2010. Disponível em: https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-90-481-8598-6_13. Acesso em: 15 out. 2022.

FERRI, Emerson José; MONTICELLI, Nelma Aparecida Magdalena; ATVARS, Teresa Dib Zambon. Planejamento e Gestão Estratégica na Unicamp: do planejamento aos resultados. *In: SERAFIM, Milena Pavan; ATVARS, Teresa Dib Zambon (Org). Planejamento e Gestão Estratégica no Setor Público: Aplicações e reflexões a partir da Unicamp.* Campinas: Editora Unicamp, 2020, p. 155-194. ISBN 978-65-8653-59-7.

GEORGE, Bert; WALTER, Richard; MONSTER, Joost. Does strategic planning improve organizational performance? A meta-analysis. **Public Administration Review**, v. 79, n. 6, p. 810-919, 2019. Disponível em: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/puar.13104>. Acesso em: 15 out. 2022.

GESSER, Grazielle Alano *et al.* Governança universitária: um panorama dos estudos científicos desenvolvidos sobre a governança em instituições de educação superior brasileiras. **Avaliação**, Campinas/Sorocaba, v. 26, n. 1, p. 5-23, 2021. Disponível em: <https://www.scielo.br/j/aval/a/dHSCFkhscTBnXtYzv59KBgD/>. Acesso em: 15 out. 2022.

HUISMAN, Jeroen; BJORN, Stensaker. Performance governance and management in higher education revisited: international developments and perspectives. **Quality in Higher Education**, v. 28, n. 1, 106-119, 2022. Disponível em: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/epdf/10.1080/13538322.2021.1951457?needAccess=true&role=button>. Acesso em: 02 jun. 2023.

KNOBEL, Marcelo; BRANDÃO, Rachel Bueno (Org.). **Relatório de Gestão: 2017-2021.** Campinas:Unicamp, 2021, 160 p. il. ISBN 978-65-88816-16-5.

LEMAITRE, Maria José *et al.* Repensando a garantia de qualidade para o ensino superior no Brasil. **Revisões das Políticas Nacionais para a Educação.** OCDE, 2018, p. 185. Disponível em: https://download.inep.gov.br/acoes_internacionais/ocde/Repensando_a_Garantia_de_Qualidade_para_o_Ensino_Superior_no_Brasil_PT.pdf. Acesso em: 02 out. 2022.

LOBATO, Josiane de Oliveira; *et al.* Os indicadores de desempenho e de qualidade e o processo de governança nas universidades federais brasileiras: Um estudo multicaso. **Revista de Administração**, v. 12, n. 3, p. 594-609, 2019. Disponível em: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/340427108_Os_indicadores_de_desempenho_e_de_qualidade_e_o_processo_de_governanca_nas_Universidades_Federais_Brasileiras_um_estudo_multicaso. Acesso em: 02 out. 2022.

MINTZBERG, Henry. Who should control the corporation? **California Management Review**, v. 27, n. 1, p. 90-116, 1984. Disponível em: <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.2307/41165115?journalCode=cmra>. Acesso em: 02 out. 2022.

MONTICELLI, Nelma Aparecida Magdalena; *et al.* Avaliação institucional e gestão estratégica – vínculos necessários para o desenvolvimento institucional. **Avaliação**, Campinas/Sorocaba, v. 26, n. 1, p. 315-342, 2021. Disponível em: <https://www.scielo.br/j/aval/a/HV7CFsRvwyVbMdSx597wJ4H/>. Acesso em: 02 out. 2022.

PALUDO, Augustinho; OLIVEIRA, Antonio. **Governança Organizacional Pública e Planejamento Estratégico**: para órgãos e entidades públicas. Indaiatuba: Editora Foco, 2021. 160 p. ISBN 978-65-5515-243-2.

PLANETA, Cleopatra Silva; *et al.* Impacto Social das Universidades. *In*: Marcovitch, Jacques (Ed.). **Repensar a Universidade II**: Impactos para a Sociedade. São Paulo: Editora Com Arte, 2019, p. 195-218. ISBN 978-85-7166-195-0.

RANIERI, Nina Beatriz Stocco. **Governança universitária, complexidade, pressão e desafios**. 2021. Disponível em: <https://metricas.usp.br/governanca-universitaria/>. Acesso 30 jul. 2022.

SARRICO, Cláudia; VEIGA, Amélia; AMARAL, Alberto. The long road-how evolving institutional governance mechanisms are changing the face of quality in Portuguese higher education. **Educational Assessment Evaluation and Accountability**, v. 25, p. 375-391, 2013. Disponível em: <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11092-013-9174-x>. Acesso em: 02 out. 2022.

STAUB, Donald. ‘Another accreditation? What’s the point?’ Effective planning and implementation for specialized accreditation. **Quality in Higher Education**, v. 25, n. 2, p. 171-190, 2019. Disponível em: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/13538322.2019.1634342>. Acesso em: 02 out. 2022.

STEPHENS, Simon; GALLAGER, Pdraig. Metrics, metrics: the emergence of technological universities in Ireland. **Quality Assurance in Education**, v. 30, n. 1, p. 19-31, 2022. Disponível em: <https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/QAE-04-2021-0060/full/html>. Acesso em: 02 out. 2022.

TRAUMANN, Thomas. Guedes e vôo da galinha: o crescimento de 2021 vem acompanhado de inflação e sem emprego. **Veja**, São Paulo, 1 de junho de 2021. Disponível em: <https://veja.abril.com.br/coluna/thomas-traumann/guedes-e-voo-da-galinha>. Acesso em: 20 nov. 2022.

WISE, Graham; *et al.* Inclusive higher education governance: managing stakeholders, strategy, structure and function. **Studies in Higher Education**, v. 45, n. 2, p. 339-352, 2020. Disponível em: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/03075079.2018.1525698>. Acesso em: 02 out. 2022.

ZIMMERMAN, Fábio. **Gestão Estratégica com o uso do BSC**. Brasília: ENAP, 2015. Disponível em: https://planejamentoestrategico.mcti.gov.br/arquivos/Gestao_Estrategia_BSC.pdf. Acesso em: 02 out. 2022.