

Routledge Open Business and Economics

DIGITAL TRANSFORMATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION MANAGEMENT

A NEW ACADEMIC WAVE

Łukasz Sułkowski, Regina Lenart, and Roksana Ulatowska



ROUTLEDGE

Digital Transformation in Higher Education Management

Universities are undergoing profound transformations as digital technologies reshape their missions, governance, and organisational culture. This book provides a comprehensive analysis of these changes, offering an integrative framework to understand digital transformation as a systemic shift in higher education. Grounded in post-pandemic case studies from Europe and Asia, it examines how digital tools, institutional strategies, and leadership practices intersect to drive innovation while addressing challenges such as equity, academic integrity, and organisational resistance. Readers will gain valuable insights from the "new academic wave" framework, which reconfigures traditional higher education theories for the digital era. Key topics include data-driven governance, inclusive digital pedagogy, cybersecurity, faculty online safety, and the evolving roles of leadership and culture. The book combines rigorous research with practical guidance, featuring comparative case studies, actionable strategies, and critical reflections to support both scholarly inquiry and institutional decision-making. This monograph is essential for higher education researchers, university leaders, policymakers, and educational technology professionals. Its global perspective, human-centred approach, and balance of theory and practice ensure relevance for diverse institutional contexts. By bridging academic analysis with practical solutions, it equips readers to navigate the complexities of digital transformation in higher education.

Łukasz Sułkowski is a Professor of Management in the Department of Management and Social Communication and Head of the Department of Higher Education Institution Management at Jagiellonian University, Poland.

Regina Lenart is a Professor of Management in the Department of Management and Social Communication and the Director of the Institute of Public Affairs at Jagiellonian University, Poland.

Roksana Ulatowska is an Assistant Professor in the Institute of Public Affairs at Jagiellonian University, Poland.

Routledge Open Business and Economics

Routledge Open Business and Economics provides a platform for the open access publication of monographs and edited collections across the full breadth of these disciplines including accounting, finance, management, marketing and political economy. Reflecting our commitment to supporting open access publishing, this series provides a key repository for academic research in business and economics.

Books in the series are published via the Gold Open Access model and are therefore available for free download and re-use according to the terms of Creative Commons licence. They can be accessed via the Routledge and Taylor & Francis website, as well as third party discovery sites such as the Directory of OAPEN Library, Open Access Books, PMC Bookshelf, and Google Books.

Note that the other Business and Economics series at Routledge also all accept open access books for publication.

Environmental, Social, and Governance Ratings
Risks, Regulations, and Market Dynamics
Patrycja Chodnicka-Jaworska

Just Transition and the European Green Deal
Regional Perspectives
Edited by Everardus Wilhelmus (Michiel) Stapper, Marcin Baron, Ralph Horne, Nevelina Pachova and Monika Wieczorek-Kosmala

Sustainable Development in East Asia
Edited by Krzysztof Falkowski

Digital Transformation in Higher Education Management
A New Academic Wave
Łukasz Sułkowski, Regina Lenart, and Roksana Ulatowska

For more information about this series, please visit: Routledge Open Business and Economics - Book Series - Routledge & CRC Press

Digital Transformation in Higher Education Management

A New Academic Wave

Łukasz Sułkowski, Regina Lenart, and Roksana Ulatowska

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
NEW YORK AND LONDON

First published 2027
by Routledge
605 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10158

and by Routledge
4 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon, OX14 4RN

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

© 2027 Łukasz Sułkowski, Regina Lenart, and Roksana Ulatowska

The right of Łukasz Sułkowski, Regina Lenart, and Roksana Ulatowska to be identified as authors of this work has been asserted in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

The Open Access version of this book, available at www.taylorfrancis.com, has been made available under a Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial-No Derivatives (CC BY-NC-ND) 4.0 International license.

Any third party material in this book is not included in the OA Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. Please direct any permissions enquiries to the original rightsholder.

The publication has been supported by a grant from the Faculty of Management and Social Communication under the Strategic Programme Excellence Initiative at Jagiellonian University.

For Product Safety Concerns and Information please contact our EU representative GPSR@taylorandfrancis.com. Taylor & Francis Verlag GmbH, Kaufingerstraße 24, 80331 München, Germany.

Trademark notice: Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

ISBN: 978-1-041-36216-6 (hbk)
ISBN: 978-1-041-36217-3 (pbk)
ISBN: 978-1-042-00142-2 (ebk)

DOI: 10.4324/9781042001422

Typeset in Galliard
by Newgen Publishing UK

Contents

Introduction 1

PART I
Academic Missions in the Digital Era 15

1 Digital Research Ecosystems 17

2 Teaching and Learning in the Digital University 33

3 Digital Engagement and the Third Mission 55

PART II
Digital Governance, Leadership, and Administration 71

4 New Governance Paradigms in the Digital Era 73

5 Academic Leadership in the Digital University 90

6 Digital Transformation of Administration and Professional Services 107

PART III
Organisational Dynamics of the Digital University 125

7 Reimagining University Strategy in the Digital Age 127

8 Evolving Organisational Culture in Academia 148

9 Reconfiguring Power Dynamics in the University 173

PART IV
Digital Transformation of Management Functions 197

10 Managing Human Capital and Talent in a Digital Environment 199

11 Digital Marketing and Communication Strategies 209

12 Financial Management and Data-Driven Decision-Making 226

PART V
The New Academic Wave – Challenges and Futures 239

13 Core Characteristics of the New Academic Wave 241

14 Contradictions and Challenges in the New Era 258

15 Horizons and Emerging Possibilities for the New Academic Wave 275

16 Empirical Case Studies of Digital-Era Transformation in Higher Education Management 290

Index *311*

Introduction

In an era of rapid and pervasive digitalisation, universities worldwide are confronting transformative pressures that alter the ways in which they operate, teach, conduct research, and engage with society. Through a comprehensive, multidimensional lens, this monograph examines the digital transformation of higher education management. It provides a research-grounded examination of how emergent digital technologies and evolving data practices are reshaping the principal goals, organisational structures, and strategic orientations of contemporary universities. Rather than treating digitalisation as a sequence of discrete technology deployments, this book argues that digital transformation constitutes an institutional recomposition of academic work, culture, and governance. Such a systemic shift demands analytical frameworks capable of accounting for its full complexity.

To capture this systemic character, the book introduces the concept of the "new academic wave", an integrative analytical framework for understanding digital transformation not as a technical phenomenon but as a broader structural reconfiguration of the university as an institution. The framework draws on organisational theory, higher education studies, and science and technology studies to conceptualise how digitalisation restructures authority, redistributes professional autonomy, and redefines institutional missions. This conceptual foundation guides the empirical analysis throughout the book and enables the authors to move beyond descriptive accounts of technology adoption towards explanatory accounts of institutional change.

This research monograph investigates how universities have become what might be termed "digital universities" without thereby becoming merely digital organisations. That is, how they have integrated digital logics into their core operations while sustaining, renegotiating, or in some cases undermining distinctively academic values and norms. The book treats digital transformation as an institutional recomposition of the university's mission, authority structures, and professional norms, rather than as a set of tools to be deployed within an otherwise stable institution.

DOI: 10.4324/9781042001422-1
This chapter has been made available under a CC BY-NC-ND license.

The book's analytical scope spans the three core missions of the modern research university – teaching and learning, research and open science, and civic engagement – as well as the administrative functions that increasingly steer and mediate these missions: governance, finance, human resources, quality assurance, marketing, and institutional analytics, including AI-driven decision support. This focus is timely. Major international bodies and university associations, including Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), and the European University Association, have identified artificial intelligence (AI), data infrastructures, and digitally enhanced learning as system-level forces reshaping educational governance and organisational capabilities. At the same time, this situation raises important questions about fairness, academic honesty, and how institutions are held responsible (OECD, 2021; EUA, 2023; UNESCO, 2022).

The empirical design of the study is structured around the principles of methodological triangulation. In the cases examined in this volume, documentary analysis was complemented by direct engagement with the institutions under study. Three interrelated forms of empirical evidence were used: documentary sources, semi-structured interviews, and observational data. The documentary corpus includes institutional strategy documents, digital transformation reports, annual reports, and governance communications. During fieldwork visits, the research team conducted in-depth semi-structured interviews with institutional leaders, academic staff, administrative managers, and information technology (IT) professionals. These interviews were further complemented by direct and participant observation of digitally mediated teaching and administrative environments, institutional processes, and everyday digital practices. This triangulated design enabled the study to move beyond formal policy narratives and examine how digital transformation was interpreted, enacted, and embedded within institutional settings.

The empirical focus on the post-pandemic phase is deliberate. This period is treated as a distinct phase of digital maturation and institutional learning, thereby enabling the analysis to differentiate sustained, strategically embedded transformation from the emergency-response dynamics that characterised the earlier COVID-19 period. This distinction is analytically significant: whereas the pandemic phase was characterised by rapid, largely reactive digitalisation, the post-pandemic phase has been marked by deliberate consolidation, critical reflection, and the renegotiation of digital arrangements across governance, curriculum, and research infrastructure. The fieldwork and study visits were conducted within this post-pandemic window, ensuring that the primary data capture institutional responses under conditions of strategic deliberation rather than crisis management.

A distinctive feature of this monograph is the analytical role assigned to the case studies presented throughout the volume. Rather than functioning as comprehensive institutional portraits or as the primary vehicles of empirical exposition, the cases are deployed as focused illustrative examples that illuminate specific mechanisms, tensions, and pathways of digital transformation theorised within the *new academic wave* framework. Their purpose is not to provide exhaustive descriptions of individual universities, but to render visible how particular dimensions of digitalisation operate under different organisational, cultural, and governance conditions.

The case studies are therefore presented as analytically selective illustrations. Each is introduced at points in the book where the distinctive features of the institution under discussion are relevant to the conceptual arguments being developed. These cases serve to concretise abstract dynamics – such as shifts in authority, reconfiguration of professional roles, or the interaction between digital infrastructure and academic values – without claiming to represent full institutional trajectories or generalisable models.

The case studies are treated as interpretive lenses rather than evaluative judgements. The reader is invited to engage with them as situated examples that reveal how digital transformation unfolds in practice, shaped by national contexts, governance arrangements, organisational histories, and institutional missions. Differences between cases are not framed in terms of success or failure, but as analytically productive variations within a shared transformation wave.

While the empirical material underpinning these case illustrations is grounded in original research, methodological considerations are addressed separately. A dedicated methodological section details the design principles guiding case selection, the modes of data collection employed, and the analytical strategies used to interpret empirical material. This separation is intentional: it allows the Introduction to focus on framing the conceptual and analytical ambitions of the book, while ensuring that issues of research design, triangulation, and validity are treated with appropriate depth and transparency elsewhere.

By positioning case studies as analytically targeted illustrations rather than comprehensive empirical accounts, the monograph maintains its primary orientation as a theory-driven investigation into institutional change. The cases support this aim by demonstrating how the *new academic wave* manifests in concrete organisational settings, while leaving space for readers to reflect on how these dynamics may resonate – differently and unevenly – within their own institutional contexts.

The illustrative examples used throughout this volume draw on a deliberately varied set of higher education institutions that reflect the

structural diversity of contemporary university systems. These include large public research universities, born-digital institutions developed around online and hybrid organisational logics, universities of applied sciences with strong regional and practice-oriented missions, and cooperative or mission-driven universities embedded in distinctive governance and economic arrangements. The institutions referenced are located across North America, Europe, and Asia and operate under differing policy regimes, levels of institutional autonomy, and degrees of state coordination. This diversity is not employed for the purposes of institutional comparison or evaluation. Rather, it provides an empirical backdrop against which the book examines how the dynamics associated with the *new academic wave* of digital transformation take shape across contrasting organisational forms, governance contexts, and academic cultures.

This research monograph is organised around five central questions at the intersection of digital innovation and higher education management:

1) How can digital technologies be integrated into teaching, research, and community engagement in ways that drive innovation without compromising academic standards, professional autonomy, or core institutional values?
2) In what ways are university governance models and leadership practices evolving in the digital era, and what new paradigms and roles are emerging to balance entrepreneurial agility with scholarly tradition and collegial governance?
3) How does digital transformation influence the organisational culture and power dynamics within universities, and how can institutions foster an innovative, adaptive culture while maintaining inclusive governance and a robust academic identity?
4) How are the core management functions of higher education institutions – spanning human resources, marketing, finance, quality assurance, and institutional analytics – being reconstituted through data-driven tools and AI? What practices ensure that these innovations support, rather than supplant or distort, educational missions?
5) What defines the "new academic wave" of transformation in contemporary higher education, and what future opportunities and challenges does this wave present for institutions seeking to remain resilient, equitable, and academically rigorous in an increasingly digitalised world?

The book is structured in five parts, each reflecting a key dimension of digital transformation in higher education management. Each part opens with a brief framing section that situates the forthcoming chapters within the new academic wave framework, making explicit the connections between the empirical cases and the theoretical mechanisms under examination. This

architecture is intended to ensure that the book functions as a cumulative argument rather than a collection of discrete case studies or thematic surveys.

Throughout the volume, empirical findings are explicitly connected back to the theoretical mechanisms introduced in the opening framework – demonstrating, for example, how a new governance platform altered decision-making dynamics in ways consistent with the framework's predictions, or how particular forms of digital infrastructure investment produced unintended consequences for academic culture and professional identity. The aim is not merely to document what has changed but to explain why, under what conditions, and with what implications for the future governance and management of the university.

Part I: Academic Missions in the Digital Era
This section examines how the core missions of the university (research, teaching, and public engagement – the "third mission") are being transformed by digital forces. It sets the stage by examining the frontline academic changes that the new wave encompasses.

Chapter 1: Digital Research Ecosystems
Chapter 1 examines how scholarly research activities, infrastructures, and outputs are being reshaped by digital transformation. It develops a conceptual framework for understanding digital research ecosystems as socio-technical environments in which data infrastructures, open science platforms, artificial intelligence tools, repository systems, governance arrangements, and research communities interact across the full research lifecycle. The chapter discusses the historical shift towards data-intensive science, the emergence of the fourth paradigm of scientific discovery, and the growing importance of open data, Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, and Reusable (FAIR) principles, automated knowledge curation, and virtual collaboration across institutions.

The chapter uses selected conceptual and literature-based examples to illustrate how digital infrastructures are changing the organisation, validation, preservation, and evaluation of research. Particular attention is paid to the opportunities associated with faster knowledge sharing, interdisciplinary collaboration, and enhanced research transparency, as well as to the risks posed by data security challenges, infrastructural fragmentation, digital divides, academic capitalism, and excessive reliance on quantitative research metrics such as bibliometric indicators and altmetrics.

The chapter does not claim to provide a generalisable empirical model of digital research transformation. Instead, it establishes the theoretical and analytical foundations for the book's subsequent discussion of digital transformation in higher education institutions. It argues that digital innovation in research can enhance academic openness, rigour, and collaboration,

but only when supported by appropriate governance structures, ethical safeguards, infrastructural equity, and a sustained commitment to curiosity-driven inquiry.

Chapter 2: Teaching and Learning in the Digital University
This chapter delves into the process of digitising pedagogy and enhancing the student's learning experience. It covers the expansion of online and blended learning, the use of learning management systems, AI tutors and analytics, virtual reality classrooms, and digital credentials. The chapter examines how these tools can personalise instruction and expand access while also critically assessing the risk that over-reliance on learning analytics and automated assessment may reduce education to what is easily measurable, potentially overlooking dimensions such as critical thinking and creativity. New emphasis is placed on inclusive design and accessibility, examining how digital learning environments can accommodate diverse student needs – or inadvertently exclude some – and on academic integrity issues, particularly the rise of AI-generated content and online assessment, which is prompting new integrity strategies. The chapter also addresses the importance of preserving the human element in teaching – mentorship, academic freedom, and intellectual curiosity – along with digital tools. As useful examples of how technology can effectively enhance teaching and improve student learning, the chapter describes how a medium-sized university used an AI-based personalised learning platform, along with training for teachers and changes in rules to maintain academic standards.

Chapter 3: Digital Engagement and the Third Mission
Chapter 3 focuses on the ways in which universities engage with society in the digital age, which is often referred to as the "third mission" of outreach and service. It covers social media scholarship, academic blogging, podcasts, digital public lectures, Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs) that extend education to the public, and partnerships enabled by technology, including innovation hubs and startup incubators that link academic research with entrepreneurial activity in broader networks. This chapter specifically examines emerging security and reputational concerns, including the potential for online harassment or personal threats against lecturers who disseminate their research via social media, and the strategies institutions are implementing to safeguard academics' personal security in digital environments. Furthermore, the chapter explores digital equity, highlighting that rural and underserved populations may not fully benefit from online outreach unless access obstacles are overcome, and posits that the third mission in the digital era necessitates intentional efforts to promote inclusivity and achieve significant outcomes. It also analyses the role of universities in combating misinformation and providing online expertise, thereby illustrating the evolving responsibilities of academia within a networked public sphere.

Part II: Digital Governance, Leadership, and Administration
This section delves into the management and governance structures of universities and how they are adapting (or struggling to adapt) to the digital wave. Each chapter in this part connects to the leadership and governance mechanisms of the framework, with an introduction highlighting how digitalisation redefines authority and decision-making in universities.

Chapter 4: New Governance Paradigms in the Digital Era
Chapter 4 explores the transformation of university governance and decision-making through digitalisation. Key themes include data-informed governance (the use of dashboards and analytics in strategic planning), distributed decision structures (e.g., crowdsourcing input from the campus via online platforms), and changes in policy and regulatory compliance (such as managing privacy regulations like General Data Protection Regulation in educational data). We also discuss cybersecurity and risk management as a modern governance concern – for instance, many universities now include cybersecurity expertise on governing boards and have to address hacking and data breach risks as part of governance and risk oversight. Another new topic in this chapter is the cross-jurisdictional challenge – namely, how global digital programmes force governance to navigate different national regulations and ensure equitable access for international students (e.g., dealing with varying internet censorship or privacy laws). The chapter uses the case of a university senate that adopted an online system for policy deliberations, analysing how the arrangement changed participation and accountability.

Chapter 5: Academic Leadership in the Digital University
The focus in this chapter is on the roles and approaches of academic leaders in steering digital transformation, including department chairs, deans, provosts, and university executives. It covers leadership strategies for fostering innovation, overcoming resistance to change, and building a digital-ready organisational culture. We discuss skills that leaders need, such as being able to use technology and manage change by, for example, setting up "innovation committees" that include people from different departments. Drawing on transformative leadership theory, the chapter outlines how visionary leaders can inspire a shared digital vision. It also incorporates leadership change theories (including ecosystem leadership concepts) to suggest that effective leaders act as network orchestrators, connecting teams and resources across traditional boundaries to achieve digital transformation. Furthermore, the role of faculty and staff unions is addressed here, acknowledging that leaders must engage with union representatives when initiatives affect workloads, roles, or work conditions. For instance, a case vignette will show how a university president negotiated with faculty unions to implement a new online teaching policy. By analysing

such examples, the chapter provides insight into collaborative leadership approaches that balance innovation with consensus-building.

Chapter 6: Digital Transformation of Administration and Professional Services
Chapter 6 reviews how the administrative backbone of universities (registrars, libraries, IT services, student services, Human Resources, etc.) is being digitised and modernised. The topics include automation of administrative processes (e.g., admissions chatbots, robotic process automation in finance), the introduction of integrated campus Enterprise Resource Planning systems (ERPs) and cloud systems, and data-driven decision-making in support services (using predictive analytics for student success, for example). The chapter uses the case of a university library that went mostly digital and a student affairs office that introduced an AI advising system. It discusses efficiency gains, cost issues, and the need to retrain administrative staff. Importantly, we also consider organisational and ethical implications, for instance, how the shift to digital services may affect staff roles or pose privacy concerns. This chapter ties back to governance as well, noting how administrative data is now part of strategic governance conversations. It is shown that digital transformation in administration is not just an IT upgrade; it also requires change management and can encounter cultural resistance similar to academic change.

Part III: Organisational Dynamics of the Digital University
This section addresses how deeper organisational elements – strategy, culture, and internal power structures – are reimagined in the context of digital transformation. In the Part III introduction, we outline how the "new academic wave" triggers changes in institutional identity and norms, linking these chapters to this idea.

Chapter 7: Reimagining University Strategy in the Digital Age
How do universities plan for the future amid unprecedented technological change? This is the central question of Chapter 7. It presents how academic strategy and planning processes have changed in the digital age. It indicates that traditional multi-year strategic plans are being supplemented or even replaced by more flexible, scenario-based, digitally infused ways of planning for institutions. The chapter presents the notion of "digital-era academic strategy", a planning framework that perpetually incorporates technological projections, data analytics, and digital competencies into the university's mission, identity, and objectives. A defining feature of the contemporary landscape is that universities are no longer treating digital transformation as a peripheral IT project; today it is a core strategic priority. Institutions across the globe are embedding digital objectives directly in their mission statements and strategic plans, declaring ambitions to become "digital by

default", to lead in online and hybrid learning, or to position themselves as technology-driven research powerhouses. This chapter examines how these strategic declarations translate or struggle to translate into institutional reality, and what governance, leadership, and cultural conditions enable or hinder their realisation.

Chapter 8: Evolving Organisational Culture in Academia
Chapter 8 examines the shifts in organisational culture among universities as they adapt to the digital era. The premise is that achieving sustainable innovation is not only a matter of new systems or policies, but also of cultural evolution – the shared values, norms, and attitudes among faculty, staff, and students that determine whether digital transformation is embraced, resisted, or merely tolerated. The chapter contends that culture constitutes the imperceptible framework of institutional transformation: in the absence of cultural preparedness, even the most advanced technologies and meticulously crafted strategies will either underachieve or completely collapse. The chapter explores cultural shifts across all three core domains of academic life – teaching, research, and administration. It examines how values and norms are evolving in each. It addresses the growing openness to online and hybrid pedagogy, the embrace of open science and collaborative digital research practices, and the emergence of data-driven decision-making mindsets in administrative culture. Throughout, the chapter is attentive to the tensions, contradictions, and resistances that accompany cultural change, recognising that culture is not simply "managed" by leadership but is collectively enacted, contested, and negotiated across the institutional community.

Chapter 9: Reconfiguring Power Dynamics in the University
Digital transformation in higher education not only changes operational processes but also reshapes patterns of influence over decisions. Chapter 9 investigates the evolving power dynamics and political structures within universities as they undergo digital change. The chapter argues that digitalisation is never politically neutral: it redistributes authority, creates new centres of expertise, empowers some actors while marginalising others, and challenges the established collegial and bureaucratic power structures that have historically governed academic institutions. The chapter examines how the rise of big data, digital infrastructure, and new professional roles has changed the balance of power among traditional groups: faculty, administrators, IT staff, students, and new hybrid roles like instructional designers and data analysts. It poses a key question: does digital transformation centralise authority (through enterprise systems, executive control of data, and top-down technology policies) or decentralise it (by making information more accessible, encouraging widespread participation, and amplifying previously unheard voices)? The chapter argues that digitalisation

does both at the same time, and the specific results within an institution depend on how governance structures manage these conflicting trends. This chapter ties directly to the book's analytical framework by illustrating how the "new academic wave" of digitalisation alters the traditional collegial and bureaucratic power structures in universities.

Part IV: Digital Transformation of Management Functions
This section zooms into specific managerial and functional domains (human resources, marketing/communications, and finance) to see how digitalisation is impacting each.

While each chapter stands on its own, an integrated perspective is maintained. The introduction and conclusion will highlight cross-cutting themes, such as the need for *data-driven decision-making* and the interconnectedness of these functions in the digital environment.

Chapter 10: Managing Human Capital and Talent in a Digital Environment
Chapter 10 addresses the human dimension of higher education management: how universities attract, develop, and retain talent (faculty, researchers, and professional staff) in an era of digital transformation. It begins by noting that the roles and skills demanded of university personnel are changing fundamentally. Faculty, for example, are increasingly expected not only to excel in teaching and research but also to be adept at using educational technology, managing an online presence, engaging with data analytics, or even contributing to entrepreneurial activities such as grant acquisition for technology initiatives. Professional staff face comparable shifts as administrative processes are digitalised, automated, and reorganised around new technological capabilities. The chapter examines how human resource strategies in universities are adapting to these expectations across the full talent lifecycle, from recruitment and hiring through professional development, performance evaluation, and career advancement to retention and well-being. Throughout, it emphasises a human-centric approach: even as automation and artificial intelligence enter HR processes, leadership must maintain transparency, fairness, and a commitment to treating faculty and staff as partners in innovation rather than as mere implementers of institutional mandates.

Chapter 11: Digital Marketing and Communication Strategies
In a highly competitive and interconnected higher education landscape, universities must reconsider their approach to marketing their programmes and communicating with stakeholders. Chapter 11 explores the transformation of marketing and external relations through digital strategies, while also examining the increasingly important domain of internal communications – how leadership uses digital channels to connect with faculty, students, and staff. The chapter argues that in the digital age, marketing, communication,

and institutional identity are no longer separate functions but are today deeply interconnected domains that together shape how a university is perceived, experienced, and trusted by its diverse audiences. The chapter illustrates the blend of marketing and IT functions that characterise contemporary university communications. Digital marketing now requires technical competencies that were previously the domain of IT departments, such as data analytics, platform management, content optimisation, and CRM administration. Conversely, IT teams must understand brand, message, and audience in ways that were once the exclusive province of communications professionals. This convergence demands new organisational structures, collaborative working relationships, and critically, digital literacy among communications staff at all levels.

Chapter 12: Financial Management and Data-Driven Decision-Making
This chapter explores the transformation of universities' financial planning and operations through the use of digital tools and data analytics. Universities face increasing pressure to be financially sustainable and accountable, which has spurred the adoption of sophisticated management information systems, predictive models, and fintech solutions. However, the chapter argues that digitalisation does more than just upgrade existing processes: it fundamentally reshapes the economic model of higher education, creating new revenue streams, new cost structures, new investment imperatives, and new forms of financial risk that governance frameworks must address. Throughout, the chapter stresses that data-driven finance should complement, not replace, strategic judgement. It connects financial management to the governance and cybersecurity themes explored in earlier chapters, noting that financial data now sits at the heart of strategic governance conversations and that protecting financial operations from cyber threats has become a board-level responsibility.

Part V: The New Academic Wave – Challenges and Futures
The concluding section steps back to assess the broader implications of the digital transformation wave and discusses the future trajectory of higher education. This section explicitly ties back to the framework initially introduced, evaluating how well the "new academic wave" concept explains the case findings and where the remaining gaps or uncertainties lie.

Chapter 13: Core Characteristics of the New Academic Wave
Chapter 13 synthesises findings from all previous chapters to articulate the defining features of the transformation reshaping higher education – what this book terms the "new academic wave". The chapter revisits the framework's key components – mission re-composition, data-driven governance, cultural shifts, power dynamics, human capital, and financial management – and shows how the case studies presented throughout the book

have illustrated each. It distils a set of characteristics and principles that underlie successful digital transformation in universities, while also examining variations in how the wave manifests across different institutional contexts. This chapter serves a dual function. First, it provides a clear, consolidated framework of what defines the new academic wave – a reference point that readers can carry into their own institutional contexts. Second, it subjects that framework to critical scrutiny: What has been confirmed by the evidence presented in the book? What has emerged as more complex or contested than initially anticipated? What might need adjustment or further investigation? The chapter sets the stage for the critical reflections and forward-looking discussions in the final chapters.

Chapter 14: Contradictions and Challenges in the New Era
While the new academic wave creates opportunities, it also generates significant tensions that universities must navigate. Chapter 14 takes a critical look at the contradictions, trade-offs, and unresolved challenges inherent in digitally driven transformation. The chapter serves as a deliberate reality check: acknowledging that the new academic wave is not uniformly positive or easy, and that the characteristics celebrated in Chapter 13, such as agility, interconnectedness, data-driven culture, and openness, have downsides that institutions must address honestly and strategically. The chapter systematically examines several categories of tension: ethical dilemmas, structural inequalities, internal contradictions between innovation and academic tradition, resistance and pushback, and emerging risks to institutional autonomy. Throughout, it presents these challenges not as reasons for pessimism but as problems that demand thoughtful governance, principled leadership, and inclusive solutions. By identifying contradictions, the book prepares stakeholders in higher education to tackle them directly by developing strategies that can transform challenges into opportunities for improvement.

Chapter 15: Horizons and Emerging Possibilities for the New Academic Wave
As the digital wave continues, Chapter 15 concludes the book by exploring potential future developments in higher education. Drawing on current trends, expert opinion, and the analytical framework developed throughout the book, it speculates about what universities might transform into in 10 to 20 years' time and examines the emerging possibilities that could reshape teaching, research, governance, and institutional identity. The chapter is deliberately speculative but grounded, anchoring its projections in the evidence, patterns, and principles established in previous chapters rather than engaging in unbounded futurism. The chapter serves three purposes. First, it maps the horizon: identifying the technologies, trends, and structural shifts most likely to shape the next phase of the academic wave. Second, it highlights the opportunities: showing how digital transformation, if steered correctly, could help higher education become more inclusive, efficient,

creative, and impactful. Third, it calls for action: encouraging leaders, faculty, administrators, students, and policymakers to proactively shape the future rather than be swept along by technological currents they neither chose nor control. The book concludes by distilling practical takeaways from the collective insights of all chapters.

Chapter 16: Empirical Case Studies of Digital-Era Transformation in Higher Education Management

The empirical role of case studies is further developed and systematised in Chapter 16, which brings together a set of analytically selected institutional case studies in a dedicated empirical section. This chapter offers a comparative and methodologically explicit examination of how digital transformation in higher education management is enacted across different organisational domains, governance architectures, and national contexts. It is preceded by a dedicated methodological section that outlines the design logic of the case studies, the sources of empirical material, and the principles guiding their interpretation. Importantly, while the methodological framework for the case studies is presented in a unified manner, individual cases are analytically anchored in different conceptual strands developed across the book. In this way, Chapter 16 does not function as a standalone empirical appendix but as an integrative empirical component that consolidates and deepens the book's theoretical arguments by showing how different dimensions of the new academic wave materialise in diverse institutional settings.

Author's Note

In the interest of scholarly transparency and in accordance with the guidelines of the publisher and relevant professional associations, the authors wish to disclose that large language model (LLM)-based tools were employed as assistive instruments at specific stages of the preparation of this manuscript. The systems used in this project included OpenAI's ChatGPT (GPT-4o) and Anthropic's Claude, both of which were available during the writing and revision phases from 2024 to 2026. No single system was used exclusively; instead, the choice of tools varied depending on the specific task. AI assistance was sought for the following circumscribed purposes: the synthesis and organisation of source materials; the generation of initial prose drafts, which were subsequently subjected to substantial human revision; the exploration of alternative phrasings and structural formulations; and the checking of terminological consistency across chapters. AI tools were not employed for the identification, evaluation, or interpretation of primary empirical data, for the development of the theoretical framework, nor for the substantive scholarly arguments advanced in the text. All analyses, interpretations, and conclusions presented here are solely the result of human authorship.

Every section of the manuscript, including those in which AI-assisted drafts formed a starting point, has been comprehensively reviewed, revised, and verified by the authors. The authors are solely responsible for the accuracy, integrity, and scholarly rigour of the published content, including any remaining errors or omissions.

Furthermore, the authors acknowledge that using AI writing tools in academic research raises important questions about originality, intellectual responsibility, and the fundamental integrity of the research process. These concerns are not secondary to this work; rather, they constitute the core of the transformations under investigation. The authors' decision to engage with these tools and to disclose this engagement fully is itself intended as a contribution to the ongoing disciplinary conversation about the conditions under which AI may appropriately complement, rather than displace, human scholarly judgement. We hold that transparency, critical oversight, and authorial accountability are non-negotiable prerequisites of any such engagement, and we have endeavoured to honour these principles throughout.

Part I

Academic Missions in the Digital Era



Taylor & Francis
Taylor & Francis Group
http://taylorandfrancis.com

1 Digital Research Ecosystems

1.1 Introduction and the Evolution of Scientific Paradigms

The contemporary global scientific enterprise is experiencing a substantial, non-linear structural transformation that significantly redefines the relationship between technology, empirical data, institutional governance, and human intellect. For centuries, scholarship progressed through distinct methodological eras, beginning with the purely empirical observation of natural phenomena, moving to the formulation of systematic theoretical frameworks, and eventually evolving into computational simulations of highly complex systems during the late 20th century. Many scholars argue that academia has entered what is widely recognised as the fourth paradigm of scientific discovery (Hey et al., 2009). This modern era is characterised by data-intensive exploration, where new insights are no longer derived solely from localised experimentation or isolated conceptual models, but are instead extracted from massive, heterogeneous, and highly distributed datasets that span geographical and institutional boundaries. In this complex landscape, traditional digital tools, desktop applications, and isolated databases are no longer capable of meeting the massive demands of modern scientific inquiry. Instead, the global academic community relies on digital research ecosystems (DREs), which represent dynamic, self-organising sociotechnical frameworks where advanced computational infrastructures, automated workflows, semantic web technologies, and diverse networks of human actors interact continuously to accelerate the production, verification, and dissemination of knowledge (Borgman, 2015). These developments are closely associated with the global Open Science movement, an ideological and practical shift that advocates for the systemic dismantling of access barriers, the democratisation of scholarly resources, and the enforcement of absolute transparency across every stage of the research lifecycle (Fecher & Friesike, 2014).

The emergence of DREs cannot be separated from the historical evolution of e-Science and grid computing initiatives that began at the turn of the

DOI: 10.4324/9781042001422-3
This chapter has been made available under a CC BY-NC-ND license.

millennium. Early efforts focused primarily on raw computational power, providing physicists and meteorologists with the necessary bandwidth and processor speeds to handle vast quantities of simulation data. However, as the digitisation of knowledge penetrated the social sciences, humanities, life sciences, and medicine, the technological focus shifted from pure computational speed to data management, meaning, and accessibility. The contemporary research landscape is flooded with data from high-throughput sequencing machines, sensor networks, social media archives, and digitised historical manuscripts (Tenopir et al., 2011). This explosion of unstructured and semi-structured information necessitated a shift towards systemic frameworks that could automate the ingestion, standardisation, and interpretation of information. Consequently, modern digital ecosystems are designed to handle not only the quantitative burden of big data but also the qualitative challenge of varied data formats, ensuring that diverse scientific outputs can be synthesised to address grand societal challenges, such as climate change, global pandemics, and systemic macroeconomic shifts.

Furthermore, this paradigm shift significantly alters the epistemology of science, changing how researchers conceptualise truth, validation, and discovery. In the traditional scientific method, hypotheses were formulated by human minds based on existing literature and intuition, followed by targeted experimentation to prove or disprove the premise. Within a fully mature digital research ecosystem, the process often becomes reversed or deeply iterative. Massive datasets are continuously mined by automated algorithms to identify unexpected correlations, anomalies, and patterns that no longer require a pre-existing human hypothesis to be discovered. This data-driven inductive approach does not replace deductive reasoning but creates a continuous feedback loop where human intellect and machine intelligence complement one another (Wang et al., 2023). The digital ecosystem serves as the primary environment where this cognitive synthesis occurs, providing the shared semantic language, validation mechanisms, and collaborative spaces necessary to turn raw computational outputs into recognised, peer-reviewed scientific contributions.

The expansion of these digital spaces also redefines the concept of scholarly community and authorship. Historically, science was conducted by isolated individuals or small, localised teams working within physical laboratories or university departments. The modern digital ecosystem obliterates these geographic constraints, allowing large-scale global consortia to collaborate in real time on shared cloud platforms, using unified code repositories and synchronised data stores. This interconnectedness shifts the focus from individual ownership of knowledge to collective intelligence, where a scientific breakthrough is rarely the result of a single mind but rather the product of an optimised ecosystem that allows data, software, and human expertise to align at the proper moment. As a result, understanding the

dynamics, architecture, vulnerabilities, and future trajectories of DREs has become an essential prerequisite for analysing the progress of contemporary civilisation (Maienschein et al., 2019).

1.2 Philosophical and Theoretical Foundations of Digital Ecologies

To establish a rigorous framework for analysing DREs, it is necessary to examine their philosophical and theoretical foundations, drawing heavily from general systems theory, digital ecology, and science and technology studies. A digital research ecosystem cannot be understood if it is reduced to its technical components, such as servers, fibre-optic networks, and software licences. Instead, it typically needs to be theorised as an evolving, complex adaptive system that exhibits properties of emergence, self-organisation, and co-evolution. The ecological metaphor is deliberate and highly functional; just as biological ecosystems consist of living organisms interacting with their physical environments and exchanging energy and matter, DREs consist of diverse human agents, institutional entities, and software artefacts that interact within a shared technological matrix to exchange information, academic credit, and knowledge assets. This perspective allows researchers to analyse how changes in one part of the system, such as a shift in funding policy or the introduction of a new artificial intelligence (AI) tool, send waves through the entire academic structure, altering behaviour, incentive mechanisms, and scholarly outputs.

From the perspective of Science and Technology Studies, particularly Actor-Network Theory, non-human components within a digital research ecosystem are not passive tools used by human actors; rather, they are actants that possess agency and actively shape the course of scientific practice. A code repository, an institutional database, or an algorithmic discovery tool limits, guides, and enables specific types of scientific behaviour while discouraging others (Ribes & Polk, 2015). For instance, the structural design of a data repository dictates what metadata fields a researcher typically needs to fill out, thereby controlling how future generations will perceive and utilise that specific dataset. The software interfaces used by scientists act as cognitive scaffolds that structure thought processes, meaning that the design choices made by software engineers and database architects substantially influence the epistemological direction of scientific disciplines. Therefore, analysing a digital research ecosystem requires a critical evaluation of the embedded values, power dynamics, and assumptions that are coded into the software and standards relied upon by modern academia.

Another foundational theory relevant to digital ecologies is the concept of infrastructure as a social construct, as articulated in modern infrastructure studies. Infrastructure is frequently invisible until it breaks down; we

rarely think about the complex network of cables, protocols, and database standards that support our daily academic work until a server crashes or an application programming interface (API) access point is closed. In a digital research ecosystem, this infrastructure is deeply tied to social practices, institutional habits, and professional identities. The transition from physical notebooks and localised hard drives to open, shared digital environments requires a shift in academic culture, demanding that researchers view their work as part of a collective digital commons rather than private property. This cultural transition creates tension between traditional academic structures, which reward individual prestige and closed publication models, and the collaborative ethos of digital ecosystems, which maximise value through openness, liquidity of data, and significant transparency (Mullen, 2024).

The economic theory of the commons provides vital insights into the sustainability and governance of DREs. Knowledge and research data within a digital ecosystem possess the characteristics of public goods, being non-excludable and non-rivalrous, especially when managed under open-access frameworks (Fecher & Friesike, 2014). However, the technical platforms that host and process these public goods are often subject to economic pressures, resource constraints, and commercial exploitation. The application of the knowledge commons framework to DREs helps researchers understand how institutional alliances, university libraries, and global consortia can design governance structures that protect the academic digital commons from enclosure by monopolistic publishers, while ensuring long-term financial sustainability and technical maintenance of the shared infrastructure.

1.3 Structural Architecture and Layered Frameworks of DREs

The architecture of a mature digital research ecosystem is built upon a multi-tiered, interoperable framework designed to ensure that data, software tools, and human processes can align across institutional and national boundaries. To comprehend the complexity of these environments, it is useful to deconstruct them into four highly interconnected structural layers: the infrastructure layer, the data and repository layer, the application and analysis layer, and the socio-institutional layer. Each layer operates on its own set of rules and protocols, yet the failure or misalignment of any single layer compromises the integrity and performance of the entire system.

The physical and computational infrastructure layer forms the foundational bedrock of the ecosystem. This layer comprises high-performance computing centres, high-throughput networks, distributed cloud storage fabrics, and the low-level communication protocols that allow hardware

components to exchange data at immense speeds. In the contemporary era, this layer is increasingly defined by large-scale federated clouds, such as the European Open Science Cloud, which seek to connect national and institutional computing centres into a unified, accessible digital utility for researchers. The primary challenge at this foundational level is ensuring scalable, equitable access to computational power, as modern data-intensive sciences require immense energy and hardware resources that are often difficult to distribute fairly across the global academic landscape.

Directly above the physical hardware sits the data and repository layer, which is responsible for the persistent curation, organisation, and preservation of scientific outputs. This layer contains Current Research Information Systems, institutional repositories, domain-specific data archives, and decentralised version control systems. It is within this layer that raw computational outputs are transformed into formal digital objects through the systematic assignment of persistent identifiers, such as digital object identifiers and archival resource keys, alongside the enforcement of strict schema classifications (Wilkinson et al., 2016). The data and repository layer serves as the memory of the digital research ecosystem, guaranteeing that the digital footprint of a scientific project remains accurate, uncorrupted, and retrievable for decades, regardless of changes in the underlying physical hardware or commercial software market.

The third level is the application and analysis layer, which encompasses the entire suite of digital tools, programming environments, statistical packages, and computational workflows that researchers use to manipulate, analyse, and visualise data. This layer includes interactive computing environments like Jupyter Notebooks and RStudio, automated pipeline tools, and advanced machine learning (ML) models that extract patterns from complex datasets (Wang et al., 2023). The hallmark of a modern application layer within a high-functioning ecosystem is reproducibility: tools are designed not just to execute a command once, but to package the entire computational environment – including specific library versions, dependencies, and execution parameters – into containers that can be shared, verified, and re-executed by any researcher anywhere in the world.

The highest and most complex tier is the socio-institutional layer, which governs the interactions, behaviours, and incentives of the human actors within the ecosystem. This layer includes funding agency mandates, university open-access policies, ethical review boards, international data sharing agreements, and the cultural norms practised by communities of researchers. Without this layer, the underlying technical architecture remains an empty shell. The socio-institutional layer defines what constitutes legitimate academic output, how researchers are evaluated for promotion and tenure, and how intellectual property rights are balanced against the ethical obligation to share knowledge for the public good (Mirowski, 2018). The primary

tension in contemporary DREs lies at the interface between the technical capabilities of the lower layers, which allow for seamless global data sharing, and the historical, institutional constraints of the socio-institutional layer, which often continue to reward traditional closed publication models.

1.4 The Research Data Lifecycle and the Operationalisation of FAIR Principles

At the very centre of any digital research ecosystem is the concept of the research data lifecycle, an operational model that views data as an evolving, multi-stage asset rather than a static product that terminates at the moment of journal publication (Tenopir et al., 2011). This lifecycle spans from the initial planning and conceptualisation phase, through data collection, processing, analysis, and preservation, to the eventual sharing, reuse, and evaluation of the data by the broader scientific community. Within a highly optimised digital ecosystem, every stage of this lifecycle is mediated by automated tools and standardised protocols that reduce the friction of data movement and maximise the long-term utility of the information generated.

The initial stage of the lifecycle involves planning and creation, where researchers utilise digital management tools to draft machine-actionable Data Management Plans. These plans are no longer static text files submitted to funding bodies: they are dynamic, interactive records that inform the digital ecosystem of the expected data formats, volumes, storage needs, and licensing requirements of an upcoming project. As data collection begins, whether through automated physical sensor networks, high-throughput sequencing devices, or large-scale digital surveys, the ecosystem automatically captures essential metadata regarding the experimental context, device calibration, and environmental conditions, ensuring that the primary data is contextualised from its moment of origin.

Once collected, the data enters the processing and analysis stage, where it undergoes cleaning, transformation, and statistical modelling within secure computational environments. In traditional workflows, this phase was often a black box, with researchers manually tweaking datasets on personal computers, leading to errors and irreversible data loss. Within a mature digital ecosystem, all processing steps are logged using automated provenance tracking software, meaning that every transformation applied to a raw dataset is recorded in an immutable audit trail. This transparency allows for deep validation and ensures that if an error is found in an upstream analysis script, the ecosystem can automatically re-compute the downstream results without requiring a complete manual recreation of the project.

The preservation and sharing phases represent the long-term commitments of the ecosystem, where data is migrated to secure long-term archival repositories that enforce the international FAIR Data Principles

(Wilkinson et al., 2016). These principles hold that all scientific data typically needs to be Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, and Reusable, and they have become a central framework for modern research data stewardship. To make data findable, the ecosystem typically needs to assign persistent globally unique identifiers and index the accompanying metadata in open searchable catalogues. Accessibility requires that the data be retrievable via open communication protocols that support standard authentication procedures, guaranteeing that even if the data itself typically has to remain restricted due to privacy concerns, its metadata remains visible to the world.

Interoperability requires the use of shared vocabularies, standardised data schemas, and formal ontologies that allow different computational systems to read, exchange, and integrate datasets across disciplinary boundaries. This represents one of the most difficult technical milestones for DREs, as it requires moving away from proprietary file formats towards open machine-readable representations of knowledge, such as the Resource Description Framework and web ontology languages. Finally, reusability demands that the data be accompanied by accurate provenance records and explicit, legally clear community licences, such as Creative Commons frameworks, allowing future scientists – and automated machine agents – to confidently incorporate the data into new research projects without fear of legal liability or methodological misinterpretation.

1.5 Artificial Intelligence, Machine Learning, and Automated Knowledge Curation

The integration of AI, ML algorithms, and deep language learning architectures has introduced a transformative dynamic into DREs, significantly reshaping them from passive information storage platforms into active, semi-autonomous engines of cognitive synthesis (Wang et al., 2023). Historically, digital repositories acted as digital filing cabinets, relying entirely on human operators to upload documents, manually input keywords, and search for relevant information using basic text queries. In the contemporary AI-driven ecosystem, algorithms operate continuously beneath the surface, reading text, parsing code, mapping data relationships, and discovering hidden conceptual connections across millions of disparate scientific publications and datasets that would completely overwhelm human researchers (Brickley et al., 2019).

One of the most immediate impacts of AI within these ecosystems occurs in the domain of automated knowledge curation and metadata enrichment. When vast amounts of raw data are ingested into an ecosystem, human researchers rarely have the time or specialised expertise to manually map every file to complex domain ontologies. ML models solve this bottleneck by automatically analysing the contents of incoming datasets, predicting

their context, extracting relevant variables, and applying rich, standardised semantic tags. This automated curation ensures that new data is instantly integrated into the ecosystem's overarching knowledge graphs, making it immediately discoverable to other researchers and automated analytical tools, thereby maintaining high standards of data interoperability without increasing the administrative burden on scholars.

Furthermore, Large Language Models and semantic search engines have significantly altered how literature reviews and knowledge discovery are conducted. Traditional keyword searches often fail to bridge the gap between scientific disciplines that use discipline-specific terminology to describe identical concepts. AI-driven semantic architectures map scientific literature into multidimensional vector spaces, allowing the ecosystem to understand the conceptual meaning behind queries. This capability enables the discovery of deep cross-disciplinary links, such as identifying a mathematical algorithm used in astrophysics that could solve an unrelated optimisation problem in genomic sequencing or macroeconomic forecasting. AI agents can synthesise thousands of papers simultaneously, presenting researchers with concise summaries of the state of the art, identifying consensus views, highlighting methodological contradictions, and pointing out unresolved questions within the literature.

Beyond literature analysis, AI has become a core component of the experimental and analytical phases of the research lifecycle. Deep learning architectures, such as AlphaFold in structural biology or the deep neural networks used in quantum chemistry, are embedded directly within the application layers of DREs (Wang et al., 2023). These tools can simulate millions of molecular combinations or physical configurations in a fraction of a second, selecting only the most promising candidates for physical testing in a laboratory. This predictive capability accelerates the scientific process, allowing ecosystems to handle tasks that were previously impossible due to computational or temporal limitations. AI systems also assist in code generation and validation, helping scientists write clean, optimised, and reproducible analysis scripts, while automatically detecting logical or statistical flaws in their computational workflows.

Finally, the convergence of AI with automated curation raises substantial epistemological questions regarding the future nature of authorship and scientific authority (King et al., 2009). As AI systems become more adept at generating hypotheses, writing code, and synthesising data, the line between technology as a tool and technology as a collaborative scientific entity begins to blur. In a highly advanced digital research ecosystem, an AI agent can identify a gap in the literature, locate an underutilised public dataset, write an analysis pipeline, and draft a manuscript outlining its findings. This level of automation forces the academic community to re-evaluate its socio-institutional frameworks and develop new guidelines for

credit distribution, ethical boundaries, and validation mechanisms to ensure that the speed of AI-driven discovery does not compromise the rigour and trustworthiness of the scientific record.

1.6 Socio-Technical Dynamics: Power, Academic Capitalism, and Publisher Monopolies

While the technical architecture of DREs offers considerable opportunities for collaboration and efficiency, these environments are deeply entangled with the sociotechnical dynamics of power, institutional prestige, and global capital. Technology is never neutral, and the digital systems used in contemporary science are shaped by the economic context of academic capitalism. In this environment, knowledge production is frequently treated as a commodity to be financialised, monitored, and controlled (Mirowski, 2018). This commercialisation creates an intense structural conflict between the idealistic goals of the Open Science movement – which envisions a digital commons that is free and open to all humanity – and the economic realities of monopolistic publishing houses and technology conglomerates that seek to enclose these digital spaces for corporate profit.

For decades, the traditional academic publishing model operated on a system of structural exploitation, where universities paid researchers to conduct studies, funded by public grants, and then relinquished the intellectual property rights to commercial publishers for free. These publishers then charged astronomical subscription fees back to the same universities to access their own scientific output. As DREs emerged, these commercial publishers recognised the threat of open-access repositories and shifted their business strategies from content gatekeeping to data and platform gatekeeping. Instead of merely selling access to journals, major publishing conglomerates began systematically acquiring the infrastructure of the digital research lifecycle, purchasing institutional repositories, current research information systems (CRIS) platforms, citation management software, and research analytics tools.

This corporate expansion has resulted in a vertical integration of the academic pipeline, allowing a small number of profit-driven corporations to track researchers' activities throughout the research lifecycle, from the initial literature search, through data collection, to final publication (Zuboff, 2019). By controlling these interconnected platforms, commercial providers harvest vast quantities of behavioural and bibliometric data, which they use to construct proprietary metrics, such as institutional rankings and individual researcher productivity scores. These proprietary metrics are then sold back to universities, which use them to make critical decisions regarding hiring, promotions, departmental funding, and resource allocation. This dynamic creates a closed loop of algorithmic surveillance, where researchers are

forced to conform to performance metrics dictated by commercial entities, whose algorithms are proprietary and hidden from public scrutiny, thereby undermining the autonomy and integrity of academic institutions.

Furthermore, the commercial enclosure of digital research infrastructure introduces dangerous biases into the scientific ecosystem. Platforms designed around maximising engagement, citation counts, and institutional prestige naturally favour high-profile, incremental research in fashionable disciplines, while marginalising high-risk, long-term interdisciplinary studies or research focused on localised societal challenges in the global South. When the software platforms used to manage, analyse, and discover science are privately owned, their algorithms prioritise corporate profitability over scientific validity (Mirowski, 2018). This reality underscores the urgent necessity for the global academic community to reclaim sovereignty over its DREs by divesting from commercial monopolies and investing in open-source, community-governed, and publicly funded infrastructures that prioritise knowledge dissemination over profit extraction.

1.7 Geopolitical Inequalities, the Digital Divide, and Data Colonialism

The expansion of DREs across the global academic landscape does not occur on an equal playing field. Instead, it encounters deep historical geopolitical inequalities that are frequently amplified by the unequal distribution of digital infrastructure, financial resources, and technological sovereignty. This disparity creates a substantial digital divide that separates a small cluster of well-funded elite institutions in the global North from the vast majority of universities and researchers in developing economies (Chan et al., 2005). As science becomes increasingly data-intensive and reliant on advanced computational infrastructure, this digital divide threatens to harden into a permanent state of data colonialism, where the global South is structurally marginalised within the international scientific hierarchy.

At the most basic level, the operationalisation of a modern digital research ecosystem requires a consistent supply of electricity, high-speed fibre-optic connectivity, up-to-date computational hardware, and access to secure, scalable cloud storage. For many institutions in developing nations, these basic infrastructural prerequisites are either non-existent, prohibitively expensive, or highly unreliable. A researcher working at a university with frequent power outages and severely limited internet bandwidth cannot fully participate in global data networks, run resource-intensive ML models, or stream massive datasets from international repositories. Consequently, despite the theoretical availability of open-access data, the practical ability to utilise this data remains concentrated in nations that possess the economic capital to maintain high-performance computing environments.

Beyond physical hardware, data colonialism manifests in the flow of knowledge and the division of scientific labour (Chan et al., 2005). In many global health, environmental, and agricultural research initiatives, scientists from the global South are relegated to the role of local data collectors – gathering biological samples, conducting field interviews, or monitoring local ecological shifts. This raw data is then ingested into DREs owned and maintained by Western institutions, where high-level synthesis, algorithmic analysis, and theoretical discoveries are performed by Northern scholars. The resulting publications and intellectual property are credited primarily to the institutions that control the digital ecosystem, while the local communities and researchers who provided the foundational data are left with minimal recognition, little technological capacity building, and no ownership over the scientific outputs.

To counter these neocolonial dynamics, international open science frameworks typically need to move beyond the passive provision of open data and actively address the unequal distribution of computational agency. True equity within DREs requires the establishment of decentralised infrastructure investments, the proliferation of open-source analytical software that can run efficiently on low-resource hardware, and the enforcement of ethical data governance protocols that protect the data rights of local communities. Furthermore, global research consortia typically need to adopt fair authorship and data-sharing frameworks which guarantee that scientists from developing nations are equal partners in the governance, analysis, and intellectual ownership of the digital ecosystems to which they contribute, thereby ensuring that the democratisation of science becomes an inclusive reality rather than an exclusive rhetorical ideal.

1.8 Governance, Legal Frameworks, Trust, and Privacy Contradictions

The governance of DREs operates within a landscape of intense legal complexity, ethical friction, and structural contradictions. As these ecosystems expand to integrate diverse data streams from across the globe, they typically have to navigate a web of conflicting national legislation, institutional mandates, intellectual property regimes, and human rights frameworks. The primary governance challenge lies in establishing and maintaining trust among all participants, including scientists, research participants, funding bodies, and the public, while simultaneously operating under a paradigm that demands significant openness on the one hand, and strict data security, privacy, and sovereignty on the other.

This structural contradiction is most visible when analysing the intersection of Open Data mandates with modern data privacy frameworks, such as the European Union's General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) or similar

legislative measures worldwide. Open Science initiatives compel researchers to make their primary datasets publicly accessible to ensure reproducibility and maximise reuse value (Fecher & Friesike, 2014). However, when research involves human subjects – such as in biomedical trials, genomic sequencing, psychological studies, or digital sociology – the data carries deep privacy risks. Even when datasets are ostensibly anonymised, advanced ML algorithms within modern digital ecosystems can cross-reference multiple public databases to re-identify individual participants, compromising their privacy and violating legal protections.

To resolve these privacy–openness contradictions, DREs are forced to develop and integrate sophisticated cryptographic and architectural solutions. One such approach is the implementation of federated data analysis structures, where data remains stored securely at its institution of origin behind local firewalls, and analytical algorithms are sent to the data, rather than moving the data to a centralised repository. Only the aggregated, non-identifiable statistical results are sent back to the researcher. Additionally, the use of differential privacy – a mathematical framework that injects a calculated amount of "noise" into a dataset to mask individual identities while preserving the overall statistical integrity of the sample – is becoming a standard feature within sensitive application layers. These technologies allow ecosystems to strike a delicate balance, preserving the utility of data for scientific discovery while maintaining compliance with strict legal privacy standards.

Beyond personal privacy, the governance of DREs should also confront the rising demand for data sovereignty, particularly from indigenous communities and sovereign states that reject the uninhibited extraction of their knowledge assets. Indigenous data sovereignty frameworks, such as the CARE Principles for Indigenous Data Governance, emphasise that data collected from indigenous peoples should typically be governed according to their local values, traditions, and self-determination (Carroll et al., 2020). This requires digital ecosystems to implement nuanced conditional access protocols that move away from a binary model of "completely open" or "completely closed", adopting instead dynamic metadata labels and access permissions that respect the cultural context and collective rights of the communities from which the data originated.

The long-term stability of DREs depends on establishing robust models of institutional trust and financial sustainability. Managing massive repositories, ensuring continuous data validation, and defending infrastructure against cyber threats require substantial ongoing financial investments. If funding models are based entirely on short-term competitive project grants, the digital infrastructure risks decay, fragmentation, or eventual acquisition by commercial entities once the primary funding expires. A sustainable governance framework requires viewing DREs as critical public

infrastructure, equivalent to roads, electrical grids, or public libraries. This model demands long-term commitments from international consortia, national governments, and university networks in order to ensure that the digital platforms supporting global scientific progress remain securely held in public trust, transparently managed, and universally accessible for generations to come.

1.9 Future Horizons: Decentralised Science (DeSci) and Autonomous Research Loops

As DREs continue to evolve under the twin pressures of technological innovation and structural dissatisfaction with traditional academic institutions, the future horizon is being shaped by two interconnected paradigms: Decentralised Science (DeSci) and autonomous closed-loop research systems. These emerging frameworks aim to address the systemic failures of contemporary academia – including the reproducibility crisis, publisher monopolies, funding inefficiencies, and administrative bottlenecks – by redesigning the fundamental architecture of scientific discovery using Web3 technologies and advanced automation (Diaz et al., 2025).

DeSci represents a significant departure from the centralised institutional models that have dominated scholarship for centuries. By leveraging blockchain technology, smart contracts, decentralised autonomous organisations (DAOs), and cryptographic storage networks like the InterPlanetary File System, DeSci seeks to create a truly open peer-to-peer scientific infrastructure (Diaz et al., 2025). Within a DeSci-enabled ecosystem, the traditional, closed peer-review system is replaced by open incentivised cryptographic protocols where reviewers are compensated directly with tokens or reputation points recorded on immutable public ledgers. Funding distribution is decentralised through quadratic funding mechanisms, which allow scientific communities to collectively determine research priorities and distribute resources democratically, while bypassing the bureaucratic gatekeeping of centralised funding bodies.

Furthermore, DeSci transforms how intellectual property and data ownership are handled within DREs. Through the creation of Intellectual Property Non-Fungible Tokens (IP-NFTs), researchers can fractionalise ownership of their discoveries, data, or patents, thereby allowing them to raise research capital directly from patient advocacy groups, philanthropic communities, or global investment pools without relinquishing control to corporate publishers or university technology transfer offices. These smart contracts can automatically execute licensing agreements, distribute royalties to contributors, and guarantee that data remains permanently accessible in the public domain, thus establishing a self-sustaining economic ecosystem for open scientific inquiry.

Concurrently, the integration of laboratory automation, robotics, and advanced AI is driving the transition towards autonomous closed-loop research ecosystems, often referred to as self-driving laboratories (King et al., 2009). In these environments, the traditional role of the human scientist as a physical experimenter is completely automated. The digital ecosystem operates as an autonomous cognitive loop: a centralised AI agent scans the global corpus of scientific literature, identifies a gap or an unverified hypothesis, designs a series of optimisation experiments, and commands robotic laboratory hardware to synthesise compounds or run physical simulations.

Once the robotic systems complete the physical trials, automated sensors capture the raw data, structure it according to strict semantic standards, and feed it directly back into the AI analysis engine. The algorithm interprets the results, updates its internal scientific model, and automatically designs the next iteration of experiments, running continuously without human intervention (King et al., 2009). This closed-loop approach accelerates the pace of discovery in fields such as materials science, drug design, and clean energy technology, transforming months of manual laboratory labour into days of continuous automated optimisation (Wang et al., 2023).

Taken together, the convergence of DeSci with autonomous research loops will reshape the global landscape of scientific discovery. The role of human researchers within these advanced digital ecosystems will move away from routine mechanical execution, manual literature synthesis, and administrative grant writing. Instead, human scholars will focus on high-level philosophical guidance, strategic direction, and ethical oversight, defining the boundary conditions, safety protocols, and societal goals of the autonomous discovery systems. By creating open, decentralised, and highly automated networks of knowledge production, the future evolution of DREs holds the potential to unlock a significant era of human creativity and scientific progress, democratising access to the tools of discovery and ensuring that the fruits of global scholarship are preserved as a shared inheritance for all humanity.

1.10 Conclusion

DREs have quietly become the backbone of how science gets done today. What started as a practical response to mounting data and stretched computing resources has grown into something far more significant: a living, evolving web of infrastructure, tools, institutions, and people, all shaping how knowledge is made and shared.

What comes through most clearly across this chapter is that these ecosystems are never just technical. Every layer, from the physical servers up to the policies that govern access, carries human choices, values, and power dynamics within it. The promise of openness sits alongside real

tensions: publishers protecting profit margins, wealthier institutions pulling ahead of poorer ones, and the everyday struggle to keep data both shareable and private. None of this is likely to resolve neatly, and it should not be expected to. Still, there's genuine reason for optimism. AI is helping researchers make sense of an ocean of information that no person could read alone. FAIR principles are giving data a longer, more useful life. And newer ideas like DeSci hint at a future where discovery is not gatekept by a handful of powerful institutions.

Ultimately, the strength of a digital research ecosystem lies in the balance it strikes, between openness and protection, automation and human judgement, global ambition and local reality. Getting that balance right will matter enormously for what science becomes in the decades ahead.

References

Borgman, C. L. (2015). *Big data, little data, no data: Scholarship in the networked world*. MIT Press.

Brickley, D., Burgess, M., & Noy, N. (2019). Google dataset search: Building a search engine for datasets in an open web ecosystem. In *Proceedings of the World Wide Web Conference* (pp. 1365–1375). Association for Computing Machinery.

Carroll, S. R., Garba, I., Figueroa-Rodríguez, O. L., Holbrook, J., Lovett, R., Materechera, S., ... & Hudson, M. (2020). The CARE principles for Indigenous data governance. *Data Science Journal*, *19*(1), 1–12.

Chan, L., Kirsop, B., & Arunachalam, S. (2005). Open access archiving: The fast track to building research capacity in developing countries. *SciDevNet*.

Díaz, F., Menchaca, C., & Weidener, L. (2025). Exploring the decentralized science ecosystem: Insights on organizational structures, technologies, and funding. *Frontiers in Blockchain*, *8*, 1524222.

Fecher, B., & Friesike, S. (2014). Open science: One term, five schools of thought. In Bartling, S., Friesike, S. (eds) *Opening science* (pp. 17–47). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-00026-8_2

Hey, T., Tansley, S., & Tolle, K. (Eds.). (2009). *The fourth paradigm: Data-intensive scientific discovery* (Vol. *1*). Microsoft Research.

King, R. D., Rowland, J., Oliver, S. G., Young, M., Aubrey, W., Byrne, E., ... & Whelan, K. E. (2009). The automation of science. *Science*, *324*(5923), 85–89.

Maienschein, J., Parker, J. N., Laubichler, M., & Hackett, E. J. (2019). Data management and data sharing in science and technology studies. *Science, Technology, & Human Values*, *44*(1), 143–160.

Mirowski, P. (2018). The future(s) of open science. *Social Studies of Science*, *48*(2), 171–203.

Mullen, L. B. (2024). Open access, scholarly communication, and open science in psychology: An overview for researchers. *Sage Open*, *14*(1_suppl), 21582440231205390.

Ribes, D., & Polk, J. B. (2015). Organizing for ontological change: The case of cyberinfrastructure. *Social Studies of Science*, *45*(2), 211–233.

Tenopir, C., Allard, S., Douglass, K., Cullen, A. U., Frame, M., Brandel, F., ... & King, D. (2011). Data sharing by scientists: Practices and perceptions. *PLoS ONE*, *6*(6), e21101.

Wang, H., Fu, T., Du, Y., Gao, W., Huang, K., Liu, Z., ... & Coley, C. W. (2023). Scientific discovery in the age of artificial intelligence. *Nature*, *620*(7972), 47–60.

Wilkinson, M. D., Dumontier, M., Aalbersberg, I. J., Appleton, G., Axton, M., Baak, A., ... & Mons, B. (2016). The FAIR Guiding Principles for scientific data management and stewardship. *Scientific Data*, *3*(1), 1–9.

Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power*. Public Affairs.

2 Teaching and Learning in the Digital University

2.1 The Technologically Mediated Learning Environment

Higher education is increasingly organised through digital infrastructures that influence how knowledge is produced, taught, assessed, and experienced. The traditional image of the university as a place defined primarily by lecture halls, laboratories, libraries, and face-to-face encounters remains important, but it no longer captures the full reality of contemporary academic life. In many institutions, teaching and learning now take place through a dense assemblage of learning management systems, cloud platforms, video-conferencing tools, digital repositories, mobile applications, automated notification systems, plagiarism detection software, and data dashboards. These systems do not merely support the educational process from the outside. They increasingly structure the rhythms, expectations, and possibilities of academic work itself (Bates, 2019).

For this reason, the digital transformation of higher education should be understood as a socio-technical process. It involves technologies, but it also involves organisational routines, pedagogical assumptions, governance models, student expectations, staff capabilities, and broader political and economic pressures. A university that adopts a new learning management system, for example, does not simply acquire a neutral technical instrument. It also adopts a particular model of course organisation, communication, assessment, monitoring, and data storage. Similarly, the implementation of learning analytics or artificial intelligence (AI) in education changes the relationship between teachers, students, administrators, and institutional decision-makers. It introduces new forms of visibility and new categories of risk, success, engagement, and performance.

The movement towards technologically mediated learning has accelerated developments that were already visible before the pandemic and before the recent rise of generative AI. Flexible study pathways, digital course materials, cross-institutional mobility, virtual collaboration, hybrid seminars,

DOI: 10.4324/9781042001422-4
This chapter has been made available under a CC BY-NC-ND license.

and data-informed student support were initially treated as innovations or strategic experiments. They are now increasingly regarded as ordinary components of institutional functioning. In this sense, contemporary universities do not simply use digital tools: they are becoming dependent on digital infrastructures for the basic coordination of educational activity. Course registration, access to learning materials, communication with students, submission of assignments, feedback delivery, assessment records, and student support are often mediated by software platforms that collect, organise, and interpret educational data.

This mediation changes the experience of students in both visible and less visible ways. The student no longer encounters the university only through a classroom, a lecturer, a timetable, or a library desk. Increasingly, the institution is encountered through dashboards, login portals, electronic notifications, automated reminders, video links, digital discussion boards, and algorithmically organised resources. Learning is extended across time and space. It may take place on campus, in the workplace, at home, during travel, or asynchronously, including late at night. This flexibility has genuine value, especially for working professionals, caregivers, international students, students with disabilities, and those whose lives do not fit the assumptions of a traditional residential campus model (Daniel, 2019).

At the same time, the digital environment changes the meaning of academic presence. Being enrolled in a course no longer means only attending lectures or participating in seminars. It can also mean logging into a platform, watching recordings, submitting tasks, posting on a forum, responding to a quiz, completing micro-activities, or leaving traces in a learning analytics system. These forms of presence are not equivalent. A student may be highly visible to a system without being intellectually engaged, just as another student may be deeply reflective but leave fewer measurable digital traces. This distinction is important because many digital systems encourage institutions to treat measurable activity as a proxy for learning. Such proxies may be useful, but they are always partial.

The central difficulty of the digital university therefore lies in balancing technological capacity with educational judgment. Digital tools can widen access, improve communication, enable rapid feedback, support collaboration, and create new forms of participation. Yet they can also encourage standardisation, surveillance, fragmentation, and excessive dependence on quantitative indicators. When learning is interpreted mainly through clicks, attendance logs, completion rates, and automated scores, higher education risks losing sight of less measurable but central aims: critical thinking, ethical reflection, intellectual independence, creativity, civic responsibility, and the formation of scholarly identity. The challenge is not to reject digitalisation, but to govern it in ways that remain faithful to the educational purposes of the university.

This chapter approaches the digital university from that perspective. It examines online and blended learning, the pandemic transition, AI, learning analytics, immersive technologies, digital credentials, inclusion, academic integrity, and the preservation of the human dimension of education. Across these themes, the chapter argues that technology should not be treated as an autonomous force that determines the future of higher education. Its effects depend on institutional choices, pedagogical design, regulatory frameworks, professional norms, and the willingness of academic communities to protect the values that make higher education more than a content-delivery industry.

2.2 The Expansion of Online and Blended Learning

One of the most visible expressions of digital transformation in higher education is the growth of online and blended learning. Over the past decade, and especially since 2020, universities have expanded the use of digital platforms to support full online programmes, hybrid courses, flipped classrooms, virtual seminars, and asynchronous learning modules. This development has not eliminated the physical campus, but it has changed its role. In many programmes, campus time is increasingly used for discussion, laboratory work, project-based collaboration, mentoring, and applied problem-solving, while lectures, introductory explanations, readings, quizzes, and preparatory tasks are moved into digital environments (Bates, 2019).

Blended learning is often presented as a compromise between traditional and online education, but it is more accurately understood as a distinct pedagogical model. When well designed, it allows instructors to separate the functions of teaching and allocate them to the environments where they are most effective. Content that students can process individually may be delivered through recorded lectures, readings, podcasts, simulations, or interactive exercises. Activities requiring dialogue, interpretation, feedback, emotional support, and collective sense-making may be reserved for synchronous meetings. This arrangement can support deeper learning, but only when the online and face-to-face components are meaningfully integrated. A poorly designed blended course can easily become a burdensome accumulation of disconnected tasks.

Fully online education has developed in parallel, creating new possibilities for students who cannot participate in campus-based programmes. Working adults, students living far from metropolitan academic centres, people with caring responsibilities, and international learners may gain access to higher education through online pathways that would otherwise be unavailable. In this sense, digitalisation can serve a democratising function. It reduces some barriers linked to geography, mobility, scheduling, and relocation costs. It also allows universities to reach new audiences through professional courses,

continuing education, open educational resources, and Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs). Although early predictions that MOOCs would replace conventional universities were overstated, these platforms remain significant for lifelong learning and global knowledge dissemination.

The institutional backbone of this expansion is the Learning Management System. Platforms such as Moodle, Canvas, Blackboard, and Brightspace have become central to the organisation of teaching. In their simplest form, they provide access to syllabi, readings, assignments, and grades. In practice, however, they increasingly operate as educational operating systems. They coordinate communication, deadlines, group work, discussion forums, assessment workflows, feedback channels, attendance records, and learning analytics. Their influence is therefore both practical and pedagogical. They shape how a course is perceived, how students navigate it, how teachers communicate expectations, and how administrators monitor educational activity.

The learning management system (LMS) also changes the temporality of learning. Traditional classroom teaching is organised around scheduled meetings, whereas platform-based learning distributes educational activity across days, weeks, and sometimes months. Students can revisit materials, pause recordings, contribute to asynchronous discussions, and complete activities at different times. For some learners, this flexibility supports autonomy and self-paced study. For others, particularly those who lack strong self-regulation skills, it creates uncertainty and overload. Digital flexibility can therefore be enabling and demanding at the same time. It requires students to manage time, attention, motivation, and digital navigation more independently than in many campus-based settings.

The expansion of online learning has also revealed the importance of social presence. A course may be technically well organised but still feel impersonal. Students in fully online programmes frequently report isolation, weaker identification with the institution, and limited informal contact with peers and teachers (Crawford et al., 2020). These experiences matter because higher education is not only an individual cognitive activity. It is also a social practice through which students test ideas, encounter different perspectives, receive encouragement, and build academic confidence. Informal encounters in corridors, libraries, laboratories, and seminar rooms have educational value, even if they are rarely captured in formal course design.

For this reason, online and blended education should not be evaluated only in terms of efficiency, scalability, or convenience; its quality depends on the extent to which it creates meaningful interaction. Discussion forums, peer feedback, group projects, synchronous seminars, virtual office hours, and structured mentoring can reduce the distance of online learning, but they require deliberate design and sustained academic labour. A common

mistake is to assume that a course can function independently once it has been uploaded to a platform. In reality, online education often requires more careful communication, clearer scaffolding, more frequent feedback, and stronger relational presence than traditional teaching.

Critical digital pedagogy adds an important caution. If online learning is managed primarily through standardised templates, compliance checklists, progress bars, and automated reminders, it may shift the teacher's role from intellectual mentor to content manager. This does not happen automatically, but it is a real risk when universities treat digital courses as products to be delivered rather than as educational relationships to be cultivated. The managerial logic of efficiency can reduce pedagogical imagination. Courses become tidy, measurable, and scalable, but less open to surprise, disagreement, exploration, and the slow formation of understanding (Deem et al., 2007).

The future of online and blended learning therefore depends on institutional choices. Digital platforms can extend access and strengthen learning when they are used to support active engagement, inclusive participation, and sustained dialogue. They can weaken education when they reduce it to a sequence of tasks designed mainly for monitoring and administrative convenience. The key question is not whether universities should use online and blended models. They already do and will continue to do so. The more important question is how these models can be governed, designed, and evaluated in ways that protect the intellectual and social purposes of higher education.

2.3 The Catalyst of Global Disruption: Lessons from the Pandemic Transition

The COVID-19 pandemic marked a decisive moment in the digital transformation of higher education. Before 2020, online teaching was often treated as one mode among many, associated with distance education, continuing professional development, or institutional innovation projects. The sudden closure of campuses changed this position almost overnight. Universities across the world were required to move teaching, assessment, supervision, administration, and student support into digital environments under conditions of uncertainty and crisis. This was not a planned transition to online learning. It was an emergency response, often described as Emergency Remote Teaching (ERT) (Crawford et al., 2020).

The distinction between ERT and carefully designed online education is essential. Good online learning is normally developed through instructional design, staff preparation, accessibility planning, assessment redesign, and iterative quality assurance. During the early pandemic, most institutions had no opportunity for such preparation. Courses designed for physical

classrooms were rapidly transferred to platforms such as Zoom, Microsoft Teams, WebEx, and institutional learning management systems. Lectures were streamed, seminars became video calls, examinations were redesigned or proctored remotely, and office hours were conducted online. What occurred was less a pedagogical strategy than collective improvisation under pressure (Marinoni et al., 2020).

Nevertheless, the pandemic demonstrated a significant degree of institutional resilience. In many countries, universities were able to maintain educational continuity despite unprecedented disruption. Cloud services, campus networks, learning platforms, digital libraries, and video-conferencing tools allowed teaching to continue when physical presence became impossible. Academic staff who had previously used digital tools only occasionally acquired new competencies very quickly. Students also adapted to unfamiliar forms of participation, collaboration, and assessment. The crisis accelerated digital learning by several years, and in some institutions it overcame long-standing scepticism towards online education.

The COVID-19 pandemic also revealed how much of the university's ordinary functioning had already become digitally dependent. Even where teaching had remained largely face-to-face before the pandemic, administrative processes, library access, communication, assessment submission, and student records were often already mediated by digital systems. The pandemic did not create this dependence; it exposed and intensified it. It showed that digital infrastructure had become part of the university's continuity planning and institutional resilience. At the same time, it revealed that access to such infrastructure was unevenly distributed across institutions, countries, disciplines, staff groups, and student populations.

The digital divide became one of the most visible weaknesses of the emergency transition. The move online assumed that students had a personal computer, reliable broadband, a quiet place to study, sufficient digital literacy, and the emotional capacity to learn during a public health crisis. Many did not. Some students followed lectures on smartphones, shared devices with family members, relied on unstable mobile data, or attempted to complete examinations in crowded households. Students from low-income backgrounds, rural areas, and regions with weaker digital infrastructure experienced the transition very differently from students with private rooms, fast internet, and modern equipment.

The pandemic also highlighted the emotional and relational limits of digital instruction. Many students experienced loneliness, anxiety, fatigue, loss of motivation, and weakened connection to their academic communities. The now familiar scene of the teacher speaking to a screen of silent black rectangles was not merely a technical inconvenience. It expressed a deeper pedagogical problem: digital communication can sustain instruction, but it does not automatically sustain presence, trust, or dialogue.

Synchronous video meetings often reproduced the schedule of the classroom without reproducing its social energy. Students and teachers alike struggled with screen fatigue, blurred boundaries between study and home life, and the absence of informal academic contact (Marinoni et al., 2020).

Assessment became another area of tension. Institutions had to decide whether to postpone examinations, replace them with coursework, conduct oral assessments, use open-book formats, or rely on remote proctoring. Each option had consequences. Remote proctoring raised privacy and equity concerns. Open-book assessment required redesign rather than simple translation from closed-book formats. Written assignments became more difficult to interpret in terms of independent authorship as students worked remotely and, later, as generative AI tools became widely available. The pandemic therefore forced universities to confront a question that remains relevant: What kinds of assessment genuinely measure understanding rather than the ability to comply with a particular format?

One lasting lesson of the pandemic is that digital pedagogy cannot be reduced to the delivery of content through a screen. A two-hour lecture transferred unchanged into a video-conferencing platform rarely becomes good online education. Effective digital teaching requires attention to pacing, interaction, accessibility, cognitive load, community building, feedback, and assessment design. It also requires institutional support: training for staff, technical assistance for students, inclusive policies, investment in infrastructure, and recognition of the additional labour involved in high-quality digital teaching.

The post-pandemic university has not returned to the pre-pandemic model. It has entered a more hybrid and reflective phase. Many students now expect recorded materials, digital submission, online consultations, and flexible participation. Many teachers have retained digital practices that proved useful. At the same time, the pandemic has reminded academic communities that physical presence, informal interaction, and embodied learning remain valuable. The task after the pandemic is therefore not to choose between campus and digital education, but to develop a more mature understanding of when, why, and for whom different modes of learning are appropriate.

2.4 AI and Learning Analytics

AI and learning analytics are increasingly shaping the digital university. Their influence extends beyond isolated tools and enters the governance of teaching, assessment, student support, and institutional decision-making. Universities now collect large amounts of data about student behaviour, performance, engagement, and progression. They use these data to identify risk, personalise instruction, improve retention, optimise administrative

services, and evaluate educational quality. This marks a shift from digital systems as repositories of information to digital systems as interpretive and predictive infrastructures (Daniel, 2019).

Adaptive learning systems illustrate this shift clearly. These platforms use data about student performance to adjust learning materials, recommend exercises, identify conceptual gaps, and personalise the sequence of content. In a large introductory course, where one teacher may be responsible for hundreds of students, such systems can provide forms of immediate feedback that would otherwise be impossible. A student who repeatedly makes the same error can be directed towards additional explanations or practice. Another student who demonstrates mastery can move more quickly to advanced tasks. In this respect, AI-supported personalisation may help address differences in preparation, pace, and confidence among students.

Yet personalisation should not be understood as a purely technical achievement. Educational personalisation involves judgment about what matters in learning. An adaptive system may recognise that a student has answered questions incorrectly, but it may not understand the broader reasons: anxiety, language difficulty, conceptual confusion, lack of prior knowledge, disability, overwork, or a temporary personal crisis. The system can signal a pattern, but it cannot fully interpret the student's situation. For this reason, adaptive learning is most valuable when it supports teachers and tutors rather than replacing their interpretive role.

Learning analytics operates on a broader institutional scale. By collecting data from learning management systems, library systems, assessment platforms, attendance tools, and virtual learning environments, universities can create dashboards and predictive models. These models may identify students who are at risk of failing, withdrawing, or disengaging. They may also help departments evaluate course design, identify bottlenecks in curricula, and improve student support. Used carefully, analytics can make invisible difficulties visible and allow earlier intervention.

The promise of learning analytics is particularly strong in contexts where students might otherwise disappear from institutional attention. In large universities, a student may miss deadlines, stop attending, or fail formative tasks without any single staff member noticing the broader pattern. Analytics can draw attention to such cases. It can help academic advisors contact students earlier, offer support, and connect them with tutoring, financial aid, counselling, or disability services. In this sense, data can serve a pastoral function when embedded in human care.

However, the same systems raise serious ethical and pedagogical concerns. A central risk is reductionism. Learning is a complex, interpretive, social, and emotional process, but analytics often relies on measurable traces: logins, clicks, time spent on pages, submission dates, quiz scores, and forum posts. These indicators can be useful, but they are not learning itself. A student

may spend little time on a platform because they have already mastered the material, or because they are learning through offline reading, peer discussion, or printed texts. Another student may generate high levels of platform activity without developing deep understanding. When indicators become targets, teaching and learning may be reorganised around what is easy to measure rather than what is educationally meaningful (O'Neil, 2016).

AI-supported assessment also requires caution. Automated grading systems can provide rapid feedback on quizzes, code, short answers, and some forms of writing. They may reduce routine workload and allow students to receive responses more quickly. Yet grading is not merely classification. It is also an act of interpretation, communication, and pedagogical responsibility. The assessment of argumentation, originality, ethical reasoning, creativity, and disciplinary judgment is difficult to automate without narrowing the definition of quality. If universities rely too heavily on automated assessment, they may encourage forms of student work that are easier for machines to evaluate but less valuable for intellectual development.

AI chatbots and virtual assistants are another growing component of the digital university. They can answer routine questions about deadlines, procedures, technical issues, library access, and course navigation. Their availability outside office hours can be helpful, especially for students studying asynchronously or across time zones. However, the use of chatbots also changes the student's relationship with the institution. When administrative communication is automated, students may receive quick answers but less human recognition. Institutions need to distinguish between routine informational support, which may be effectively automated, and situations requiring empathy, discretion, judgment, or pastoral sensitivity.

Privacy and surveillance are some of the most important concerns associated with AI and learning analytics. Predictive systems require data, and educational data can be highly sensitive. It may reveal not only academic performance but also habits, vulnerabilities, language use, attendance patterns, mental health risks, socio-economic constraints, and forms of disability. Continuous tracking can create a culture in which students feel that they are always being observed and assessed. This can undermine trust and encourage strategic behaviour aimed at satisfying the system rather than engaging openly with learning.

Algorithmic bias adds another layer of risk. Models trained on historical data may reproduce the inequalities present in that data. If students from particular backgrounds have historically been more likely to fail or withdraw because of institutional barriers, an algorithm may classify similar future students as high risk. Such classifications can be helpful if they trigger additional support, but harmful if they lower expectations, stigmatise students, or place them into restrictive pathways. Predictive systems therefore need

transparency, regular auditing, human oversight, and mechanisms for appeal. The ethical question is not only whether the prediction is statistically accurate, but also how it is used and what consequences it produces.

The responsible use of AI in higher education requires a governance framework that combines pedagogical expertise, data protection, student participation, and institutional accountability. Universities should be able to explain what data are collected, why they are collected, how they are analysed, who has access, and how decisions are made. Students should not be treated as passive data subjects. Teachers should not be reduced to operators of dashboards. AI and analytics can improve education when they support professional judgment and strengthen relationships of care, but they become dangerous when they displace judgment, narrow educational values, or turn learning into a permanently monitored performance.

2.5 Virtual Reality and Immersive Learning Environments

The development of virtual reality, augmented reality, mixed reality, and other immersive technologies has opened new possibilities for teaching and learning. These technologies are often grouped under the term Extended Reality (XR). Their educational value lies in their ability to create simulated environments where students can interact with objects, spaces, processes, and scenarios that would otherwise be inaccessible, dangerous, too expensive, or difficult to repeat. Unlike conventional screen-based learning, immersive environments place the learner inside an interactive spatial setting. This can support forms of experiential learning that are difficult to achieve through text, video, or lectures alone.

In medical, nursing, veterinary, and health sciences education, immersive technologies can support anatomy, clinical reasoning, procedural training, and emergency response. Students may examine three-dimensional models of organs, practise diagnostic decision-making, rehearse surgical steps, or participate in simulated patient encounters. These simulations allow mistakes to occur without harm to patients. They also make it possible to repeat rare or complex scenarios until students develop confidence and procedural fluency. In fields where ethical and safety concerns limit opportunities for early practice, virtual reality (VR) can provide a valuable bridge between theoretical instruction and supervised real-world experience.

Engineering, architecture, and the natural sciences also benefit from immersive simulation. Engineering students can inspect machinery, test structural designs, observe fluid dynamics, or explore industrial systems that would be costly to build physically. Architecture students can walk through a full-scale virtual model of a building, evaluate spatial relationships, and notice design problems that may not be obvious in two-dimensional plans. Environmental science students can explore ecosystems, geological

formations, or climate scenarios in ways that make abstract processes more tangible. Such learning environments can help students connect conceptual knowledge with spatial and practical understanding.

The humanities and social sciences may also use immersive environments, although their value is sometimes less obvious at first glance. Historical reconstruction can allow students to enter representations of ancient cities, museums, archaeological sites, or cultural landscapes. Teacher education can use simulations of classroom situations. Public management and policy programmes can create crisis simulations, negotiation exercises, or participatory governance scenarios. In these cases, the aim is not to replace reading, interpretation, or discussion, but to provide a situated experience that can later be analysed critically. The most valuable learning often occurs not inside the simulation itself but in the debriefing that follows.

From the perspective of learning theory, immersive environments may support attention, embodiment, and memory. They can combine visual, auditory, spatial, and kinesthetic elements, allowing students to engage with material through multiple channels. For some learners, this can increase motivation and improve retention. Simulations can also provide safe environments for practising difficult interactions, such as public speaking, professional interviews, conflict management, or clinical communication. Students with particular forms of anxiety may benefit from controlled repetition before entering real-world situations.

However, the educational value of immersive technologies should not be assumed. Novelty can produce engagement, but engagement is not the same as learning. A technically impressive simulation may have limited pedagogical value if it lacks clear objectives, scaffolding, feedback, and reflection. There is also a risk that immersive learning will be used as a demonstration of institutional modernity rather than as a carefully designed educational intervention. Universities should therefore evaluate XR tools according to pedagogical criteria: What problem do they solve, what form of learning do they support, and how do they connect with assessment, reflection, and disciplinary understanding?

Cost and access are major constraints. High-quality headsets, tracking systems, graphics hardware, and custom software remain expensive. Developing a serious educational simulation requires collaboration among academic experts, instructional designers, programmers, artists, and accessibility specialists. Well-resourced universities may be able to invest in such infrastructures, while smaller or underfunded institutions may not. This creates the risk of a new immersive divide, where elite institutions offer highly sophisticated simulation-based learning while less resourced institutions rely on lower-quality tools or are excluded altogether.

Accessibility also needs careful attention. Some students experience motion sickness, eye strain, dizziness, sensory overload, or discomfort

when using head-mounted displays. Others may be unable to use certain equipment because of visual impairment, mobility limitations, neurological conditions, or religious and cultural considerations. If immersive technologies are treated as compulsory without alternatives, they may exclude the very learners that digital education claims to support. Universal Design for Learning should therefore guide implementation from the outset rather than be added as an afterthought.

There are also deeper pedagogical questions about simulation and reality. A virtual field trip is not the same as being in a field site. A simulated patient is not the same as a real patient. A reconstructed historical city is not the past itself. Simulations are interpretations. They contain assumptions, omissions, simplifications, and design choices. Students need to be taught to question immersive environments rather than merely experience them. In this sense, XR should be accompanied by critical reflection on representation, evidence, uncertainty, and the limits of technological mediation.

Immersive learning is therefore best understood as a complement to, not a replacement for, laboratories, fieldwork, studio critique, clinical placements, seminars, and face-to-face mentorship. Its promise lies in expanding the range of experiences available to students, especially where real-world access is constrained. Its risk lies in overestimating the educational power of technological immersion while underestimating the importance of dialogue, interpretation, and human guidance. Used thoughtfully, XR can enrich higher education. Used uncritically, it may become another costly symbol of innovation without sufficient pedagogical depth.

2.6 Digital Credentials and Flexible Learning Pathways

The digital transformation of higher education is also changing the structure of qualifications. For much of the modern university's history, academic recognition has been organised around long-cycle educational pathways, including bachelor's, master's, doctoral, and professional programmes. These degrees remain central, but they are increasingly supplemented by shorter, modular, and more flexible forms of certification. Digital credentials, micro-credentials, professional badges, and stackable certificates reflect the growing demand for continuous learning in economies characterised by technological change, occupational mobility, and recurring reskilling.

Micro-credentials are typically designed to certify a specific competency, skill, or knowledge area. They may focus on data analysis, project management, cybersecurity, digital pedagogy, sustainability reporting, AI ethics, leadership, or sector-specific regulatory knowledge. Their appeal lies in their scale and flexibility. Learners can complete them without committing to a full degree, and employers can interpret them as evidence of particular capabilities. For working professionals, micro-credentials may offer a practical

way to update skills while remaining employed. For universities, they provide a means of engaging alumni, industry partners, and non-traditional learners.

Digital credentials also respond to the changing temporality of education. The idea that education is concentrated mainly in early adulthood is increasingly insufficient. Many professionals need to return to learning repeatedly throughout their careers. New technologies, regulatory changes, environmental transitions, demographic pressures, and shifts in public services all require continuing education. In this context, the university becomes not only a place of initial formation but also a lifelong learning partner. Digital platforms make such recurring engagement easier to organise and document.

Technological infrastructures are important to this development. Secure digital records, verifiable certificates, and, in some cases, blockchain-based credential systems can make qualifications portable across institutions and national contexts. Instead of relying on paper transcripts or slow administrative verification, learners may share digital evidence of achievement with employers, professional bodies, or other universities. This can reduce bureaucratic friction and support international mobility. However, the technological reliability of a credential is only one part of its value. It also needs academic credibility, clear learning outcomes, recognised standards, and meaningful assessment.

The idea of stackable learning pathways extends this logic. Rather than completing a single fixed curriculum in a predetermined order, learners may accumulate smaller units over time and combine them into larger qualifications. A student might complete micro-credentials in computer programming, public finance, organisational ethics, and intercultural communication, eventually incorporating them into a broader degree or professional certificate. Such flexibility can support interdisciplinary profiles and respond to the diverse needs of students whose personal and professional lives do not allow uninterrupted full-time study.

At the same time, the growth of modular credentials raises important questions about the purpose of higher education. If universities focus too heavily on short-term labour-market skills, they may weaken the broader intellectual, civic, and ethical functions of academic learning. A degree is not only a bundle of competencies. It is also a sustained encounter with a discipline, a method of inquiry, a scholarly community, and a set of ways of thinking. Long-form study allows students to develop conceptual depth, historical perspective, critical judgment, and intellectual maturity. These qualities are difficult to capture in short, skills-oriented courses and credentials.

There is also a risk of stratification. Wealthier students may continue to access full residential degrees with rich mentoring, campus life, research opportunities, and cultural capital, while less advantaged learners are directed

towards cheaper, automated, and narrowly vocational digital packages. If this occurs, digital credentials could reinforce rather than reduce educational inequality. The distinction between flexible access and second-tier provision is therefore crucial. Universities need to ensure that modular learning pathways are academically robust and socially respected, not merely low-cost alternatives for those excluded from traditional education.

Employers and professional bodies also play an important role. A credential has value only if it is trusted. If the market becomes flooded with short-course certificates of uneven quality, students may invest time and money in credentials that carry little recognition. Universities should therefore avoid treating micro-credentials as simple revenue products. They should be connected to transparent standards, meaningful assessment, academic oversight, and, where appropriate, professional accreditation. The credibility of the issuing institution matters, but so does the integrity of the learning process behind the badge.

A balanced approach would integrate digital credentials into the wider mission of the university rather than allowing them to fragment it. Micro-credentials can be valuable when they provide access, support lifelong learning, respond to emerging social needs, and allow students to build flexible pathways. They become problematic when they narrow education to market responsiveness alone. The challenge for university governance is to combine flexibility with depth, employability with critical citizenship, and modularity with intellectual coherence.

2.7 Inclusion, Accessibility, and the Digital Divide

Digital education is often associated with expanded access. In some respects, this association is justified. Online and hybrid learning can reduce barriers related to distance, physical mobility, scheduling, and campus attendance. Digital materials can be adapted into multiple formats. Recorded lectures can be replayed. Captions, transcripts, screen readers, flexible deadlines, and alternative assessment formats can support students with disabilities and students with diverse learning needs. For many learners, digitalisation makes higher education more reachable than it was in a strictly campus-based model.

However, access should not be confused with inclusion. A course may be technically available online and still be difficult or impossible for many students to use effectively. Inclusion requires attention to the conditions under which students participate: devices, connectivity, digital skills, language, disability, time, care responsibilities, mental health, financial resources, and study space. The digital divide is therefore not a single problem of internet access: it is a layered form of inequality that includes material, cognitive, social, and institutional dimensions.

The material dimension remains significant. Many universities assume that students have laptops, webcams, stable broadband, up-to-date software, and private rooms suitable for study. These assumptions do not hold for all learners. Some students rely on shared household devices, outdated computers, mobile phones, prepaid data, public Wi-Fi, or unstable rural connections. Others study in crowded homes, during work breaks, or while caring for family members. Under such conditions, the flexibility of online learning may become a burden. Students are formally included but practically disadvantaged.

Digital literacy is another dimension. Younger students are often assumed to be digitally fluent because they use smartphones and social media, but academic digital literacy is different. It involves navigating learning platforms, managing files, using scholarly databases, participating in online discussions, evaluating digital sources, protecting privacy, and communicating professionally. Non-traditional students, international students, and students returning to education after a long break may need explicit support. Without such support, digital systems can intensify feelings of inadequacy and exclusion.

Language and cognitive load are also important. International students studying in a second or third language may struggle with fast synchronous sessions, automated captions of uneven quality, and platform interfaces that lack multilingual support. Students with attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD), dyslexia, autism, anxiety, or other neurodivergent profiles may find highly fragmented digital courses exhausting if they contain too many navigation steps, notifications, tabs, deadlines, and poorly structured resources. Cognitive load theory reminds us that learning environments should not overwhelm students with unnecessary complexity. Digital course design must therefore pay attention not only to content but also to navigational clarity.

Many digital materials are still produced in formats that screen readers cannot process properly. Videos lack accurate captions. Images and graphs lack alternative text. Portable document format (PDF)s are scanned rather than structured. Timed assessments are rigid. Proctoring tools may fail to accommodate assistive technologies. Colour choices may be unreadable for visually impaired students. These are not minor technical issues. They determine whether a student can participate on equal terms. Accessibility should be built into course design from the start, guided by standards such as the Web Content Accessibility Guidelines and by direct consultation with disabled students.

Universal Design for Learning provides a useful framework for this task. It encourages multiple means of engagement, representation, and expression. In practical terms, this means that students should be able to access materials in different formats, demonstrate learning in more than one way, and engage

with courses through flexible pathways. A lecture might be accompanied by slides, a transcript, audio, a visual summary, and a low-bandwidth version. An assessment might offer alternatives that measure the same learning outcomes without imposing unnecessary barriers. Such design benefits disabled students, but it also benefits many others: commuters, caregivers, students with temporary illnesses, and learners in low-bandwidth environments.

Institutions also need structural responses. Hardware-lending schemes, internet support, campus digital access points, emergency grants, accessible IT helpdesks, and staff training are not optional extras. They are part of educational equity. If universities require digital participation, they assume responsibility for making it feasible. This is particularly important in public higher education, where the democratic mission of the university depends on the inclusion of students from different social backgrounds.

The digital divide also exists between institutions and countries. Well-funded universities can invest in advanced platforms, instructional design teams, analytics systems, accessibility units, and immersive laboratories. Less resourced institutions may depend on outdated infrastructure or commercial tools with limited support. On a global scale, students and academics in regions with weaker connectivity face systematic disadvantages in participating in international digital education. Digital transformation can therefore reproduce global inequalities unless accompanied by public investment, open educational resources, interoperable standards, and international cooperation.

A socially responsible digital university should measure its success not by the sophistication of its tools but by the extent to which those tools support diverse learners. Innovation that benefits only already privileged students is not educational transformation in a democratic sense. The central question is whether digitalisation enables more people to participate meaningfully in higher education, with dignity, support, and a fair opportunity to succeed. Inclusion must therefore be treated as a design principle, a governance responsibility, and an ethical commitment.

2.8 Academic Integrity and AI-Generated Content

The emergence of generative AI has created one of the most difficult academic integrity challenges faced by contemporary universities. Large language models can generate essays, summaries, code, lesson plans, exam answers, literature reviews, translations, and research proposals within seconds. These outputs are not copied from a single source in the traditional sense, which means that conventional plagiarism detection tools are poorly suited to identifying them. The problem is not only technical. Generative AI forces universities to reconsider what counts as authorship, originality, assistance, learning, and responsible academic work.

At first, many institutions responded through prohibition and detection. They issued bans on unauthorised AI use, adopted AI-detection software, and expanded remote proctoring. This reaction is understandable. Universities depend on trust in assessment. If students can submit machine-generated work as their own, the credibility of qualifications is threatened. However, detection-oriented responses have significant limitations. AI detectors are unreliable and may produce false positives. They can also be biased against non-native speakers or students whose writing is formulaic, highly structured, or cautious. Accusing a student on the basis of an uncertain automated score can cause serious harm.

Remote proctoring raises related concerns. Systems that monitor eye movement, keystrokes, background noise, browser activity, or room conditions are often presented as solutions to online cheating. Yet they can be intrusive, anxiety-producing, and discriminatory. Students may live in shared spaces, lack control over background interruptions, use assistive technologies, or experience neurodivergent behaviours that algorithms interpret as suspicious. The use of surveillance to defend integrity can undermine the trust and dignity that universities claim to uphold.

A more sustainable response begins by recognising that generative AI is now part of the knowledge environment in which students live and work. Total prohibition may be appropriate in some assessment contexts, but it is unlikely to be effective as a general educational strategy. Students will encounter AI tools in workplaces, public administration, research, communication, and creative industries. Higher education should therefore teach them how to use these tools critically, transparently, and ethically. Academic integrity in the age of AI cannot mean the absence of technology. It must mean responsible authorship and accountable judgment.

This requires clearer distinctions between acceptable and unacceptable forms of AI use. In some assignments, AI may be prohibited because the purpose is to assess unaided writing, reasoning, memory, or technical skill. In others, students may be permitted to use AI for brainstorming, language polishing, coding assistance, translation, feedback, or comparison, provided that they disclose how it was used. In still other assignments, AI may be part of the task itself: students may be asked to critique AI-generated outputs, identify hallucinations, compare prompts, analyse bias, or revise machine-generated text using disciplinary knowledge. The key is transparency. Students need to know what is allowed, what must be declared, and what remains their responsibility.

Assessment design is central. Assignments that ask for generic essays on broad topics are highly vulnerable to AI-generated completion. Rather than relying only on detection, teachers can design assessments that require process, context, specificity, and reflection. Students can submit research logs, annotated bibliographies, drafts, peer feedback, methodological notes, oral

defences, in-class writing, project documentation, or reflective statements explaining their choices. Such approaches make learning more visible and reduce the importance of a single final product. They also support better pedagogy because they value the development of thinking over the mere submission of text.

Oral and dialogic assessment may become more important. Presentations, vivas, seminars, project interviews, and live problem-solving can help teachers understand whether students have internalised the knowledge represented in their written work. These methods are not immune to inequity and must be designed carefully, but they can restore a relational dimension to assessment. They also encourage students to take ownership of their ideas. When a student must explain, defend, and revise an argument in conversation, authorship becomes more than textual production.

Generative AI also raises questions of epistemic responsibility. AI systems can produce fluent but inaccurate text. They may invent references, simplify debates, reproduce stereotypes, or present contested claims as settled facts. Students who use such systems need skills of verification, source evaluation, citation, and critical reading. The danger is not only cheating but also intellectual passivity. If students treat AI outputs as authoritative, they may outsource the very processes of judgment that higher education is meant to cultivate.

Staff need support as well. Many academics are uncertain about how to respond to AI-generated content, how to design appropriate assessments, and how to discuss responsible use with students. Institutional policies should therefore be accompanied by professional development, disciplinary guidance, sample statements for syllabi, and spaces for academic discussion. Different disciplines will require different approaches. The use of AI in computer programming, language learning, design, law, medicine, public administration, or philosophy raises different pedagogical questions. A single university-wide rule is rarely sufficient.

Academic integrity in the era of generative AI should therefore be reframed as part of digital literacy and scholarly formation. The goal is not to create a culture of suspicion, nor to pretend that AI can be removed from academic life. The goal is to help students understand the boundaries between assistance and substitution, between editing and authorship, between information and knowledge, and between fluent output and justified argument. In this respect, generative AI may become an opportunity to improve assessment and make the values of academic work more explicit.

2.9 Preserving the Human Dimension of Education

The acceleration of digital transformation makes the human dimension of higher education more, not less, important. Learning management systems,

AI, immersive simulations, automated feedback, and digital credentials can extend educational possibilities, but they cannot replace the relational foundations of academic life. Higher education is not simply the transmission of information. It involves interpretation, judgment, mentorship, identity formation, ethical reflection, and participation in a community of inquiry. These processes are deeply human, even when they are supported by technology (Veletsianos & Kimmons, 2013).

The relationship between teacher and student remains central. Good teaching involves more than presenting content clearly. It also involves noticing confusion, encouraging effort, challenging assumptions, responding to uncertainty, recognising potential, and modelling intellectual responsibility. A teacher may help a student persist through failure, refine an argument, discover a field of interest, or imagine a future academic or professional path. These forms of influence are difficult to measure and impossible to automate fully. They depend on attention, trust, and the ethical presence of another person.

Mentorship is particularly important in digital environments because online learning can be impersonal. Automated reminders may tell students what they have missed, but they do not understand why it matters. A predictive alert may identify risk, but it does not offer recognition. A chatbot may provide information, but it does not build academic confidence. Digital support systems can be useful, but they need to be connected to human relationships. The most responsible use of learning analytics, for example, is not to classify students, but to prompt timely, respectful, and personal outreach.

Academic freedom is also at stake. When teaching is organised through platforms that standardise content, monitor activity, and produce performance metrics, instructors may feel pressure to align with what is measurable. They may avoid experimentation, controversial discussion, or open-ended inquiry because these are harder to document or evaluate. Students may also become cautious if they feel that every action is logged. Intellectual curiosity requires room for uncertainty, digression, disagreement, and productive failure. A digital university committed to academic values must preserve such spaces.

The same applies to curriculum design. Digital tools can support structure, clarity, and accessibility, but excessive modularisation can fragment learning. A course is not only a sequence of units. It is an intellectual journey that involves accumulation, reconsideration, conversation, and synthesis. Teachers need freedom to adapt to the group in front of them, to slow down when necessary, to pursue unexpected questions, and to connect course material with current events or student concerns. Platform templates should assist this work, not constrain it.

The preservation of the human dimension also requires recognition of academic labour. Digital teaching is sometimes presented as more efficient,

but high-quality digital education can be labour-intensive. Recording lectures, designing online activities, moderating forums, providing timely feedback, ensuring accessibility, supporting students remotely, and updating digital materials all take time. If institutions treat digitalisation primarily as a cost-saving strategy, they risk overburdening staff and weakening educational quality. Human-centred digital transformation requires investment in people as well as platforms.

Professional development is therefore essential. Academic teachers need opportunities to learn not only how to use tools, but also how to make pedagogical decisions in digital contexts. They need to understand cognitive load, accessibility, online facilitation, assessment redesign, AI literacy, data ethics, and inclusive communication. They also need institutional recognition for the invisible work of digital teaching. Without such recognition, digital innovation may depend on individual enthusiasm rather than sustainable academic practice.

Students also need to be understood as participants in the design of digital education. Their experiences provide insight into what works, what excludes, what overwhelms, and what supports learning. Student feedback should go beyond satisfaction surveys and include dialogue about accessibility, workload, community, assessment, and the use of data. A digital university that listens to students is more likely to build systems that support genuine learning rather than merely administrative convenience.

The future of the digital university should therefore be guided by the principle of technological subsidiarity: digital tools should perform tasks they are well suited to perform, while human beings should retain responsibility for judgment, meaning, care, and ethical decision-making. Automation may support routine feedback, scheduling, resource access, pattern recognition, and administrative guidance. It should not replace mentorship, scholarly dialogue, academic judgment, or the moral responsibility of educators towards students.

The digital transformation of higher education is now a structural reality. Online and blended learning, AI tutors, learning analytics, immersive simulations, and modular credentials will continue to shape universities. These developments can expand access, personalise learning, support lifelong education, and prepare students for complex knowledge economies. They can also intensify surveillance, inequality, standardisation, and the commodification of learning. The difference lies in governance, pedagogy, and values.

A legitimate digital university must therefore be more than technologically advanced. It must be pedagogically thoughtful, socially inclusive, ethically accountable, and humanly recognisable. Its digital systems should help teachers teach better, help students learn more deeply, and help institutions respond more fairly to diverse needs. They should not reduce education to

data flows, credentials, and automated compliance. If digital innovation is anchored in mentorship, academic freedom, accessibility, trust, and critical inquiry, it can strengthen the university's public and humanistic mission. If it is detached from these values, it may produce efficiency at the cost of education itself.

2.10 Conclusion

The digital university, as this chapter has shown, is no longer an experiment sitting at the edges of higher education. It has become the everyday fabric through which teaching, learning, and academic life actually happen, from the platforms that organise a course to the algorithms that quietly flag a struggling student.

What stands out across these pages is that technology on its own settles nothing. Online learning can widen access or leave students isolated. Learning analytics can offer timely care or slide into surveillance. Generative AI can sharpen critical thinking or invite intellectual shortcuts. The outcome depends less on the tools themselves and more on the choices institutions make around them: how courses are designed, how data is used, how staff are supported, and how much space is left for the messiness of real learning.

The pandemic made this abundantly clear. It proved universities could adapt with remarkable speed, but it also exposed how uneven that adaptation was, and how much students needed more than a working internet connection to truly learn. That lesson still matters as immersive technologies, AI tutors, and micro-credentials continue reshaping what a degree even looks like. Perhaps the clearest thread running through the chapter is this: no dashboard, chatbot, or simulation can replace what happens between a thoughtful teacher and a curious student. Digital tools are at their best when they free up space for that relationship, not when they try to substitute for it. Getting that balance right will decide whether the digital university strengthens higher education's deeper purpose, or slowly hollows it out.

References

Bates, A. W. (Tony). (2019). *Teaching in a digital age: Guidelines for designing teaching and learning (2nd ed.)*. BCcampus.

Crawford, J., Butler-Henderson, K., Rudolph, J., Malkawi, B., Glowatz, M., Burton, R., Magni, P. A., & Lam, S. (2020). COVID-19: 20 countries' higher education intra-period digital pedagogy responses. *Journal of Applied Learning and Teaching*, *3*(1), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.37074/jalt.2020.3.1.7

Daniel, B. K. (2019). Big data and data science: A critical review of issues for educational research. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, *50*(1), 101–113. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12595

Deem, R., Hillyard, S., & Reed, M. (2007). *Knowledge, higher education and the new managerialism: The changing management of UK universities.* Oxford University Press.

Marinoni, G., Van't Land, H., & Jensen, T. (2020). *The impact of COVID-19 on higher education around the world: IAU global survey report.* International Association of Universities.

O'Neil, C. (2016). *Weapons of math destruction: How big data increases inequality and threatens democracy.* Crown.

Veletsianos, G., & Kimmons, R. (2013). Scholars and faculty members' lived experiences in online social networks. *The Internet and Higher Education*, *16*, 43–50.

3 Digital Engagement and the Third Mission

3.1 The Networked Societal Role of the University

The university today operates under a multidimensional mandate shaped by three distinct yet closely interconnected institutional missions. While the first mission (teaching and pedagogical instruction) and the second mission (scientific research and epistemic inquiry) have historically anchored the institutional identity of higher education, the "third mission" has emerged over the past several decades as an important framework for institutional legitimacy, societal relevance, and public accountability (Deem et al., 2007). Broadly defined, the third mission encompasses the broad range of activities through which universities engage actively with society: transferring knowledge, stimulating economic development, fostering social innovation, and contributing directly to local, regional, and global community development. Historically executed through in-person public lectures, regional extension services, localised industrial consultancies, and in-person civic partnerships, this outreach mission has provided the basic social contract linking the academy to the public that funds and sustains it.

In the current digital era, this basic social contract is undergoing a profound sociotechnical transformation. The widespread digitalisation of the global knowledge economy has decoupled public engagement from the constraints of geographic proximity and campus infrastructure (Bates, 2019). Contemporary universities are no longer isolated "ivory towers" interacting sporadically with their immediate local surroundings; instead, they function as particularly visible central nodes within complex, globally distributed, and digitally mediated communication networks. Academic knowledge – once locked behind costly publisher paywalls or confined to institutional libraries and campus lecture halls – can now circulate globally, often almost instantly through interconnected technology ecosystems consisting of social media networks, digital repositories, podcast syndication feeds, and open educational platforms (Daniel, 2019).

This broader move towards a digitally mediated third mission greatly expands both the scale and velocity of university outreach. Higher education

DOI: 10.4324/9781042001422-5
This chapter has been made available under a CC BY-NC-ND license.

institutions can now organise continuous multidirectional interactions with an exceptionally broad range of external stakeholders, including government policymakers, industrial partners, civil society organisations, grassroots community activists, and international student populations. During times of far-reaching social, ecological, or public health disruptions, this digital infrastructure allows academic institutions to rapidly mobilise expert scientific commentary, make available open-access educational tools, and provide real-time guidance grounded in evidence to global populations navigating volatile and often confusing information environments. The digital third mission therefore moves the university away from a static repository of expertise accumulated over time to a dynamic participant operating in near real time in the global public sphere.

However, this pervasive virtualisation of public engagement introduces a parallel set of institutional risks, liabilities, and serious ethical dilemmas. The platform designs and architectures that enable broad public outreach are not neutral, value-free tools; they are corporate digital environments and ecosystems governed by often opaque algorithmic recommendation systems designed to maximise attention, emotional intensity and engagement, and political polarisation (O'Neil, 2016). By embedding their public outreach strategies within these corporate spaces, universities expose faculty members, research assets, and institutional reputations to dynamics that are difficult to predict. Academics stepping into the digital public sphere frequently find that the nuanced, methodical, and often complex character of scientific research conflicts directly with the rapid, simplified, and at times hostile logics of online platforms.

Consequently, the university today faces a twofold imperative. It must make purposeful use of digital communication technologies to fulfil its public service responsibilities, widen access to scientific insights, and drive digital-era economic innovation. Yet, it must at the same time navigate the complex threats of online harassment, digital exclusion, institutional reputation crises, and systemic patterns of misinformation that characterise the networked public sphere (Altbach & de Wit, 2020). Fulfilling the third mission in the present digital age requires moving beyond ad hoc and largely optimistic approaches to online outreach. Instead, institutions must develop particularly sophisticated, critical, and properly supported strategies that balance public openness with digital security, equity, and a firm commitment to democratic accountability.

3.2 The Evolution of the Third Mission: From Regional Outreach to Digital Ecosystems

To understand more fully the contemporary sociotechnical reality of higher education outreach, it is necessary to trace the historical evolution of the

third mission from its local and industrial origins to its current position as a digital ecosystem. Historically, the conceptualisation of the third mission emerged in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, given formal shape by landmark institutional interventions such as the Morrill Acts in the United States, which established land-grant universities explicitly tasked to support agricultural and mechanical industries within their immediate states. Throughout the mid-to-late 20th century, as more advanced economies moved towards knowledge-driven systems, the third mission evolved to focus to a large extent on knowledge and technology transfer, commercialisation of patents, and formal contracts between universities and industry, often theorised through Etzkowitz and Leydesdorff's (2000) "Triple Helix" model of university–industry–government relations.

Within this traditional framework, higher education outreach operated under a linear transactional model of knowledge dissemination. Scientific discoveries made in university laboratories were patented by internal knowledge and technology transfer offices (TTOs) and subsequently licensed to commercial enterprises, or shared with the public through top-down, unidirectional communication channels such as printed extension bulletins and formal public seminars. The boundaries of institutional interaction were clearly demarcated by physical proximity, formalised contract mechanisms, and distinct lines separating academic researchers from non-academic audiences. Public engagement was largely an episodic administrative function rather than a continuous organic dimension of academic life.

The advent of widespread digitalisation, networked communication, and the "platformisation" of society has fundamentally disrupted this linear architecture. Contemporary universities operate within a web of interactions that more closely resembles a multidirectional digital ecosystem than a transactional pipeline. Knowledge transfer is no longer confined to the commercialisation of intellectual property or formal corporate consultancies. Instead, it encompasses a continuous, fluid process of open-access data sharing, virtual co-design with community partners, and real-time public commentary on digital platforms. The digital ecosystem model forces universities to manage interactions across multiple overlapping digital spheres simultaneously, blending local civic responsibilities with global scientific visibility.

This institutional transformation alters the temporality of university responsiveness. Under the traditional model, the translation of academic research into public policy or societal utility was a slow process, often requiring years of peer-reviewed publication cycles, institutional reporting, and bureaucratic evaluation. In the digital public sphere, however, the university is expected to provide instantaneous expertise in response to unfolding societal crises, environmental disasters, or macroeconomic shocks (Daniel, 2019). The digital acceleration of the third mission allows academic institutions to bypass traditional gatekeepers, thereby injecting

empirical data, scientific models, and expert interpretations directly into public debates as they happen.

This real-time responsiveness was clearly illustrated during the global COVID-19 pandemic – an event that served as a catalyst for digital university outreach. During this crisis, traditional physical campuses closed, yet universities rapidly expanded their third-mission capacities via digital networks (Crawford et al., 2020). Epidemiologists, virologists, and public policy scholars across global institutions used digital public dashboards, open-access preprint servers, and social media platforms to disseminate real-time tracking statistics, translate complex genomic data for public consumption, and counter dangerous medical misinformation. Simultaneously, universities opened their digital learning repositories to the public, providing free instructional materials, public webinars, and open educational resources to support societies navigating the unprecedented lockdowns (Marinoni et al., 2020).

The permanent structural lessons of this pandemic-era mobilisation have cemented the digital third mission as a core strategic priority for higher education leadership. Universities are increasingly evaluated by funding agencies, state governments, and the public on their digital footprint and their demonstrable capacity to project expertise into networked spaces. However, this shift requires a complete reappraisal of institutional support mechanisms. Fulfilling the third mission within global digital environments and ecosystems means universities can no longer treat online communication as a casual, secondary activity left to the discretion of individual faculty members. Instead, it requires sophisticated institutional frameworks, dedicated digital infrastructures, clear ethical standards, and explicit protection protocols designed to manage the profound risks of open public engagement.

3.3 Digital Public Scholarship and Online Academic Communication

The expansion of the digital public sphere has driven the emergence of "digital public scholarship" – a practice that redefines how academics interact with non-expert audiences and communicate scientific findings. Historically, academic prestige and professional advancement were tied almost exclusively to publication in specialised, double-blind peer-reviewed journals, which were often expensive and inaccessible to the general public. While peer-reviewed communication remains foundational to scientific validity, individual scholars are increasingly utilising digital channels to translate, debate, and distribute their research findings directly to the broader public, bypassing traditional institutional and commercial gatekeepers (Bates, 2019).

Social media platforms have become central tools within this new landscape of academic communication. Platforms such as X, LinkedIn, YouTube, Instagram, and TikTok allow researchers to share scientific insights through accessible text summaries, visual infographics, and short-form video content. Scholars employ these networks to announce major research milestones, provide real-time commentary on political or economic developments, and engage in open peer discussions that are visible to the public. LinkedIn has evolved into an important venue for professional knowledge transfer, enabling academic researchers to interface directly with industry executives, policymakers, and civic leaders. Concurrently, video-centric platforms like YouTube and TikTok are used by science communicators to translate complex physics, biology, and sociological concepts into particularly engaging digital content that reaches millions of viewers worldwide.

Parallel to social media, academic blogging and digital commentary platforms have established themselves as vital spaces for intermediate public scholarship. Formats such as *The Conversation* or independent university-hosted blogging networks allow scholars to draft short, timely, and accessible articles that apply academic expertise to pressing current events. These platforms combine the intellectual rigour of academic authorship with the speed and readability of journalism, often syndicating articles across global media networks. This form of communication allows researchers to present nuanced arguments and contextualise complex data configurations far more rapidly than traditional journal publication timelines allow, significantly increasing the direct societal relevance of academic research.

Podcasting has also emerged as a powerful tool for digital outreach. Higher education institutions and individual research labs routinely produce specialised audio series focusing on science, history, philosophy, and social issues. The unique affordances of audio podcasting – characterised by intimate and conversational long-form deep dives – allow scholars to communicate complex intellectual narratives without reducing them to shallow soundbites. Podcasts attract particularly engaged self-selecting audiences who may lack formal access to university classrooms, effectively extending the pedagogical reach of the university into the daily lives of citizens globally.

Furthermore, the integration of digital public lectures, live-streamed webinars, and virtual panel discussions has transformed the traditional campus speaker event into a borderless civic forum. Global audiences can now participate in live Q&A sessions with leading scientists, humanists, and public intellectuals. This democratisation of access is further reinforced by Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs), which continue to serve as major instruments of open public education. While MOOCs are integrated into formal institutional degree pathways, their primary societal value often lies in public outreach and lifelong learning. They provide free access to

structured, high-quality university instruction for millions of learners who are driven purely by personal enrichment or professional upskilling.

While digital public scholarship significantly enhances the visibility and social impact of academic expertise, it also creates deep professional and operational tensions. Corporate social media environments are structurally driven by metrics – such as likes, retweets, views, and shares – that prioritise emotional resonance, controversy, and rapid consumption over methodical analysis and objective neutrality (O'Neil, 2016). Scholars who engage deeply with these platforms face subtle structural pressures to modify their communication styles, occasionally oversimplifying research conclusions or adopting more provocative stances to maintain visibility within algorithmic feeds. This dynamic can compromise the perceived objectivity and epistemic rigour that grounds public trust in academic institutions.

Furthermore, digital public scholarship frequently suffers from "context collapse", a phenomenon where a scientific text designed for a specific particularly contextualised audience is suddenly extracted by algorithmic recommendation engines and presented to an entirely different audience (Marler & Boudreau, 2017). When complex, specialist technical research regarding economics, public health, or sociology is stripped of its methodological caveats and shared across polarised social networks, it can easily be misinterpreted, weaponised for partisan political agendas, or subjected to intense public backlash. Navigating this fine line between clear public accessibility and rigorous scientific precision represents one of the most significant intellectual and communication challenges for contemporary digital scholars.

3.4 Innovation Ecosystems, Digital Partnerships, and the "Third Space"

The digital transformation of the third mission has profoundly altered how universities collaborate with external economic actors, shifting traditional knowledge and technology transfer practices into dynamic, digitally orchestrated innovation ecosystems. Higher education institutions are no longer simply sources of patented laboratory discoveries that are licensed out through linear administrative pipelines. Instead, they increasingly function as central platforms that actively coordinate collaborative networks connecting academic researchers, student entrepreneurs, venture capital investors, corporate R&D divisions, and regional policymakers.

Central to this institutional evolution is the institutional integration of digital innovation hubs, virtual startup incubators, and university-led technology accelerators. These units use advanced digital infrastructures – such as cloud-based collaborative design environments, shared supercomputing resources, virtual prototyping platforms, and global project management suites – to build agile spaces for joint venture creation. By leveraging these

digital toolsets, university incubators can support entrepreneurial teams across different geographical regions, allowing student startups to access corporate mentoring networks, legal counsel, and global venture capital without requiring a permanent physical presence in a specific tech hub. This digital reach transforms the university into a powerful engine for decentralised economic development and regional startup growth.

Concurrently, traditional university knowledge and TTOs have undergone significant digital modernisation. Contemporary knowledge and technology transfer relies heavily on centralised digital platforms that catalogue institutional intellectual property, showcase active laboratory capabilities, and streamline licensing workflows for corporate partners. These digital portals use sophisticated search algorithms and data analytics to automatically match university research profiles with emerging industrial market demands and public funding opportunities (Daniel, 2019). By reducing transaction costs and eliminating bureaucratic friction, these digital interfaces accelerate the commercialisation of scientific breakthroughs, facilitating faster deployment of advanced materials, medical tools, and software solutions into the broader economy.

Beyond purely commercial activities, universities are leveraging digital environments and ecosystems to build long-term, collaborative relationships with their global alumni networks, municipal public administrations, and civil society organisations. Digital mentoring platforms allow alumni scattered across the globe to seamlessly provide career guidance, project feedback, and venture capital access directly to current students. On a civic level, universities increasingly partner with local municipal governments to develop "smart city" initiatives and public data observatories. Through these digital partnerships, academic researchers analyse anonymised civic data streams – encompassing public transport velocities, energy consumption profiles, and urban health metrics – to co-design data-driven public policies that directly improve the quality of life in surrounding communities.

This expansion of digitally enabled ecosystems has driven the rapid growth of the "third space" within higher education institutions – a specialised organisational domain occupied by professionals who do not fit cleanly into traditional categories of faculty or general university administration (Whitchurch, 2013). These third-space professionals include knowledge and technology transfer managers, digital community organisers, incubator directors, research impact analysts, and data scientists specialising in public–private partnerships. These experts possess a unique dual literacy: they understand the rigorous timelines and cultural values of academic research, yet are equally fluent in the rapid market-driven requirements of corporate environments and digital startup networks. They serve as critical translators, managing the complex boundaries and relationship dynamics within digital collaboration spaces.

Despite the clear economic and collaborative benefits of these modern innovation ecosystems, their expansion draws ongoing critique from higher education scholars. Critics argue that an overemphasis on entrepreneurship, digital commercialisation, and corporate partnership metrics can contribute to an unhealthy commercialisation of the academy, subtly shifting institutional priorities away from fundamental public interests (Deem et al., 2007). When university rewards, internal space allocations, and infrastructure investments are dominated by market-oriented sectors like computer science, biotechnology, and financial engineering, then non-commercialisable disciplines – such as the humanities, fine arts, and foundational theoretical sciences – face systematic underfunding and organisational marginalisation. The critical challenge for university governance today is to design digital innovation ecosystems that stimulate robust economic development while firmly preserving the university's core public responsibilities to social justice, independent critical inquiry, and democratic civic enrichment.

3.5 Digital Risks, Online Harassment, and Institutional Support Frameworks

While the virtualisation of the third mission creates unprecedented opportunities for public outreach, it also exposes academics and higher education institutions to severe digital vulnerabilities, reputational crises, and personal security threats. The democratisation of communication inherent in the networked public sphere means that when scholars step onto digital platforms, they leave behind the protective boundaries of the physical campus and enter a particularly unpredictable and volatile environment. Consequently, digital risk management has evolved from a routine IT operational task into a primary pillar of institutional governance and a core duty of care for university leadership.

The escalation of targeted online harassment, hate speech, and coordinated abuse campaigns directed at academic researchers is a particularly urgent challenge within digital outreach. Scholars who share scientific evidence regarding particularly polarised public debates – such as climate change modelling, vaccine efficacy, macroeconomic policies, gender studies, or geopolitical conflicts – frequently encounter intense digital hostility. This abuse is rarely confined to constructive scientific critique; instead, it regularly manifests as personal insults, misogynistic or racist hate speech, particularly organised trolling, doxxing (the malicious public release of private home addresses and contact information), and explicit threats of physical violence.

The structural architectures of corporate social media platforms significantly amplify these hostile dynamics. Algorithmic recommendation loops

are intentionally engineered to reward outrage and accelerate the viral spread of inflammatory content, transforming localised disagreements into wide-scale public attacks within hours (O'Neil, 2016). For the affected academic, the consequences of such digital assaults are profound and multi-layered, often causing severe psychological trauma, deep professional anxiety, and burnout. Furthermore, this intense hostility creates a powerful chilling effect across the entire institution. Witnessing colleagues face unchecked digital abuse deters other researchers – particularly junior scholars, female academics, and minority academics – from participating in public discourse, thereby undermining the university's capacity to fulfil its societal mission.

To address this systemic threat, universities today are recognising that they cannot treat online harassment as an isolated personal problem to be managed by the individual academic. Institutions have a profound legal, ethical, and structural obligation to design comprehensive support frameworks that protect and defend their staff in digital spaces. Leading higher education institutions are establishing multidisciplinary digital security task forces that coordinate actions across human resource departments, legal counsel, campus security, and public relations offices. These task forces make available structured incident-response protocols that take effect the moment an academic is targeted by a viral harassment campaign, shifting the burden of documentation, platform escalation, and threat assessment away from the affected individual.

Modern institutional support frameworks encompass several critical interventions. First, universities provide dedicated legal teams to help targeted scholars navigate copyright violations, file formal defamation claims, and interface with law enforcement agencies when online abuse escalates to explicit threats of physical violence or stalking. Second, IT infrastructure departments make available personal digital security packages for public-facing scholars. These packages include enterprise-grade password managers, continuous dark-web monitoring services, and specialised data-removal tools designed to systematically erase private home addresses, phone numbers, and family records from public data-broker registries. Third, human resource divisions offer psychological counselling services specifically tailored to the unique trauma of digital mob attacks, helping scholars rebuild their professional confidence and cope with public scrutiny. Finally, institutions supply clear, practical operational protocols that guide scholars on when to engage, block, mute, or escalate online commentary, preventing researchers from inadvertently worsening volatile digital situations.

Parallel to the protection of individual faculty members, university governance must also address the complex challenges in institutional reputation management within highly networked public spheres. Information – and malicious misinformation – circulates through digital networks with such

velocity that a single miscontextualised quote or a controversial social media post by a university member can trigger an international public relations crisis within minutes. These viral controversies can lead to immediate financial threats, including targeted withdrawal of philanthropic donations, political pressure from legislative funding bodies, and coordinated public boycotts. University communication teams must therefore maintain advanced digital listening tools to detect emerging crises early, while consistently balancing the defence of institutional reputation with an unwavering commitment to protecting academic freedom and open public debate.

Finally, the expanding digital footprint of university third-mission portals introduces major infrastructure vulnerabilities, making them prime targets for sophisticated cybercriminals and state-sponsored espionage actors (Garrison et al., 2015). Public engagement portals, open-access databases, and innovation hub networks represent potential entry points into central university enterprise architectures. A security compromise in a public-facing community forum can allow attackers to spread malware across the entire campus network, leading to devastating ransomware scenarios, the exfiltration of sensitive research data, or massive leaks of student personal records. Digital risk governance requires institutions to maintain a strict zero-trust technical architecture, perform regular penetration testing across all public portals, and cultivate a deep culture of digital literacy that recognises security as an essential foundation for public engagement.

3.6 Digital Equity, Structural Exclusion, and Inclusive Public Engagement

A fundamental dilemma at the heart of the digital third mission is the deep tension between the democratising potential of digital technology and the persistent reality of the digital divide. Although online platforms technically allow universities to distribute knowledge at a global scale and interface with audiences across traditional geographic barriers, access to these digital resources remains profoundly unequal. Without deliberate, critical, and properly supported inclusion strategies, higher education outreach initiatives risk inadvertently reinforcing and exacerbating existing socio-economic inequalities, delivering benefits primarily to privileged, tech-literate urban populations while further marginalising underserved communities (Altbach & de Wit, 2020).

The barriers preventing equitable participation in digital university outreach are multi-layered and structural. At the foundational layer lies the infrastructural digital divide, characterised by systemic disparities in high-speed broadband availability, electrical grid stability, and modern computing hardware. Rural communities, low-income urban neighbourhoods, indigenous reservations, and developing regions frequently suffer from

unstable or non-existent digital infrastructures, or they face high financial costs for mobile data consumption. When a university designs its public outreach around high-bandwidth synchronous webinars, immersive virtual reality platforms, or unoptimised multimedia portals, it introduces a structural barrier that excludes individuals who lack access to top-tier digital connections and advanced hardware.

Beyond infrastructure, the cognitive barrier of the digital divide centres on unequal levels of digital literacy and technological fluency. Meaningful engagement with digital public scholarship requires audiences to possess sophisticated skills in navigating complex online interfaces, parsing scientific data configurations, and critically evaluating the validity of online information. Individuals from historically disadvantaged educational backgrounds or elderly populations often face significant challenges navigating modern university learning management portals or open data repositories. If higher education institutions fail to provide intuitive digital interfaces that support users through clear navigation, step-by-step guidance, and accessible instructional clues, their digital outreach assets remain functionally inaccessible to the populations that could benefit most from academic expertise.

Furthermore, achieving true digital equity requires strict adherence to digital accessibility standards for individuals with diverse physical, sensory, or cognitive disabilities. Far too frequently, public-facing university websites, digital lecture recordings, and open educational resources are deployed without essential accessibility features. Online lectures lacking accurate real-time captioning systematically exclude deaf and hard-of-hearing citizens; untagged data visualisations and complex portable document format (PDF) documents are completely unreadable with the screen-reading software used by blind individuals; and rigid, non-adaptable user interfaces present severe hurdles for users with fine-motor or cognitive impairments. Under international frameworks like the Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG 2.1), ensuring universal accessibility is not an optional administrative courtesy; it is a mandatory legal obligation and a core ethical requirement for any public educational institution.

To overcome these multidimensional barriers, higher education institutions today must systematically pivot towards inclusive digital engagement frameworks. This shift requires adopting explicit design principles that prioritise accessibility and equity from the inception of any public outreach project. First, public educational portals, open-access resources, and digital lectures must be systematically optimised for low-bandwidth environments and mobile-only operating systems. Providing downloadable text-heavy alternatives, compressed audio files, and offline-compatible learning packages ensures that citizens can access academic content without requiring continuous high-speed broadband connections. Second, universities must establish centralised compliance workflows that guarantee all

public digital assets are natively compatible with screen readers, offer robust high-contrast viewing modes, provide comprehensive alternative text for visual data, and include human-verified closed captioning and transcripts for all multimedia content. Finally, meaningful public engagement must move away from top-down, paternalistic knowledge distribution models towards authentic co-design processes involving community leaders, local non-profits, and grassroots organisations. By actively involving target populations in the architectural and pedagogical design of digital platforms, institutions ensure that the content delivered aligns directly with the lived cultural realities, linguistic requirements, and immediate socio-economic needs of those communities.

Ultimately, inclusive public engagement recognises that technology is simply an enabling medium, not a complete solution. Building genuine equity within the digital third mission requires a sustained investment in institutional trust-building, continuous public responsiveness, and deep cultural sensitivity. To help bridge the digital literacy gap, higher education institutions must actively combine their online outreach platforms with localised physical community support structures by partnering with, for example, public library networks, municipal community centres, and regional schools. By purposefully structuring the digital third mission around inclusion rather than raw audience metrics, universities can ensure that the digital transformation serves as a powerful instrument for social democratisation and equitable knowledge diffusion.

3.7 Universities, Misinformation, and the Networked Public Sphere

The contemporary digital landscape is characterised by deep systemic challenges that threaten the foundations of democratic governance and empirical truth. The rapid expansion of corporate social media platforms, the integration of often opaque algorithmic recommendation systems, and the hyper-fragmentation of digital information channels have driven the viral spread of misinformation, deepfake content, pseudoscientific narratives, and complex conspiracy theories. In this particularly polarised algorithmically mediated information ecosystem, public trust in traditional institutions – including governments, journalism, and scientific bodies – has faced continuous erosion. This reality redefines the societal responsibilities of higher education institutions within the networked public sphere (Altbach & de Wit, 2020).

Universities can no longer view their public service responsibilities as simply distributing objective scientific facts into an open, rational marketplace of ideas. The classical Enlightenment model of science communication which assumed that public errors could be corrected simply by providing

more accurate data is insufficient within digital spaces driven by emotional polarisation, echo chambers, and active disinformation campaigns. Today, scientific expertise must actively compete against particularly engaging, emotionally resonant, and algorithmically accelerated falsehoods that are purposefully engineered to exploit cognitive biases and deep-seated social anxieties (O'Neil, 2016). Consequently, universities today must step forward as active defenders of empirical truth and institutional anchors of evidence-based reasoning.

To fulfil this role within the networked public sphere, universities must make available multi-layered, innovative digital strategies that combine scientific accuracy with accessibility and speed. Academic institutions are increasingly investing in dedicated research communication labs that translate particularly complex multi-year scientific findings into clear fact-checking resources, interactive data visualisations, and rapid-response digital explanations. When dangerous health claims, environmental misconceptions, or distorted economic statistics begin to circulate virally, university scholars must be structurally equipped to inject verified empirical insights directly into the digital streams where the misinformation is actively spreading.

This proactive approach requires a deep institutional commitment to training the next generation of researchers in advanced digital communication methodologies. Scholars must learn to navigate the delicate balance between necessary scientific complexity and public accessibility, translating rigorous methodology into clear insights without sacrificing intellectual integrity. This training includes mastering data storytelling, engaging constructively with non-expert communities in digital forums, and understanding the algorithmic mechanics that govern platform visibility. By cultivating a faculty that is particularly fluent in digital communication, universities can significantly expand the presence of empirical expertise within public digital spaces.

Furthermore, higher education institutions must lead the development of public-facing digital literacy and critical-thinking initiatives. Universities are uniquely positioned to design and distribute open-access educational modules, public webinars, and community workshops that train citizens to recognise logical fallacies, detect manipulative algorithms, evaluate source credibility, and identify deepfakes or synthetic media. By actively teaching these critical digital fluencies, universities help immunise the public sphere against disinformation campaigns, empowering communities to navigate the complex information landscape with analytical independence.

Finally, universities must leverage their deep structural expertise to conduct rigorous research into the systemic drivers of misinformation itself. Multi-disciplinary academic teams uniting computer scientists, data engineers, psychologists, sociologists, and media scholars critically analyse

the algorithmic architectures of social media networks, track the propagation vectors of digital deception, and co-design open-source technologies for automated fact-checking and source verification. By producing this foundational research, higher education institutions do not simply react to isolated instances of false information; instead, they provide policymakers, journalists, and civic organisations with the structural tools and empirical frameworks required to defend the integrity of democratic public discourse.

3.8 Towards an Accountable and Value-Grounded Third Mission

The comprehensive analysis articulated throughout this chapter demonstrates that the digital transformation of the third mission cannot be understood as a simple value-neutral modernisation of administrative outreach tools or public relations channels. Rather, digitalisation represents a fundamental, permanent, and systemic reconfiguration of how higher education institutions engage with, serve, and co-evolve with society. As universities become deeply embedded within globally connected data-intensive public spheres, their traditional outreach strategies must be systematically re-engineered to remain effective, secure, and legitimate within particularly volatile digital environments.

This sociotechnical evolution has unlocked unprecedented strategic opportunities to expand the public value of higher education. The institutionalisation of digital public scholarship, supported by open-access repositories, academic blogging networks, deep podcast dialogues, and global online course architectures, allows universities to dismantle historical gatekeepers and widen access to advanced scientific knowledge on a global scale. Concurrently, the choreography of digitally enabled innovation ecosystems, startup incubators, and smart city data partnerships transforms the modern university into an agile and particularly potent engine for decentralised economic innovation, regional development, and collaborative civic co-design.

Yet, these undeniable technological opportunities are structurally bound to profound digital risks and systemic exclusions that strike at the foundational ethics of the academy. The intense metric-driven nature of corporate digital platforms exposes public-facing scholars to unprecedented vulnerabilities, including targeted online harassment, doxxing, and psychological trauma, requiring the urgent and particularly comprehensive institutional mobilisation of legal, technical, and psychological support frameworks. Simultaneously, the persistent realities of the digital divide warn against uncritical reliance on high-bandwidth virtual tools, reminding university governance that digital outreach can inadvertently accelerate social inequality unless there is an unwavering commitment to low-bandwidth

optimisation, universal WCAG accessibility compliance, and community-led co-design.

Moving forward, the ultimate legitimacy of higher education and public trust in it will depend entirely on the capacity of university leaders to cultivate an adaptive, value-grounded third-mission paradigm that subordinates technological tools to the broader public interest. Algorithms, platforms, and digital environments and ecosystems must not be permitted to distort the core mission of the university; rather, they must be managed as transparent public instruments engineered to defend empirical truth, cultivate critical digital literacy, and foster inclusive civic dialogue. By anchoring all digital public engagement strategies within an unyielding commitment to equity, human security, and public accountability, higher education institutions can ensure that the digital university remains a vibrant, trusted, and socially transformative sanctuary dedicated to the advancement of human development and global societal well-being.

3.9 Conclusion

The digital third mission, as this chapter has traced, has turned the university into something closer to a public node than a closed institution. Knowledge that once moved slowly, through printed bulletins and formal seminars, now travels instantly through social media, podcasts, and open platforms, reaching audiences the traditional campus could never have touched.

This shift has brought real gains. Academic expertise can meet a crisis in real time, innovation ecosystems can connect students and researchers with partners across the globe, and public scholarship can bring rigorous knowledge to people who would otherwise never encounter it. Yet the same openness that makes this possible also exposes universities to genuine harm. Algorithmic platforms reward outrage more readily than nuance, harassment can follow academics home, and the digital divide means that engagement designed for everyone often reaches only the already well-connected.

What emerges most strongly is that none of this can be left to chance. A university stepping into the digital public sphere needs more than good intentions; it needs proper legal support for staff facing abuse, accessible design built in from the start, and a genuine partnership with the communities it hopes to serve, rather than simply broadcasting at them.

In the end, the third mission's digital future will be shaped less by the platforms themselves and more by the values universities choose to defend within them. Handled with care, digital engagement can extend the university's public purpose further than ever before. Handled carelessly, it risks trading trust and depth for reach and noise. The task ahead is to make sure openness and responsibility grow together, not apart.

References

Altbach, P. G., & de Wit, H. (2020). Postpandemic outlook for higher education is bleakest for the poorest. *International Higher Education,* (102), 3–5. Retrieved from https://ejournals.bc.edu/index.php/ihe/article/view/14583

Bates, A. W. (2019). *Teaching in a digital age: Guidelines for designing teaching and learning* (2nd ed.). Tony Bates Associates Ltd.

Crawford, J., Butler-Henderson, K., Rudolph, J., Malkawi, B., Glowatz, M., Burton, R., Magni, P. A., & Lam, S. (2020). COVID-19: 20 countries' higher education intra-period digital pedagogy responses. *Journal of Applied Learning and Teaching*, *3*(1), 1–20.

Daniel, B. K. (2019). Big data and data science: A critical review of issues for educational research. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, *50*(1), 101–113.

Deem, R., Hillyard, S., & Reed, M. (2007). *Knowledge, higher education and the new managerialism: The changing management of UK universities.* Oxford University Press.

Etzkowitz, H., & Leydesdorff, L. (2000). The dynamics of innovation: From National Systems and "Mode 2" to a Triple Helix of university–industry–government relations. *Research Policy*, *29*(2), 109–123.

Garrison, G., Wakefield, R. L., & Kim, S. (2015). The effects of IT capabilities and delivery model on cloud computing success and firm performance for cloud supported processes and operations. *International Journal of Information Management*, *35*(4), 377–393.

Marinoni, G., Van't Land, H., & Jensen, T. (2020). *The impact of COVID-19 on higher education around the world: IAU global survey report.* International Association of Universities.

Marler, J. H., & Boudreau, J. W. (2017). An evidence-based review of HR analytics. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, *28*(1), 3–26.

O'Neil, C. (2016). *Weapons of math destruction: How big data increases inequality and threatens democracy.* Crown.

Whitchurch, C. (2013). *Reconstructing identities in higher education: The rise of third space professionals.* Routledge.

Part II

Digital Governance, Leadership, and Administration



Taylor & Francis
Taylor & Francis Group
http://taylorandfrancis.com

4 New Governance Paradigms in the Digital Era

4.1 Introduction: The Sociotechnical Reconfiguration of University Governance

Traditional models of higher education governance have often been understood through the theoretical perspectives of collegial bureaucracy and shared professional authority. For centuries, the institutional architecture of universities operated under a two-track governance model (Deem et al., 2007). On one tier, academic senates, faculty boards, and departmental councils exercised formal authority over the central epistemic functions of the institution, including curriculum design, research directions, peer evaluation, and the preservation of academic freedom. On the parallel administrative level, rectors, presidents, deans, and administrative managers were responsible for financial oversight, facility maintenance, and large-scale resource allocation. Decision-making within these classic configurations was intended to be deliberative, relatively slow, and incremental. It depended heavily on in-person committee meetings, consensus-building among senior scholars, and an organisational culture that viewed rapid market-driven optimisation with deep scepticism. This institutional design prioritised stability, long-term historical continuity, and deep insulation from immediate political or economic shocks.

However, the pervasive digital transformation of the global knowledge economy has initiated a profound sociotechnical reconfiguration of these traditional governance structures and decision-making processes. Contemporary universities are no longer just physical sites of learning and scholarly inquiry; they have evolved into complex digital organisations operating within particularly volatile environments shaped by rapid technological change, pervasive datafication, global market competition, and platform-based communication (Bates, 2019). Today's higher education institutions manage expansive technology ecosystems, including enterprise cloud architectures, integrated learning management systems, predictive data warehouses, and globally distributed networks (Sultan, 2010).

DOI: 10.4324/9781042001422-7
This chapter has been made available under a CC BY-NC-ND license.

Consequently, university governance must expand its focus beyond traditional educational and fiscal administration to master complex technological structures, international legal requirements, and digital asset protections.

A defining element of this governance shift is the dramatic expansion of information visibility and data availability within university executive suites and governing boards. Historically, institutional leaders made long-term planning decisions based on static, periodic, and often retrospective reports compiled annually by decentralised departments. In the current digital era, governance processes are heavily mediated by interconnected digital platforms capable of collecting, aggregating, and processing vast streams of real-time institutional information (Daniel, 2019). Governing bodies are now continuously exposed to live operational metrics, student behaviour tracking systems, financial dashboards, and predictive modelling frameworks. This constant data exposure alters the cognitive habits of leadership in fundamental ways, creating an organisational expectation for rapid, data-justified strategic manoeuvres.

At the same time, this digital transformation has deeply altered the traditional internal distribution of institutional authority. Decision-making processes have become increasingly networked, collaborative, and dependent on specialist technical expertise. This shift challenges the historical monopoly of both the traditional professorate and the generalist administrator (Whitchurch, 2013). Modern governance requires active, continuous participation from information technology specialists, cloud architects, institutional data analysts, cybersecurity experts, and legal counsel specialising in intellectual property and data privacy. The boundaries between academic governance, technical system management, and organisational administration are increasingly blurred. For instance, a routine pedagogical decision regarding which software tool to adopt in a classroom now immediately triggers complex governance evaluations regarding data security, software integration, legal liability, and long-term capital expenditure.

This expansion of digital governance paradigms introduces profound ethical, organisational, and political challenges that go to the heart of the university's public mission. As institutions become increasingly dependent on data-driven management architectures, they face severe tensions between the pursuit of technocratic efficiency and the preservation of central academic values (Altbach & de Wit, 2020). The growing organisational reliance on automated tracking systems and algorithmic evaluation tools raises urgent concerns regarding internal surveillance, the erosion of professional autonomy, and the systematic reduction of particularly complex qualitative academic realities to flat, quantifiable performance indicators (O'Neil, 2016). The central challenge for university governance today is to balance the obvious benefits of technological innovation and administrative

optimisation with a fierce commitment to academic freedom, deep collegial participation, and democratic institutional accountability.

4.2 Data-Informed Governance and Institutional Analytics

The move towards data-informed governance represents a foundational shift in how universities formulate strategy, allocate capital, and evaluate institutional performance. Historically, university administration was often guided by localised traditions, political negotiations within faculty senates, and intuitive assessments by long-serving administrators. Today, higher education institutions are deeply embedded within a culture of institutional analytics, characterised by the systematic collection, processing, and visualisation of massive organisational data streams (Daniel, 2019). Governing boards and executive leadership teams rely heavily on sophisticated business intelligence dashboards, predictive data models, and cross-institutional benchmarking frameworks to guide the university through an increasingly competitive global education landscape.

Modern digital dashboards provide university trustees, rectors, and provosts with real-time visibility into an exceptionally broad range of institutional operations. These systems aggregate data from distinct software architectures – such as student information systems, enterprise financial platforms, research management portals, and human resource databases – into one highly polished interface (Markus & Tanis, 2000). At a single glance, an executive can monitor fluctuating student retention velocity, class attendance tracking systems, live grant expenditure rates, departmental space utilisation optimisation metrics, and individual faculty publication impact factors (Marler & Boudreau, 2017). This centralised visibility allows leaders to detect emerging organisational anomalies, operational inefficiencies, or financial deficits long before they manifest in traditional annual financial audits.

Furthermore, the integration of predictive analytics systems has transformed institutional planning from a reactive practice to a proactive, predictive posture. By applying machine learning models to historical student data, universities can build predictive early-warning frameworks. These algorithms evaluate thousands of discrete variables – including mid-term grade trajectories, learning management system engagement logs, financial aid vulnerabilities, and historical high school preparation profiles – to flag specific cohorts of students at high risk of academic failure or sudden withdrawal. This analytical capability allows governance boards to allocate advising resources and financial aid interventions directly to the areas of greatest need, significantly improving institutional retention statistics and student success metrics.

In many universities today, this analytical framework heavily influences resource allocation and strategic positioning across all academic divisions. Governing boards routinely employ activity-based budgeting models and data-driven performance metrics to determine whether a specific department should receive capital investment, faculty lines, or structural consolidation. Departments are systematically benchmarked against internal peers and external competitors using standardised national and global metrics, such as student-faculty ratios, time-to-degree velocity, and external research funding generated per square meter of laboratory space. These internal data practices are further reinforced by the significant pressure of global university rankings, which heavily influence institutional priorities and long-term branding strategies.

Despite these clear operational benefits, the rapid expansion of data-driven governance raises profound structural and ethical concerns among higher education scholars. Critics argue that an over-reliance on quantitative data streams promotes a corporate managerialism that reduces the complex, multidimensional reality of higher education to a shallow set of measurable outputs (Deem et al., 2007). Qualitative dimensions of the academy – such as long-term intellectual creativity, radical artistic expression, localised community impact, the student mentorship experience, and the cultivation of critical thinking – are notoriously difficult to capture via digital sensors and business intelligence metrics. When governance priorities are dictated solely by what can be visualised on an executive dashboard, non-quantifiable but vital academic endeavours face systemic underfunding and institutional marginalisation.

Moreover, the heavy institutional reliance on data metrics can create unintended perverse structural incentives across the organisation. When departmental funding, faculty promotion, and administrative prestige are tied directly to specific performance indicators, academic units frequently engage in gaming behaviours to optimise their metrics without improving underlying quality. For example, admissions departments may shift criteria to artificially boost selectivity metrics, while faculties may feel subtle pressure to inflate grading distribution curves to improve student course satisfaction scores on dashboard metrics (O'Neil, 2016). This dynamic shifts organisational focus away from long-term intellectual contributions towards short-term metric optimisation.

Finally, it is critical for university governance to recognise that institutional data architectures and algorithmic evaluation tools are not neutral, value-free tools. Data collection protocols, variable weights within predictive models, and selection criteria for performance dashboards reflect specific institutional priorities, ideological assumptions, and historical biases (O'Neil, 2016). If a machine learning model is trained on historical data from a period characterised by systemic exclusion or socio-economic

inequality, the algorithm will naturally codify those inequities, presenting them as objective scientific predictions. Uncritical reliance on these automated governance tools risks reinforcing structural discrimination in admissions, hiring, and resource distribution, all while obscuring accountability behind a facade of statistical objectivity. Therefore, modern digital governance requires continuous critical reflection and ethical auditing of the analytical tools that guide executive decisions.

4.3 Distributed Governance and Digital Participation

Introducing modern digital communication platforms has significantly expanded the technical opportunities for stakeholder participation and democratic engagement within higher education governance. Historically, university governance models relied on highly formal committee-based structures that operated within rigid institutional hierarchies (Deem et al., 2007). Faculty senates, staff councils, and student governments required physical presence, long-term committee appointments, and adherence to slow, complex parliamentary procedures. While this design protected deliberative quality, it naturally limited broad participation due to geographical fragmentation, scheduling conflicts, and structural barriers that marginalised junior scholars, professional service staff, and non-traditional students.

In the contemporary digital era, universities are increasingly deploying distributed governance frameworks supported by digital participation platforms. These tools include integrated digital consultation systems, online internal crowdsourcing platforms, collaborative policy wiki systems, virtual town hall meetings, and verified electronic voting mechanisms. These technologies allow institutions to easily solicit, aggregate, and analyse feedback from tens of thousands of individual campus stakeholders simultaneously. This capability allows broad segments of the university community to contribute directly to high-level strategic planning, curriculum transformations, sustainability initiatives, campus architecture master plans, and institutional budgeting priorities.

A prominent manifestation of distributed digital governance is the emergence of university crowdsourcing initiatives and academic participatory budgeting platforms. Rather than delegating strategic visioning exclusively to an isolated executive committee or an expensive external corporate consultancy, forward-thinking universities use online platforms to crowdsource innovative institutional ideas from their global network of students, alumni, faculty, and staff. Through secure digital portals, community members can pitch specific operational reforms, vote on competing infrastructure investment proposals, and collectively co-author policy drafts. When implemented with genuine institutional commitment, these distributed systems can

significantly elevate organisational transparency, strengthen institutional trust, and cultivate a deeply inclusive and democratic campus identity.

The normalisation of these virtual governance mechanics was considerably accelerated by the global onset of the COVID-19 pandemic. Over the course of a few disruptive weeks, academic senates, governing boards, human resource tribunals, and faculty councils worldwide were forced to abandon physical boardrooms and fully migrate to online communication suites and digital voting architectures (Crawford et al., 2020). This sudden operational migration proved that complex institutional legislative bodies could maintain continuity, achieve statutory quorums, and execute high-stakes regulatory decisions within entirely virtual spaces (Marinoni et al., 2020). Many universities discovered that virtual governance significantly boosted raw attendance metrics, effectively removing the historical travel barriers, scheduling conflicts, and multi-campus commute times that had depressed participation for decades.

However, the permanent move towards distributed digital governance also introduces significant limitations, structural vulnerabilities, and communication challenges. Higher education scholars observe that virtual environments frequently alter the underlying qualitative nature of democratic deliberation. Physical committee meetings, despite their procedural inefficiencies, provide critical spaces for informal interpersonal interaction, nuanced negotiation, non-verbal communication, and spontaneous relationship building. In contrast, digital governance platforms tend to favour transactional and highly structured forms of communication that are oriented towards efficiency. Virtual formats often discourage deep ideological debate and collective consensus-building, reducing complex governance deliberations to a series of brief, isolated comments or binary electronic votes.

Furthermore, there are serious structural concerns regarding unequal, asymmetric participation dynamics within digital governance systems. The transition to virtual platforms does not automatically eliminate historical institutional power hierarchies; in some contexts, it can inadvertently amplify them or shift power to different factions. Individuals who possess advanced digital literacy, superior technological infrastructure, or high comfort levels with rapid online public communication often exert a disproportionate influence within virtual decision-making environments. Conversely, vulnerable or marginalised populations within the academy – such as precariously employed adjunct faculty, manual service staff, or students facing digital poverty – may withdraw entirely from digital consultation spaces due to concerns over surveillance, institutional retaliation, or digital fatigue.

Even when platforms are broadly accessible, excessive reliance on surface-level digital consultation tools introduces the dangerous political risk of "performative participation". Governing boards and university executives

can easily employ digital surveys, quick crowdsourcing polls, and virtual town halls to create a superficial illusion of widespread community co-design and democratic endorsement (Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2017). If the data aggregated from these digital platforms is selectively parsed or ignored by executive decision-makers during the actual policy codification and allocation of capital, the process degenerates into an administrative validation mechanism. This superficial engagement alienates the campus community and deeply erodes long-term institutional trust. Therefore, structural digital participation must be backed by transparent and explicit governance rules that clearly define how community inputs are integrated into the final execution of institutional strategy.

4.4 Cybersecurity and Digital Risk Governance

As higher education institutions have rapidly evolved into highly integrated cloud-dependent digital organisations, cybersecurity has shifted from a localised technical challenge managed by information technology (IT) staff to a primary pillar of institutional risk governance. Contemporary universities present an exceptionally high-value target for sophisticated global cybercriminals, state-sponsored espionage networks, and opportunistic hackers. This vulnerability stems from the unique operational reality of the academy: universities simultaneously manage vast repositories of sensitive financial data, medical records, proprietary research data, national security defence contracts, and the personal identity profiles of hundreds of thousands of active and historical stakeholders.

The cyber threat landscape confronting modern higher education is diverse and continuously evolving. Academic institutions are subject to relentless ransomware campaigns designed to completely paralyse administrative infrastructure, lock learning management systems, and freeze enrolment databases until massive financial ransoms are paid. Concurrently, particularly sophisticated advanced persistent threats (APTs) target university laboratory networks to exfiltrate proprietary scientific breakthroughs, advanced technological intellectual property, or classified findings from corporate or government-partnered research initiatives. Compounding these targeted attacks is the pervasive threat of wide-scale phishing networks that exploit the open communication culture of the academy to compromise identity credentials and gain access to central institutional finance networks.

The structural vulnerability of universities is effectively hardwired into their historical commitment to open, collaborative, and decentralised digital environments. Unlike particularly locked-down corporate entities or military organisations, the traditional mission of higher education requires supporting global scientific collaboration, open access data exchange, and seamless connectivity for thousands of personal student and faculty devices

(BYOD – Bring Your Own Device). This cultural demand for openness creates an exceptionally wide and fragmented network attack surface that is difficult to secure through traditional firewall perimeters. A single compromised personal laptop in a student dormitory or an unpatched legacy server in an isolated research laboratory can serve as an entry point for an attack that cripples the entire enterprise infrastructure.

The institutional consequences of a major cybersecurity failure can be devastating across all dimensions of university life. From an operational perspective, a successful ransomware attack can totally disrupt teaching activities, cancel examinations, freeze financial payroll operations, and disable admissions portals for weeks, resulting in immediate and non-recoverable fiscal losses. Legally and regulatorily, data breaches exposing personal records can trigger catastrophic financial penalties from data protection authorities, alongside class-action lawsuits from affected students and staff. Reputational damage can lead to a drop in future student enrolments, the immediate withdrawal of private philanthropic donors, and the cancellation of lucrative high-stakes research partnerships with corporate entities and government agencies that require rigorous data security certifications.

An institution's governance structures must become significantly more flexible and responsive to these continuous emerging threats. Governing boards can no longer treat cybersecurity as an isolated, incomprehensible technical line-item to be passively delegated to a chief information officer. Modern university boards must develop a high degree of digital risk maturity, frequently appointing specialised cybersecurity executives, corporate risk managers, and defence technology experts directly to their governing panels. Executive leadership teams are now required to maintain continuous risk oversight and establish independent, well-resourced offices led by a Chief Information Security Officer (CISO) who reports directly to the executive cabinet rather than the general IT infrastructure budget.

Effective cybersecurity governance recognises that digital resilience cannot be achieved solely through the acquisition of advanced software tools, threat-detection algorithms, or encrypted cloud storage. The overwhelming majority of successful institutional cybersecurity breaches are initiated via social engineering tactics that exploit human vulnerabilities, such as administrative ignorance, cognitive overload, or a lack of basic digital literacy. Therefore, modern risk governance requires substantial and permanent investment in changing the organisational culture of the campus. This involves deploying mandatory institutionalised cybersecurity literacy certifications for all faculty and administrative staff, executing continuous simulated phishing evaluations, and engineering clear protocols for data classification, multifactor identification, and incident reporting.

Layouts of full cloud integration, automated business processes, and transnational digital learning programmes continuously expand the

complexity of digital risk governance. As universities migrate their primary operational workloads to external public cloud ecosystems and rely on third-party software-as-a-service (SaaS) vendors for essential data processing, they introduce complex layers of supply-chain risk (Garrison et al., 2015). Governance structures must establish rigorous, standardised vendor risk assessment mechanisms and continuous legal review workflows. These processes ensure that external commercial software providers strictly adhere to institutional security benchmarks, maintain comprehensive disaster recovery capabilities, and assume clear financial and legal liability in the event of a systemic data breach. Cybersecurity governance is ultimately a continuous cycle of risk assessment, cultural education, and strategic investment designed to preserve the public trust and operational viability of the academy.

4.5 Regulatory Compliance and Educational Data Protection

The widespread digitalisation of higher education has drastically accelerated the complexity, legal exposure, and administrative burden of regulatory compliance within university governance frameworks. Contemporary higher education institutions operate within a dense web of evolving national, regional, and international legal statutes that explicitly regulate the digital environment. Governing bodies must now manage sophisticated compliance portfolios that encompass stringent data privacy protections, digital accessibility mandates, intellectual property rights, international consumer protection laws, and automated decision-making regulations.

The primary regulatory catalyst forcing a comprehensive overhaul of university data governance is the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) implemented by the European Union, alongside corresponding international variations. GDPR completely redefines personal data sovereignty, granting individuals extensive legal rights over their digital footprints and imposing immense financial penalties on organisations that fail to comply. Because universities collect, store, and process massive volumes of particularly intimate personal data – including psychological counselling logs, financial aid histories, detailed academic tracking statistics, medical records, and real-time biometric location tracks – they are subject to the highest standards of data protection scrutiny.

Under modern data privacy frameworks, university governance bodies must ensure that all institutional data processing operations strictly adhere to core legal principles, including purpose limitation, data minimisation, storage limitation, and absolute transparency. Institutions are legally required to establish explicit, unbundled consent architectures across all student and staff portals, provide clear and accessible data privacy declarations, and build robust administrative mechanisms capable of fulfilling

complex data subject rights. These rights include the right of data portability, the right of comprehensive access, and the right to erasure ("the right to be forgotten"). Fulfilling a single student's request to completely erase their comprehensive digital history across a fragmented network of legacy IT databases, cloud systems, and departmental backups requires a particularly mature data governance model.

To effectively navigate this legal landscape, universities today must establish a centralised, independent data protection office directed by a certified Data Protection Officer (DPO) who possesses direct reporting lines to the executive rectorate or board of trustees. This office is responsible for conducting proactive Data Protection Impact Assessments (DPIAs) prior to the procurement or deployment of any new enterprise software, cloud platform, or tracking architecture. Every system must be systematically evaluated to determine its architectural data flows, encryption standards, server hosting locations, and potential vulnerabilities to unauthorised access or commercial data leakage.

Furthermore, the rapid institutional adoption of advanced learning analytics platforms and automated machine learning models introduces complex legal and ethical compliance dilemmas (Chassignol et al., 2018). Governing bodies must ensure that the predictive models used to track student performance, automate course advising recommendations, or evaluate staff productivity do not violate statutory protections against automated profiling and opaque decision-making. Universities must guarantee absolute algorithmic transparency. This means students and staff have a legal right to understand the underlying analytical variables, logic, and data sources that drive an automated recommendation or institutional intervention. Governance frameworks must also provide clear, unpenalised pathways for stakeholders to entirely opt out of predictive tracking models, requiring the preservation of traditional human-mediated administrative alternatives.

Concurrently, digital accessibility regulations play an increasingly critical role within higher education risk governance and compliance strategies. National and international legal frameworks mandate that public educational institutions ensure that all digital learning environments, public websites, enterprise software interfaces, and multimedia educational resources are fully accessible to individuals with diverse physical, sensory, or cognitive disabilities. Universities are required to strictly adhere to international technical standards, such as the Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG 2.1). Non-compliance with these accessibility mandates exposes the university to severe litigation, civil rights investigations, and massive financial liabilities. Therefore, digital governance requires establishing centralised oversight workflows that continuously audit digital content, provide mandatory training for instructional designers, and embed assistive technologies – such as automated real-time captioning, screen-reader

optimisation, and alternative input design – directly into the default institutional infrastructure.

Ultimately, contemporary regulatory compliance demonstrates that data management can no longer be handled through an ad-hoc approach by disconnected departments. Modern university governance requires a highly sophisticated and integrated compliance system that seamlessly brings together specialised legal experts, data privacy officers, enterprise IT security engineers, accessibility champions, and academic leaders into a permanent, collaborative governance council. This structural integration ensures that technological integration is continually guided, constrained, and validated by a deep and unwavering alignment with legal frameworks, ethical principles, and public accountability obligations.

4.6 Cross-Jurisdictional Challenges and Global Digital Governance

The dramatic expansion of global distance education, transnational online degree programmes, and digital international consortia has pushed university governance far beyond traditional geographic and institutional borders (Bates, 2019). Modern higher education institutions routinely deliver complex digital curricula, host virtual learning platforms, and process data for students located across hundreds of different countries simultaneously. This virtualisation of educational delivery has generated particularly intricate cross-jurisdictional governance challenges, forcing university boards and executive leaders to navigate a fragmented global landscape characterised by deeply conflicting legal frameworks, volatile political realities, international trade barriers, and stark technological inequalities.

One of the principal cross-jurisdictional hurdles confronting global digital university governance is the direct conflict between international data protection regimes and national data sovereignty laws. For instance, a university based in the European Union that operates under strict GDPR principles must ensure that the personal data of its global student body is systematically protected against unauthorised state surveillance, arbitrary access, and extrajudicial seizure. However, when delivering online instruction to students residing in nations that mandate absolute domestic data localisation or enforce invasive national security surveillance laws, the university faces a severe legal contradiction. Governing boards are forced to make high-stakes determinations regarding whether to make available complex geo-fenced database architectures, locate mirror servers within authoritarian jurisdictions, or withdraw digital operations from specific regions entirely to preserve their fundamental commitment to student privacy and human rights.

Even more challenging to the historical core of the academy is navigating international internet censorship regimes and the direct suppression

of digital information by foreign states. Many nations enforce particularly restrictive, centralised network filtering systems – often referred to as national firewalls – that systematically block access to major global information databases, independent news organisations, digital collaboration platforms, and open social media tools. When a university registers international students who must access their course materials from behind these invasive filtering architectures, the core academic mission is deeply compromised (Altbach & de Wit, 2020). Course components that rely on restricted platforms (e.g., certain video repositories, cloud documents, or collaborative coding tools) become non-functional.

To address these digital barriers without compromising institutional principles, university governance must design and implement highly sophisticated technical and pedagogical workarounds. This requires deploying secure university-managed virtual private network (VPN) tunnels, utilising encrypted cloud delivery networks that bypass jurisdiction-specific blocklists, or creating alternative text-heavy offline course packs that ensure educational continuity. Crucially, these technical manoeuvres must be executed with careful attention to localised legal risks. In some jurisdictions, encouraging or supporting student usage of unauthorised decryption tools or unapproved VPNs carries severe criminal penalties. University boards must therefore engage in continuous expert-led geopolitical risk analysis, balancing their commitment to academic freedom with a strict duty of care to protect their international student body from legal danger.

Furthermore, global digital governance requires confronting the stark realities of international digital poverty and deep technological inequality. The architectural design of modern learning management systems, video-conferencing suites, and virtual examination proctoring tools is frequently built upon a privileged assumption of universal access to hyper-fast, unmetered broadband internet connectivity and modern computer hardware. However, international students living in developing regions, rural environments, or conflict zones routinely experience particularly unstable network infrastructures, frequent electrical grid failures, high financial costs for mobile data consumption, and restricted access to desktop hardware.

When a university relies blindly on high-bandwidth, real-time synchronous streaming or intrusive artificial intelligence (AI-)driven video proctoring algorithms that require uninterrupted high-speed data connections, it introduces systemic discrimination into its evaluation systems. International students are penalised not for academic deficiencies, but for the infrastructural limitations of their geographic location. Therefore, ethical global governance requires mandating an "asynchronous-first" pedagogical design framework and establishing strict data-minimisation rules for all international digital courses. Learning systems must be rigorously optimised for mobile-only operating systems and low-bandwidth conditions in order

to ensure that educational access remains truly democratic and equitable across the global digital landscape.

Finally, administrative tracking requires managing borderless digital education that introduces immense complexity regarding transnational accreditation, consumer protection harmonisation, and international tax compliance. A university that delivers online instruction to students in multiple countries may inadvertently be deemed to have a permanent economic presence in those jurisdictions under local law. This exposure can subject the home institution to complex local corporate taxes, educational licensing mandates, and foreign consumer safety lawsuits. To manage these risks, global governance structures must develop particularly responsive administrative architectures that integrate international legal experts, specialised accounting workflows, and cross-cultural student support operations. Global digital governance proves that modern digitalisation does not flatten the world; rather, it forces universities to critically and dynamically engage with the complex intersections of global politics, international law, and socio-economic inequality.

4.7 The Persistent Tensions Between Technocratic Efficiency and Collegial Values

The move towards fully digitally mediated governance models alters the internal power dynamics and qualitative properties of institutional decision-making (Deem et al., 2007). Historically, university assemblies and departmental boards functioned as vital communicative spaces where informal interpersonal interactions, spontaneous negotiations, and empathetic conversations occurred naturally alongside formal voting procedures. These informal networks were critical for establishing organisational trust, resolving long-standing ideological disputes, and forging creative compromises across diverse disciplinary faculties. Within highly structured transactional digital governance platforms, communication often shifts towards more procedural hyper-formalised exchanges, which can compress space for authentic slow-paced consensus-building.

Moreover, the architectural reality of digital governance configurations introduces a subtle move towards centralised technocratic control (Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2017). Because digital communication channels, online deliberative portals, and voting modules are configured, monitored, and maintained by a university's central IT division – which naturally answers to executive management – the absolute independence of traditional legislative bodies faces new structural pressures. Executive teams hold the administrative power to dictate platform rules, design user interfaces, moderate text streams during live virtual discussions, and configure specific electronic voting algorithms. This administrative position can allow managers

to employ subtle curation tactics, such as organising digital agendas to prioritise specific metrics or limiting immediate, spontaneous text-based amendments under the guise of technical systems management.

This tension is deeply connected to the expanding role of data analytics in determining academic survival and prestige. When governance boards prioritise automated dashboard readouts above the multidimensional qualitative realities of scholarly inquiry, the traditional autonomy of the professorate is fundamentally challenged (Whitchurch, 2013). The structural independence of academic units relies on their ability to pursue long-term, high-risk, and non-commercialisable lines of critical intellectual inquiry. If every departmental line item and curriculum reform must be continually justified against immediate short-term performance metrics displayed on an executive screen, the long-term public mission of the higher education institution risks becoming completely subservient to narrow technocratic performance targets (O'Neil, 2016).

Property frameworks for digital consultation spaces must therefore purposefully protect open discussion, guarantee transparency in how aggregated platform feedback is integrated into final policy execution, and preserve structural spaces for qualitative non-metric-driven critique. Digital governance structures must remain continually subordinate to the democratic will of the academic community, ensuring that the migration to cloud platforms and virtual tools acts as a powerful catalyst for authentic horizontal collaboration rather than a subtle mechanism for corporate managerial control.

4.8 Towards an Adaptive and Value-Grounded Governance Paradigm

The comprehensive analysis presented throughout this chapter demonstrates that the digital transformation of higher education cannot be understood as a simple value-neutral modernisation of administrative tools or IT systems. Rather, digitalisation represents a fundamental, permanent, and systemic reconfiguration of the foundational paradigms of university governance, risk management, and institutional decision-making. As higher education institutions continue to evolve into complex data-rich digital organisations, they must systematically re-engineer their historic administrative frameworks to survive within particularly volatile, globally networked, and aggressively competitive socioeconomic environments.

This governance evolution has introduced powerful capabilities that can significantly elevate institutional performance, strategic agility, and democratic accessibility. The institutionalisation of data-informed governance models, supported by real-time business intelligence dashboards and predictive analytics engines, equips university leaders with the critical tools necessary to identify operational vulnerabilities, optimise resource

distribution, and offer proactive interventions that secure student retention and scholarly impact (Daniel, 2019; Marler & Boudreau, 2017). Concurrently, the deployment of distributed digital participation platforms and online crowdsourcing networks provides an unprecedented technical opportunity to dismantle traditional institutional hierarchies, elevate transparency, and involve broad segments of the campus community in the co-creation of university strategy.

However, these clear technological advancements are structurally bound to profound ethical, political, and organisational risks that threaten the core identity of the academy. The uncritical, intense reliance on automated data metrics and algorithmic profiling frameworks introduces the dangerous risk of a technocratic corporate managerialism that systematically devalues non-quantifiable academic priorities and reduces the holistic human experience of education to a shallow set of performance indicators (Deem et al., 2007; O'Neil, 2016). Furthermore, the total virtualisation of legislative spaces highlights how digital platforms can be leveraged to compromise legislative independence, erode the qualitative depth of in-person deliberation, and expand top-down administrative surveillance and control (Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2017).

Looking towards the future, the ultimate sustainability and legitimacy of higher education governance will depend entirely on the capacity of institutional leaders to build an adaptive, sociotechnical governance paradigm that explicitly aligns technological innovation with central academic values (Altbach & de Wit, 2020). University trustees, rectors, and senates must actively develop a high degree of digital risk and regulatory maturity. They must treat cybersecurity, cross-jurisdictional legal compliance, and data sovereignty as core fiduciary responsibilities that require permanent highly specialised executive representation at the board level (Garrison et al., 2015).

Crucially, the digital university must fiercely resist the temptation to allow technological systems to dictate the mission and values of the institution. Algorithms, data architectures, cloud configurations, and automated dashboards must be carefully managed as transparent supportive tools engineered to serve the human community, expand educational equity, and protect intellectual autonomy. Effective governance in the current digital era requires a continuous courageous commitment to algorithmic transparency, rigorous ethical auditing, and robust human-in-the-loop oversight frameworks. By confidently anchoring every technical modernisation strategy within the timeless humanist traditions of critical inquiry, collegial shared authority, and democratic accountability, academic leaders can ensure that the digital university remains a vibrant, resilient, and socially responsible sanctuary for human development and global knowledge creation.

4.9 Conclusion

University governance, as this chapter has shown, has quietly outgrown the old model of committee rooms and annual reports. Boards now watch live dashboards, senates meet through screens, and decisions once shaped by slow collegial debate are increasingly nudged along by data streams, predictive models, and cybersecurity concerns that barely existed a generation ago. Much of this brings real benefit. Leaders can spot a struggling department or an at-risk student far earlier than before. Digital consultation can, in principle, bring far more voices into decisions that used to be made behind closed doors. But the chapter also makes clear how easily these same tools can work against the values they were meant to serve. A dashboard cannot see creativity, mentorship, or the slow value of a difficult idea, and a governance model built only around what can be measured risks quietly starving everything that cannot. The cybersecurity and compliance dimensions add another layer of seriousness. A university is no longer just a place of learning; it is a custodian of vast amounts of sensitive data, operating across borders with wildly different legal expectations. Getting this wrong is not a technical inconvenience, it is a threat to the institution's trust and survival.

What ties all of this together is a simple but demanding idea: technology should serve governance, not quietly replace it. Boards that treat digital tools as neutral instruments, kept firmly answerable to academic values and human judgement, are far better placed to navigate this new landscape than those that let the dashboard set the agenda. The digital era does not have to weaken collegial governance, but protecting it will take deliberate, ongoing effort.

References

Altbach, P. G., & de Wit, H. (2020). Postpandemic outlook for higher education is bleakest for the poorest. *International Higher Education,* (102), 3–5. Retrieved from https://ejournals.bc.edu/index.php/ihe/article/view/14583

Bates, A. W. (2019). *Teaching in a digital age: Guidelines for designing teaching and learning (2nd ed.)*. BCcampus.

Chassignol, M., Khoroshavin, A., Klimova, A., & Bilyatdinova, A. (2018). Artificial intelligence trends in education: A narrative overview. *Procedia Computer Science*, *136*, 16–24.

Crawford, J., Butler-Henderson, K., Rudolph, J., Malkawi, B., Glowatz, M., Burton, R., Magni, P. A., & Lam, S. (2020). COVID-19: 20 countries' higher education intra-period digital pedagogy responses. *Journal of Applied Learning and Teaching*, *3*(1), 1–20.

Daniel, B. K. (2019). Big data and data science: A critical review of issues for educational research. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, *50*(1), 101–113.

Deem, R., Hillyard, S., & Reed, M. (2007). *Knowledge, higher education and the new managerialism: The changing management of UK universities.* Oxford University Press.

Garrison, G., Wakefield, R. L., & Kim, S. (2015). The effects of IT capabilities and delivery model on cloud computing success and firm performance for cloud supported processes and operations. *International Journal of Information Management*, *35*(4), 377–393.

Marinoni, G., Van't Land, H., & Jensen, T. (2020). *The impact of COVID-19 on higher education around the world: IAU global survey report.* International Association of Universities.

Markus, M. L., & Tanis, C. (2000). The enterprise systems experience—From adoption to success. In R. W. Zmud (Ed.), *Framing the domains of IT management: Projecting the future through the past* (pp. 173–207). Pinnaflex Educational Resources.

Marler, J. H., & Boudreau, J. W. (2017). An evidence-based review of HR analytics. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, *28*(1), 3–26.

O'Neil, C. (2016). *Weapons of math destruction: How big data increases inequality and threatens democracy.* Crown.

Pollitt, C., & Bouckaert, G. (2017). *Public management reform: A comparative analysis—Into the age of austerity* (4th ed.). Oxford University Press.

Sultan, N. (2010). Cloud computing for education: A new dawn? *International Journal of Information Management*, *30*(2), 109–116.

Whitchurch, C. (2013). *Reconstructing identities in higher education: The rise of third space professionals.* Routledge.

5 Academic Leadership in the Digital University

5.1 The Evolving Landscape of Higher Education Governance

Traditional academic leadership models were largely based on collegial governance, disciplinary authority, and administrative coordination. For decades, leaders such as department chairs, deans, provosts, and rectors were primarily responsible for maintaining institutional stability, supporting academic quality, and managing relatively predictable organisational processes (Deem et al., 2007). These bureaucratic and professional archetypes operated within clear functional boundaries where decision-making was deliberative, localised, and heavily reliant on consensus-building among senior faculty. The structural rhythm of the academy prioritised long-term planning cycles and incremental changes, largely insulated from the immediate pressures of the corporate market. Governance structures were designed around the concept of shared authority, where academic senates and faculty boards held significant power over the core mission, curriculum selection, and tenure-track evaluations of the institution. This dual-ladder structure created a unique equilibrium where administrative functionaries handled the operational financing, while the academic core maintained strong authority over pedagogy and pure research directions.

Digital transformation has significantly expanded these traditional responsibilities, fundamentally altering the structural backbone and epistemic foundations of higher education governance. Contemporary academic leaders must now operate in rapidly changing, volatile environments shaped by continuous technological innovation, intensified global competition, shifting fiscal pressures, and fluid stakeholder expectations. Higher education institutions increasingly require leaders who can move beyond passive custodial management and instead respond strategically to perpetual uncertainty and pervasive institutional disruption. The modernisation of both back-office operations and classrooms requires executives to master complex sociotechnical dynamics, thereby transforming technological integration from a peripheral information technology (IT) maintenance concern

DOI: 10.4324/9781042001422-8
This chapter has been made available under a CC BY-NC-ND license.

into a core pillar of institutional strategy. This paradigm shift demands that leaders develop a comprehensive, multi-layered understanding of how data streams, cloud infrastructures, and human capital intersect to reshape the university's value proposition, institutional identity, and public delivery models in a hyper-connected global market.

One of the most important and disruptive changes introduced by digitalisation concerns the unprecedented acceleration of organisational decision-making. Digital technologies accelerate institutional communication and create strong, immediate expectations for real-time responses to emerging educational, operational, and reputational challenges (Bates, 2019). Leaders are routinely expected to make particularly consequential, multi-million-dollar decisions regarding online education delivery models, capital investments in digital infrastructure, enterprise cybersecurity risk mitigation, generative artificial intelligence (AI) policies, and institutional data analytics frameworks. They must execute these strategic manoeuvres while simultaneously addressing deep institutional concerns related to long-term financial sustainability, shifting demographics, and the preservation of rigorous academic quality. The traditional luxury of prolonged multi-year committee reviews, senatorial debates, and iterative drafting has been permanently replaced by the need for agile governance, forcing modern leaders to cultivate data-informed intuition, scenario-planning capabilities, and rapid consensus-building mechanisms.

Consequently, modern academic leadership has become fundamentally interdisciplinary, horizontal, and cross-functional. Because digital transformation implicitly affects all operational, pedagogical, and scholarly areas of university activity, it forces executive cadres to aggressively break down historic departmental silos and professional fiefdoms. Leaders must actively coordinate fluid, particularly complex collaboration between traditional academic staff, information technology professionals, information security officers, institutional research data analysts, legal advisors, and external commercial software vendors (Whitchurch, 2013). Leadership therefore increasingly involves building durable institutional connections and hybrid frameworks across traditional organisational boundaries; thus, it requires a sophisticated vocabulary that bridges the gap between traditional academic priorities and technical infrastructure requirements. It is no longer sufficient for a leader to be solely an accomplished academic scholar or a professional manager: they must become a bilingual translator who can align pedagogical excellence with complex cloud architecture; relational teaching with algorithmic automation.

The role of leaders as empathetic, visible, and transparent communicators has also become markedly more crucial during this massive systemic transition. Universities undergoing wide-ranging digital transformation often experience deep institutional uncertainty, widespread administrative

anxiety, and active professional resistance among both staff and students who fear the dehumanisation of the academy (Crawford et al., 2020). Effective leaders can no longer rely on top-down executive decrees, bureaucratic distance, or sterile corporate memos; they must articulate a coherent, passionate institutional vision that explains the holistic, humanistic purpose of technological change. By reframing digitalisation around educational equity, scholarly excellence, global democratisation of knowledge, and student success rather than pure operational austerity, structural benchmarking, or staff downsizing, they can cultivate vibrant campus environments characterised by institutional trust, structural transparency, and active stakeholder participation.

At the same time, effective digital leadership requires a careful and particularly sophisticated balancing act between aggressive technological innovation and deep institutional continuity. Universities remain unique public organisations deeply connected to ancestral traditions of academic freedom, collegial governance, and intellectual autonomy (Altbach & de Wit, 2020). Digital executives must ensure that the rapid introduction of data surveillance tools, automated administration software, and virtualisation metrics does not erode the cultural, ethical, and relational foundations of the academy. Modern leadership requires a permanent dual orientation: a capacity to champion digital agility, cloud migration, and AI integration while fiercely protecting the humanistic relational core that defines higher education. The ultimate objective of the digital university is not to build an automated revenue-optimised corporation, but to leverage advanced technology to expand the reach, depth, accessibility, and transformative power of human knowledge.

5.2 Leadership and Organisational Change

Digital transformation is fundamentally a process of deep organisational, cultural, and behavioural change rather than a mere technical deployment of software platforms and hardware systems. When universities introduce extensive enterprise resource planning (ERP) systems, expansive learning management systems (LMS), or automated business intelligence tools, they fundamentally alter the established routines, historical power dynamics, resource allocations, and communication pathways of institutional life (Markus & Tanis, 2000). This re-engineering of daily workflows inevitably triggers considerable systemic friction, making the leadership approach to change management the definitive factor in whether a technological initiative succeeds or fails. Leaders must understand that technology is never neutral; it fundamentally alters the social architecture of the campus, so it requires a sophisticated sociotechnical perspective on change that treats human factors, psychological safety, and cultural readiness with the same

analytical rigour as technical specifications and software compatibility metrics.

Resistance to digital transformation within higher education is a complex, multi-layered phenomenon that emerges from valid structural, professional, and ethical concerns rather than simple obstinacy. Faculty members frequently oppose the rapid virtualisation of instruction due to well-founded anxieties regarding sudden workload inflation, the erosion of pedagogical autonomy, the commodification of course content, and potential declines in educational quality or meaningful student engagement (Bates, 2019). Administrative and professional service staff often resist automated platforms out of fear of structural job displacement, deskilling, or invasive digital productivity monitoring that reduces human labour to quantifiable keystrokes, response times, and automated analytics (Frey & Osborne, 2017). Concurrently, students express deep reservations regarding rising digital tuition costs, hidden infrastructure fees, algorithmic bias in automated advising systems, and the psychological alienation associated with reduced in-person community interaction and relational mentorship.

Effective academic leaders recognise that this resistance is rarely a simplistic Luddite rejection of technology itself; rather, it is intimately connected to deep concerns regarding professional identity and role stability, institutional recognition, and organisational trust (Whitchurch, 2013). When changes are imposed unilaterally by executive leadership through corporate-style management mechanisms, stakeholders experience a profound loss of agency, which directly fuels institutional inertia, passive sabotage, and active political pushback across university governance structures. Successful digital transformation therefore requires academic leaders to reject purely technocratic top-down approaches that ignore the democratic and collegial traditions of the university (Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2017). Instead, they must engage in extensive, open, and cyclical dialogue with the institutional community, ensuring that technological adoption is pursued through collaborative, transparent, and inclusive pathways where change is co-authored by those who must work within the new system.

To institutionalise this participatory ethos, many progressive universities establish cross-functional innovation committees, digital transformation task forces, and interdisciplinary working groups. These structures are explicitly designed to foster organisational participation by embedding representatives from faculty bodies, student governments, administrative units, and technical teams directly into the design, evaluation, and procurement phases of digital initiatives. By providing a structured, legitimate platform for critique, co-design, and contextual beta-testing, leaders can significantly reduce institutional friction, transform technological inertia into collective ownership, and align complex software configurations with the nuanced pedagogical needs of specific academic departments. These

committees act as critical cultural buffers, ensuring that the implementation process respects the unique variances, epistemological differences, and distinct operational paces that exist between different disciplines, such as the laboratory sciences, the fine arts, and the humanities.

Transparent and strategic communication plays an indispensable role in managing these change processes successfully. Leaders must consistently and creatively explain how specific digital infrastructures directly support the core academic mission, values, and historical ethos of the university, rather than framing technology solely as a corporate instrument for cost reduction, administrative downsizing, or operational efficiency. When communication is open, honest about implementation difficulties, and focused on enhancing the human capability of the campus, it actively de-escalates anxiety and paranoia. This communicative transparency helps replace systemic scepticism with shared organisational engagement, ensuring that the campus community deeply understands the "why" behind the disruption, the long-term benefits of the transition, and the exact protections put in place to safeguard human roles.

Finally, the management of digital change requires a sustained, substantial, and non-negotiable financial commitment to comprehensive professional development and continuous capacity-building. Visionary leaders understand that implementing an advanced software system is entirely futile without a corresponding parallel investment in the people required to operate, navigate, and master it (Bondarouk et al., 2017). Universities must establish well-resourced digital literacy initiatives, permanent instructional design support centres, and ongoing pedagogical workshops that focus on the creative integration of technology. By prioritising empathy, robust technical support, and continuous professional training, academic leaders can empower their workforce to adapt confidently to evolving digital environments. This holistic approach ensures that digital transformation becomes a sustainable evolutionary milestone for the entire academy rather than a short-term disruptive shock that leaves the workforce feeling abandoned and obsolete.

5.3 Transformative Leadership and Digital Vision

Transformative leadership theory has achieved significant prominence within contemporary academic discourses surrounding the digital university. Rooted in the capacity to motivate, intellectually stimulate, and inspire followers to achieve extraordinary outcomes, transformative leaders operate by shifting organisational values, breaking established cultural scripts, and cultivating a deep sense of collective purpose. Within the context of higher education digitalisation, this leadership framework moves completely away from transactional management – such as the simple procurement

of software licences, the enforcement of digital compliance metrics, or the monitoring of IT service-level agreements – and focuses squarely on the systemic ideological, strategic, and human realignment of the entire institution.

In the current digital era, a transformative academic leader must articulate a compelling forward-looking digital vision that transcends standard administrative, bureaucratic, or technocratic language. This vision must clearly and eloquently illustrate how digital platforms can be used to democratise educational access, elevate the global impact of scholarly research, support radical interdisciplinary and global scientific collaboration, and enrich the holistic student experience (Daniel, 2019). Crucially, this narrative must tightly bind technological advancement to the historical identity, public charter, and social mission of the university. The transformative digital vision reassures the academy that technology is being introduced to augment human relationships, catalyse creativity, and expand intellectual capabilities, not to turn the university into an impersonal automated degree factory or an uncritical consumer of commercial software (Altbach & de Wit, 2020).

Formulating a coherent digital vision is particularly challenging within higher education due to the fragmented, hyper-specialised nature of academic cultures. Universities are historically decentralised organisations – often described in organisational theory as loosely coupled systems – where different disciplines and professional cadres maintain particularly disparate and sometimes conflicting perspectives regarding the value and risks of digitalisation (Deem et al., 2007). A transformative leader acts as an institutional meta-narrator, weaving these competing perspectives into a unified and inclusive organisational identity. By actively listening to the distinct concerns of the humanities, the laboratory sciences, and the professional administrative divisions, the leader constructs a digital path forward that respects epistemological pluralism while driving collective institutional progress.

Furthermore, transformative leadership actively incentivises an organisational culture of intelligent experimentation, institutional agility, and continuous learning. Rather than penalising technical setbacks, viewing budget variances as compliance failures, or treating pedagogical missteps in online delivery as reputational threats, transformative executives deliberately establish structural safety zones for innovation (Anagnoste, 2018). Universities under this style of leadership frequently launch small-scale pilot projects, digital innovation laboratories, and collaborative trial spaces where faculty and staff can test emerging AI tools, virtual reality simulations, and hybrid modalities without professional, financial, or reputational risk. This approach normalises technological adaptation, framing digital mastery as a lifelong iterative journey for the entire community, where failure is decoupled from shame and re-oriented as a valuable informational metric.

This paradigm explicitly emphasises empowerment, decentralised execution, and deep horizontal participation. Transformative leaders do not concentrate decision-making authority within an isolated executive boardroom or an elite administrative cabinet; instead, they deliberately empower decentralised actors – including junior faculty, instructional designers, library professionals, and student leaders – to spearhead digital initiatives. This democratic distribution of agency minimises hierarchical bottlenecks, accelerates institutional responsiveness, and ensures that digital tools are optimised for the practical, daily realities of the classroom and the research lab. By fostering localised ownership of innovation, leaders can catalyse a ground-up transformation that is deeply embedded in the academic fabric of the institution, ensuring that solutions are contextually appropriate and pedagogically sound.

Importantly, transformative leadership within the higher education sector must remain fundamentally distinct from corporate, industrial, or military leadership models. Because the academy is built upon the bedrock of critical inquiry, intellectual autonomy, and democratic governance, leaders cannot treat faculty as mere corporate subordinates, operational cogs, or line workers (Deem et al., 2007). Transformative digital leadership succeeds by blending strategic execution with deep respect for traditional collegial structures, academic senates, peer review mechanisms, and departmental oversight. Digital modernisation becomes truly sustainable and legitimate only when the campus community genuinely perceives it as a collectively authored, values-driven project that actively strengthens the university's public mission, safeguards its intellectual integrity, and extends its democratic reach.

5.4 Ecosystem Leadership and Network Coordination

The accelerating complexity of the contemporary digital university has accelerated the move towards ecosystem leadership approaches. Higher education institutions no longer function as isolated, self-contained ivory towers, discrete bureaucratic organisations, or completely autonomous entities; instead, they operate as particularly dynamic, fluid nodes embedded within vast, interconnected global networks and ecosystems. These networks encompass diverse academic departments, centralised professional services, international research consortia, corporate technology providers, municipal governments, national regulatory bodies, philanthropy, alumni networks, and global student market structures. Managing an institution within this hyper-complex architecture requires a profound shift in leadership thinking, moving permanently from insular protectionism and static hierarchy to dynamic network engagement and system orchestration.

Ecosystem leadership explicitly de-emphasises rigid hierarchical command, transactional control, and vertical authority, instead prioritising horizontal

coordination, strategic relationship-building, and boundary-spanning collaboration. Within this framework, university presidents, provosts, deans, and directors must evolve from traditional bureaucratic administrators into sophisticated network orchestrators. The primary task of an ecosystem leader is to connect disparate talent, emerging technologies, and institutional assets across historic organisational borders, capitalising on collective value creation that no single isolated department or external entity could achieve on its own (Garrison et al., 2015). These leaders view the university as an open, fluid system whose boundaries are constantly interacting with, adapting to, and shaping the broader global knowledge economy.

Digital transformation regularly demands unprecedented intensive collaboration between institutional units that have historically operated in complete cultural, structural, and operational isolation. For instance, the successful deployment of a comprehensive online learning ecosystem requires the seamless alignment of faculty researchers, specialised instructional designers, central IT network architects, accessibility experts, media producers, student lifecycle advisors, and data security officers (Bates, 2019). Similarly, the digitalisation of institutional research data demands deep synchronisation between academic laboratories, university libraries, research compliance boards, legal counsel, and central cloud infrastructure teams. The ecosystem leader provides the strategic vision, financial resources, and administrative scaffolding necessary to harmonise these diverse professional subcultures, translate competing vocabularies, and eliminate systemic friction.

Regionally and structurally, this coordination frequently materialises in cross-departmental frameworks, such as specialised innovation committees. By establishing these hybrid administrative architectures, leaders intentionally draw representatives from information technology, procurement, student affairs, and multiple academic faculties into one deliberative and agile body. This systemic integration ensures that software acquisition, enterprise licensing, data governance, and infrastructural scaling are not conducted blindly by an isolated IT department focused solely on cost reduction or technical compliance, but are continually steered by pedagogical necessity, user experience, equity, and academic governance. These committees support continuous horizontal communication, breaking through bureaucratic inertia, accelerating project delivery, and ensuring that technical procurement serves the academic mission rather than constraining it.

Consequently, leaders who possess exceptional communication skills, high emotional intelligence, and a capacity for cross-boundary mediation are increasingly valuable within modern higher education. Ecosystem leaders must possess the intellectual and diplomatic dexterity to translate concepts between technical IT engineers, corporate executives, and traditional academic faculty, navigating conflicting professional priorities,

values, and timelines with sophisticated diplomatic acumen. They must actively replace institutional cultures of internal competition, territoriality, and resource hoarding with a shared ecosystem mindset, demonstrating that the digital maturity, financial viability, and operational resilience of an institution depend entirely on the strength and depth of its internal and external collaborative connections (Whitchurch, 2013).

External partnerships constitute another critical and complex component of the ecosystem leadership matrix. Modern universities rely increasingly on extensive strategic alliances with global technology firms to secure advanced cloud computing capabilities, enterprise software systems, scalable infrastructure, and cutting-edge AI tools (Sultan, 2010). Academic leaders are charged with negotiating these complex multi-million-dollar relationships, ensuring that the integration of commercial technologies delivers maximum institutional value and pedagogical agility. Crucially, they must manage these corporate partnerships without compromising the university's data sovereignty, financial independence, or strict historical commitment to ethical research, data privacy, and unbiased educational standards. They must ensure that the university shapes the technology, rather than allowing commercial vendors to dictate the future of academic practice.

Finally, the dramatic global expansion of online education, micro-credentials, and virtual mobility highlights the urgent need for sophisticated network coordination across international boundaries (Crawford et al., 2020). Universities operating across transnational environments must coordinate complex configurations of digital infrastructures, regional student support hubs, diverse language requirements, and multi-jurisdictional legal and accreditation frameworks. Ecosystem leadership provides the conceptual toolkit, strategic agility, and collaborative orientation required to govern these distributed, borderless academic operations, ensuring structural coherence, strict quality assurance, and global educational equity across a globally networked educational landscape.

5.5 Leadership, Labour Relations, and Institutional Negotiation

The digital transformation of higher education fundamentally alters the structural nature of academic labour, professional expectations, performance evaluation, and workplace conditions. The rapid integration of LMS, automated performance analytics, remote work technologies, digital communication platforms, and continuous online instructional delivery models profoundly modifies the daily reality of faculty and staff (Marler & Boudreau, 2017). These sociotechnical changes routinely impact workload definitions, job security, intellectual property boundaries, promotion criteria, and the critical dividing line between professional and private life. As a consequence, labour relations, collective bargaining, contract management,

and institutional negotiation have emerged as central high-stakes domains of digital university governance that require a deep synthesis of legal, ethical, and organisational wisdom.

Because technological implementations directly reshape the physical and digital workplace, faculty unions, staff associations, and professional syndicates play an essential and active role in mediating digital transformation. When university administrations attempt to make intrusive software systems available, mandate training hours, track physical locations, or modify educational delivery policies unilaterally without deep consultation, they inevitably generate severe industrial conflict, systemic mistrust, litigation, and organisational paralysis. Astute academic leaders recognise that labour unions are not barriers to technological modernisation, organisational redesign, or institutional agility, but critical democratic stakeholders whose deep engagement is mandatory for achieving authentic, sustainable, and legitimate institutional change. They view unions as vital channels through which the workforce can articulate structural needs, identify operational vulnerabilities, and co-author change, ensuring that technological integration values the worker.

The sudden emergency transition to remote education during the initial phases of the COVID-19 pandemic threw these latent labour tensions into sharp relief worldwide. Faculty and professional staff experienced immediate, severe workload inflation as they struggled to rapidly redesign complex curricula for digital delivery while maintaining continuous online communication with anxious student bodies (Crawford et al., 2020; Marinoni et al., 2020). Furthermore, the mass recording of instructional sessions triggered contentious unresolved legal debates regarding intellectual property rights, data privacy, and the potential long-term commercial exploitation or fragmentation of faculty digital content by university administrations. This chaotic period illustrated with absolute clarity that without clear contractual frameworks, technological acceleration can easily lead to labour exploitation, professional alienation, and a collapse of institutional morale.

Successful academic leaders navigated these industrial crises and their long-term structural clean-ups by rejecting authoritarian management and instead embracing transparent negotiation, shared governance, and collaborative policy development. Universities that proactively invited union leadership into digital planning boardrooms, financial committees, and strategic task forces achieved far more stable, equitable, and durable transitions. By co-authoring emergency frameworks and long-term hybrid policies, these institutions ensured that the physical, financial, and psychological well-being of the workforce was protected, thus demonstrating that labour consultation is not an administrative burden but an absolute prerequisite for operational resilience and institutional stability.

A clear and valuable example of this collaborative governance can be observed in a case vignette from a major public research university during its post-pandemic structural alignment. Seeking to cement its hybrid instructional identity and capture new distance-education enrolment, the university administration planned a sweeping mandatory online teaching policy. Recognising that unilateral executive mandates would trigger industrial gridlock, litigation, and intense senate opposition, the university president initiated structured proactive negotiations with the faculty union executive committee before any formal draft was published to the wider campus.

The ensuing dialogues explicitly and courageously addressed the complex and multi-layered sociotechnical impacts of the policy on academic labour. Rather than allowing software capabilities or financial optimisation models to dictate workplace expectations, the president and union representatives co-authored a binding contract rider. This agreement codified formalised workload calculation adjustments, establishing clear maximums for asynchronous student enrolment ratios per instructor to prevent course quality degradation, automated grading exploitation, and faculty burnout. Furthermore, it secured direct financial compensation for digital course design, guaranteed comprehensive instructional design support, and embedded explicit privacy protections preventing the administrative use of learning management system analytics for routine faculty performance evaluations. Most importantly, the final policy reaffirmed that the choice of digital media, textbook integration, and technological tool selection remained under the sovereign domain of individual pedagogical and academic freedom. By embedding these rigorous protections directly within the collective agreement, leadership converted union representatives from sceptical critics into active co-architects of the digital campus, demonstrating that technological progress is most sustainable and ethically sound when anchored in institutional trust and labour equity.

5.6 Building a Digital Organisational Culture

True digital transformation within higher education requires institutional investments that extend far beyond the procurement of advanced computing infrastructure, cloud storage, and enterprise software systems. At its core, the ultimate success of any technological modernisation initiative depends on the parallel development of an institutional culture capable of embracing innovation, cross-functional collaboration, thoughtful risk-taking, and lifelong learning. Academic leaders play a highly symbolic foundational role in shaping this cultural environment, utilising their symbolic authority, resource allocation powers, policy frameworks, and behavioural modelling to influence how the entire campus community perceives, values, and interacts with technology on a daily basis.

A digital-ready organisational culture in higher education is characterised by institutional openness to pedagogical experimentation, enthusiasm for interdisciplinary boundary-spanning, and collective resilience when adapting to volatile external environments (Bates, 2019). Leaders cultivate this cultural matrix by actively celebrating innovative practices, providing substantial institutional funding for grassroots digital projects, and broadly redefining traditional promotion, tenure, and annual review criteria to explicitly reward digital scholarship, open educational resource (OER) production, public digital engagement, and innovative instructional design. By aligning institutional incentives, prestige, and career progression with technological fluency, leaders signal that digital adaptation is valued as a prestigious core contribution to the university's future, rather than an uncompensated peripheral activity.

Psychological safety constitutes an indispensable pillar of a digital-ready academic culture. Faculty, administrative staff, and students must feel completely secure to experiment with unfamiliar digital media, novel hybrid teaching methodologies, generative AI integrations, and experimental administrative practices without the fear of immediate professional judgment, institutional penalties, or public failure. When leaders cultivate a supportive, inclusive, and forgiving institutional climate – where pilot project failures are treated as valuable learning metrics rather than career-ending deficits – they effectively lower the psychological barriers to technological adoption, transforming an otherwise anxious and risk-averse workforce into an agile community of curious, self-directed learners who actively drive the institution forward.

At the same time, academic leaders must remain incredibly vigilant to prevent the emergence of purely technocratic, neoliberal organisational cultures that mindlessly prioritise mechanical efficiency, cost-reduction, surveillance, and quantifiable indicators above all else (Deem et al., 2007). The digital university must never allow learning analytics, key performance indicators, and algorithmic tracking tools to overshadow or distort the deeper unquantifiable values of higher education, such as critical thinking, creative expression, deep student mentorship, and intellectual serendipity (Daniel, 2019). Transformation strategies must be carefully steered to ensure that data systems serve as empowering support tools that liberate human creativity rather than confining the academy within a cold, algorithmic panopticon that reduces scholarship to a digital compliance exercise by monitoring every minute of academic life (O'Neil, 2016).

Institutional culture also exerts a profound, definitive impact on the holistic student experience. Universities that successfully fuse cutting-edge digital infrastructure with human-centred, relational educational values create particularly inclusive, supportive, and empowering learning environments. In these institutions, digital tools are leveraged intentionally to

dismantle historic barriers for non-traditional, marginalised, lower-income, or disabled students, ensuring that technological deployment serves the noble cause of educational equity and democratic access. Leadership choice in cultural orientation therefore directly dictates the ethical identity, public reputation, and social mission of the digital university, ensuring that modernisation leads to human empowerment rather than alienation.

Ultimately, engineering a sustainable digital culture requires holistic leadership approaches that seamlessly combine bold strategic ambition with deep human empathy, democratic participation, and an unyielding commitment to core academic values. Technology alone cannot modernise the academy; it requires a cultural transformation that uplifts, respects, and empowers the human spirit, intellectual curiosity, and professional dignity of the entire campus community.

5.7 Challenges and Ethical Dilemmas of Digital Leadership

Academic leadership within the contemporary digital university is uniquely characterised by a dense, shifting matrix of unprecedented ethical dilemmas, governance conflicts, and sociotechnical challenges. Modern executives do not operate in a value-neutral environment; instead, they must constantly balance aggressive market pressures for technological innovation, fiscal efficiency, operational scaling, and global institutional competitiveness against their solemn public responsibilities regarding data privacy, social inclusion, academic freedom, and community well-being (Altbach & de Wit, 2020). This requires a sophisticated ethical framework, high moral courage, and critical reflexivity capable of analysing the long-term, systemic, and sometimes unintended consequences of administrative decisions.

One of the most pressing and particularly contested ethical challenges confronting digital leadership centres on the controversial domains of data governance, institutional surveillance, and behavioural profiling. As universities today make available highly integrated enterprise architectures, cloud systems, learning analytics, and remote proctoring software, they automatically capture vast reservoirs of intimate digital footprints tracking student learning behaviours, administrative staff productivity, and physical movement on campus (Daniel, 2019). Leaders face the agonising dilemma of determining the precise boundaries of responsible, ethical data utilisation. They must rigorously ensure that learning analytics and predictive algorithms are used purely for proactive, supportive student intervention, while fiercely protecting individual privacy rights, ensuring strict compliance with regulatory frameworks like general data protection regulation (GDPR) and preventing the institutionalisation of an invasive culture of surveillance that destroys community trust, personal autonomy, and intellectual freedom (O'Neil, 2016).

Furthermore, digital leadership must directly confront and systematically dismantle the deep inequalities associated with the digital divide. The move towards a hyper-digitalised academic ecosystem often proceeds on the deeply flawed, privileged assumption that all faculty members, professional staff, and students possess identical access to high-speed internet connectivity, cutting-edge hardware, private study environments, and advanced digital literacy. Leaders carry an immense social obligation to ensure that institutional virtualisation strategies do not inadvertently marginalise economically disadvantaged, rural, international, or underrepresented students. Digital transformation must incorporate robust material support systems, comprehensive laptop lending programmes, subsidised connectivity options, physical access spaces, and universal design principles to ensure that technological progress acts as a genuine engine of social mobility rather than an automated mechanism of structural exclusion and privilege amplification.

The volatile and dizzying pace of modern technological evolution also introduces profound financial risks and strategic planning uncertainties for university executive boards and trustees. Academic leaders are forced to make massive long-term capital investments in complex digital infrastructures, enterprise resource systems, and cloud architectures that face the continuous risk of rapid obsolescence (Garrison et al., 2015). Misallocating scarce institutional resources to flawed, overhyped corporate technology trends, unverified software platforms, or vaporware can trigger severe financial strain, starving traditional academic departments, student support services, libraries, and baseline research funding. Leaders must develop exceptional technological literacy and independent critical faculties; they must also rely on non-conflicted expertise to see past the hyperbolic marketing narratives of commercial vendors and protect the long-term fiscal sovereignty, strategic flexibility, and intellectual independence of their institutions (Sultan, 2010).

Additionally, digital executives must actively address the rising tide of cognitive overload, organisational fatigue, information anxiety, and professional burnout sweeping across the contemporary academy. The relentless pressure for constant technological adaptation – coupled with the systemic breakdown of boundaries between work and personal time caused by pervasive digital communication, messaging platforms, and virtual meetings – has severely compromised the mental, physical, and emotional well-being of faculty and staff (Crawford et al., 2020). Ethical leadership demands that university managers actively design healthy digital workplaces, implement formal "right to disconnect" protocols, design realistic training timelines, and establish robust wellness support systems because human capital is the most precious and irreplaceable asset of the university.

Crucially, automated decision-making matrices and predictive modelling represent a profound sociotechnical risk that leaders must govern

directly. Predictive models used in enrolment management, scholarship allocation, student retention interventions, or automated academic advising risk codifying, naturalising, and amplifying historical systemic biases against underrepresented, minoritised, or marginalised populations if left unchecked by human review (O'Neil, 2016). Ethical leadership requires a firm and unyielding commitment to algorithmic transparency, regular bias auditing, data source validation, and the absolute mandate of "human-in-the-loop" oversight for any high-stakes administrative or pedagogical intervention affecting student futures, admissions, grading, or staff careers. Universities are not simply corporate organisations seeking optimised efficiency, throughput, or revenue maximisation, but sacred public institutions responsible for objective knowledge creation, democratic engagement, social justice, and human development. Digital leadership fulfils its true purpose only when it ensures that technological tools are governed with ethical wisdom and used to expand human potential, protect democratic discourse, and secure the collective flourishing of the global community.

5.8 Conclusion

The wide-ranging digital transformation of higher education has fundamentally, permanently, and structurally reshaped the nature, operational scale, and ethical responsibilities of academic leadership within universities today worldwide. From department chairs and deans to provosts and university presidents, executives must navigate an increasingly complex, volatile, and blurred sociotechnical landscape characterised by perpetual technological disruption, global market connectivity, shifting labour dynamics, and deep institutional uncertainty. As this chapter has comprehensively demonstrated, successful digital leadership completely transcends the restrictive domain of mere technical deployment, software procurement, or financial optimisation management. It demands a sophisticated, multidimensional, and reflective framework that prioritises human capability, organisational trust, ethical responsibility, and values-aligned governance.

Effective digital leaders must operate simultaneously as transformative visionaries and collaborative network orchestrators. Guided by transformative leadership theories, they construct inspiring, inclusive, and coherent institutional narratives that connect technological deployment directly to the noble educational, research, and social missions of the university, ensuring that digitalisation is collectively embraced, co-authored, and driven from the bottom up rather than being top-down imposed through administrative fiat. Concurrently, through ecosystem leadership approaches, digital leaders transcend ancestral departmental silos, bureaucratic protectionism, and professional fiefdoms to cultivate vital horizontal connections, seamlessly coordinating cross-functional teams, internal innovation committees, and

external partnerships to maximise institutional agility, strategic leverage, and systemic resilience within a deeply interconnected world.

Crucially, this chapter has highlighted that sustainable digital transformation is achieved only when leaders treat technology not as a neutral tool, but as a profound cultural, ethical, and labour challenge requiring continuous negotiation, consensus-building, transparency, and deep institutional dialogue. Leaders must proactively and constructively engage with faculty and staff unions to build equitable, protective contractual frameworks regarding workloads, intellectual property, training support, evaluation analytics, and professional working conditions. They must build digital-ready campus cultures rooted in deep psychological safety, open experimentation, and continuous learning, while fiercely resisting technocratic, neoliberal, and managerial pressures that seek to reduce the rich relational complexity of higher education to sterile, unquantifiable algorithmic metrics, automated evaluations, and corporate deliverables (Deem et al., 2007; O'Neil, 2016).

Looking towards the future, the ultimate destiny and viability of academic leadership depends entirely on the capacity of university executives to balance aggressive technological innovation with an unyielding and courageous commitment to foundational human-centred values. Digital systems, AI, cloud architectures, and enterprise analytics can genuinely strengthen, modernise, and elevate higher education institutions only when they are directed by leaders who prioritise inclusion, academic freedom, structural transparency, human dignity, and democratic participation (Altbach & de Wit, 2020; Whitchurch, 2013). By confidently, clearly, and consistently asserting timeless humanist values and public-good principles over emerging technical tools and market temptations, academic leaders can ensure that the digital university remains a trusted sanctuary for critical thought, creative discovery, ethical leadership, and equitable human flourishing for generations to come.

References

Altbach, P. G., & de Wit, H. (2020). Postpandemic outlook for higher education is bleakest for the poorest. *International Higher Education*, (102), 3–5. Retrieved from https://ejournals.bc.edu/index.php/ihe/article/view/14583

Anagnoste, S. (2018). Setting up a robotic process automation center of excellence. *Management Dynamics in the Knowledge Economy*, *6*(2), 307–322.

Bates, A. W. (2019). *Teaching in a digital age: Guidelines for designing teaching and learning* (2nd ed.). Tony Bates Associates Ltd.

Bondarouk, T., Parry, E., & Furtmueller, E. (2017). Electronic HRM: Four decades of research on adoption and consequences. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, *28*(1), 98–131.

Crawford, J., Butler-Henderson, K., Rudolph, J., Malkawi, B., Glowatz, M., Burton, R., Magni, P. A., & Lam, S. (2020). COVID-19: 20 countries' higher

education intra-period digital pedagogy responses. *Journal of Applied Learning and Teaching*, *3*(1), 1–20.

Daniel, B. K. (2019). Big data and data science: A critical review of issues for educational research. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, *50*(1), 101–113.

Deem, R., Hillyard, S., & Reed, M. (2007). *Knowledge, higher education and the new managerialism: The changing management of UK universities.* Oxford University Press.

Frey, C. B., & Osborne, M. A. (2017). The future of employment: How susceptible are jobs to computerisation? *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, *114*, 254–280.

Garrison, G., Wakefield, R. L., & Kim, S. (2015). The effects of IT capabilities and delivery model on cloud computing success and firm performance for cloud supported processes and operations. *International Journal of Information Management*, *35*(4), 377–393.

Marinoni, G., Van't Land, H., & Jensen, T. (2020). *The impact of COVID-19 on higher education around the world: IAU global survey report.* International Association of Universities.

Markus, M. L., & Tanis, C. (2000). The enterprise systems experience—From adoption to success. In R. W. Zmud (Ed.), *Framing the domains of IT management: Projecting the future through the past* (pp. 173–207). Pinnaflex Educational Resources.

Marler, J. H., & Boudreau, J. W. (2017). An evidence-based review of HR analytics. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, *28*(1), 3–26.

O'Neil, C. (2016). *Weapons of math destruction: How big data increases inequality and threatens democracy.* Crown.

Pollitt, C., & Bouckaert, G. (2017). *Public management reform: A comparative analysis—Into the age of austerity* (4th ed.). Oxford University Press.

Sultan, N. (2010). Cloud computing for education: A new dawn? *International Journal of Information Management*, *30*(2), 109–116.

Whitchurch, C. (2013). *Reconstructing identities in higher education: The rise of third space professionals.* Routledge.

6 Digital Transformation of Administration and Professional Services

6.1 Automation and Administrative Modernisation

The digital transformation of higher education goes far beyond teaching and research. Universities now rely increasingly on digital technologies to modernise administrative structures, improve institutional coordination, and support students and staff through integrated professional services. Administrative areas, including admissions, finance, human resources, libraries, student affairs, information technology (IT) support, and campus management, are undergoing far-reaching technological change, driven in part by automation, artificial intelligence (AI), cloud computing, and data analytics. This shift requires a more fundamental rethinking of how academic institutions operate, moving away from isolated legacy systems and practices towards a more holistic organisational model supported by technology (Bates, 2019). As global education markets become increasingly competitive, the capacity of an institution to manage back-office operations efficiently and reliably is closely linked to its capacity to attract talent and maintain financial viability.

Traditionally, university administration was often characterised by fragmented bureaucratic systems, paper-based processes, and decentralised management of information. Digitalisation has significantly altered these structures by introducing integrated digital platforms capable of connecting multiple institutional functions within more unified systems. Universities increasingly adopt enterprise resource planning systems, cloud-based infrastructures, online self-service platforms, and AI-supported administrative tools designed to improve efficiency, reduce costs, and enhance institutional responsiveness. Through these interconnected architectures, data entered at the initial recruitment stage can inform student management, financial accounts, and IT identity provisioning, helping to break down the traditional departmental silos that have historically delayed institutional response times.

DOI: 10.4324/9781042001422-9
This chapter has been made available under a CC BY-NC-ND license.

The COVID-19 pandemic accelerated this transformation considerably. Universities worldwide were forced to digitise administrative operations rapidly in order to keep institutions operating during campus closures and periods of remote work. Student support services, financial administration, admissions processes, counselling, library access, and internal communication systems gradually moved to online environments. These developments demonstrated both the immense potential and the important limitations of digital administration within higher education institutions, as universities were required to confront a long-standing technological debt while simultaneously managing emergency remote operations under an unprecedented amount of pressure (Crawford et al., 2020; Marinoni et al., 2020).

Digital transformation offers significant benefits for universities. Automated systems can streamline repetitive administrative work, improve communication, support decision-making grounded in evidence, and increase accessibility of services for students and staff. Predictive analytics tools may help institutions identify students at risk of academic failure, optimise resource allocation, and improve operational planning. By moving from intuitive or speculative management to decision-making informed by data, university leaders can use dashboard analytics available in near real time to forecast enrolment trends, manage campus facility energy expenditure, and proactively offer psychological or academic interventions to struggling student cohorts (Daniel, 2019).

At the same time, administrative digitalisation raises important organisational, ethical, and cultural concerns. Universities must address issues related to data privacy, cybersecurity, staff retraining and reskilling, algorithmic decision-making, and the changing character of administrative work. Automation may create anxieties regarding job displacement, professional identity and role stability, and the growing managerialisation of higher education. Introducing AI into admissions or scholarship allocation risks reproducing historical biases through algorithmic systems, which directly contradicts the core meritocratic mission of the academy (O'Neil, 2016). Furthermore, the move towards quantifiable indicators and key performance indicators can alienate administrative staff, generating cultural resistance if the transformation is perceived simply as a corporate-style cost-cutting mechanism rather than an enhancement of the university's central human values (Altbach & de Wit, 2020; Deem et al., 2007).

One of the most visible aspects of administrative digitalisation is the growing automation of institutional processes. Universities increasingly use digital tools to simplify repetitive tasks, speed up service delivery, and improve operational efficiency. This transformation, however, aligns with broader public sector modernisation efforts that aim to replace older bureaucratic structures with lean, technologically enhanced management models (Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2017). By restructuring routine procedures,

higher education institutions attempt to move from passive administrative compliance to proactive service-oriented operations that focus on stakeholder satisfaction and strategic value for the institution.

Admissions systems now frequently rely on automated application processing, online enrolment platforms, and communication tools supported by AI. Chatbots and virtual assistants are commonly used to answer student questions regarding deadlines, requirements, financial aid, and institutional procedures. These systems allow universities to provide support on a continuous basis while reducing the administrative workload. Existing research suggests that the implementation of conversational AI in admissions not only streamlines the recruitment funnel of prospective students but also significantly reduces the administrative burden during periods of peak enrolment, allowing human counsellors to focus on complex and non-routine student inquiries (Chassignol et al., 2018). Furthermore, these automated communication channels improve accessibility for non-traditional and international applicants who require real-time information across different time zones (Papanastasiou et al., 2019).

Financial administration has also undergone extensive automation. Universities increasingly use robotic process automation (RPA) systems for invoice processing, payroll management, procurement procedures, and budget monitoring. Automated systems can reduce manual data entry, improve accuracy, and accelerate financial operations. Within the context of higher education today, where funding models are increasingly complex and subject to strict regulatory oversight, RPA serves as an important mechanism for ensuring compliance and reducing the risk of human error in financial reporting (Anagnoste, 2018). By automating transactional financial tasks, institutions can redirect their finance personnel towards strategic financial planning, optimisation of resources, and predictive analyses of budgets (Syed et al., 2020).

Human resources departments similarly rely on digital platforms for recruitment, staff evaluation, leave management, and professional development tracking. Online recruitment systems allow institutions to process applications more efficiently while expanding access to international labour markets. Integrating electronic human resource management (e-HRM) systems in higher education has altered traditional personnel administration by fostering self-service capabilities for faculty and staff, thereby decentralising routine data management (Bondarouk et al., 2017). These systems also support advanced data analytics regarding workforce productivity, turnover intentions, and skill gaps, enabling academic leaders to make evidence-based decisions regarding talent acquisition and institutional capacity building (Marler & Boudreau, 2017).

Automation improves administrative efficiency and may reduce operational costs. Digital systems often provide faster service delivery, more

consistent procedures, and improved accessibility for students and employees. Online self-service platforms allow users to access institutional information and complete administrative tasks without direct physical interaction with university offices. This evolution shifts the student and employee experience towards a consumer-grade digital environment, where administrative interactions are expected to be instantaneous and seamless. The resulting operational agility allows universities to adapt more swiftly to external regulatory changes and shifting macroeconomic conditions that impact higher education funding and demographics.

However, automation also raises concerns regarding depersonalisation and the reduction of human interaction within university services. Students and staff may experience frustration when institutional communication becomes overly automated or difficult to personalise. Administrative work in universities often involves emotional support, contextual understanding, and interpersonal problem-solving that cannot easily be replaced by algorithms or digital systems. Academic administration operates within a unique cultural ecosystem where pastoral care and relational trust are central to student retention and well-being (Whitchurch, 2013). Over-automated systems risk alienating vulnerable student populations, such as first-generation or marginalised students, who require empathetic human guidance to navigate complex institutional terrains.

There are also concerns regarding employment transformation. Administrative staff may fear job displacement or changing professional roles associated with automation. Universities therefore increasingly face the challenge of balancing technological efficiency with organisational inclusion and workforce adaptation. The proliferation of automated tools often accelerates the "managerialisation" of the academy, shifting the identity of administrative staff from traditional university public servants to metrics-driven operational specialists (Deem et al., 2007). To mitigate structural resistance and anxiety, higher education leaders must invest in comprehensive upskilling and reskilling initiatives, ensuring that technological adoption serves to augment human labour rather than simply displace it (Frey & Osborne, 2017).

6.2 Enterprise Systems and Digital Infrastructure

Contemporary universities increasingly rely on integrated digital infrastructures designed to connect institutional operations within unified management systems. Enterprise resource planning (ERP) systems play a particularly important role in coordinating administrative processes across multiple institutional areas. This infrastructural shift reflects a broader migration towards enterprise architecture in public sector organisations, where the goal is to substitute fragmented legacy databases with single-source-of-truth

frameworks (Al-Mashari et al., 2003). By embedding these unified architectural models, higher education institutions attempt to resolve the persistent problem of data duplication, streamline cross-functional workflows, and achieve higher levels of organisational agility.

Enterprise systems integrate functions such as finance, student records, human resources, library services, scheduling, procurement, and institutional reporting within centralised digital environments. These systems improve coordination between departments and allow institutional leaders to access comprehensive operational information in real time. The capacity to pull real-time data from disparate domains changes the nature of institutional research and strategic governance, transforming data from a passive historical record into an active managerial asset (Daniel, 2019). Furthermore, this data integration enhances external reporting compliance, enabling universities to report performance metrics to government agencies and accreditation bodies with greater speed and accuracy.

Cloud computing has further transformed university administration by enabling remote access to institutional systems and supporting flexible organisational structures. Cloud-based platforms support collaboration between departments, support remote work arrangements, and reduce dependence on campus infrastructure. Moving away from on-premise servers towards Software-as-a-Service (SaaS) and Infrastructure-as-a-Service (IaaS) models allows universities to scale their computing power dynamically, mitigating the risks of system crashes during high-traffic periods such as course registration and admissions deadlines (Garrison et al., 2015). Moreover, the cloud provides a resilient foundation for disaster recovery and operational continuity, a benefit that became glaringly obvious during recent global disruptions (Crawford et al., 2020).

Digital infrastructures also improve institutional communication. Universities increasingly use centralised communication platforms, mobile applications, and online portals to provide information regarding courses, examinations, financial services, campus events, and administrative procedures. These portals aggregate touchpoints into consumer-grade interfaces, matching the digital experiences students and staff expect outside the academy. By utilising centralised notification frameworks and mobile-first portals, institutions can push targeted information to specific user groups, ensuring that critical deadlines or emergency safety notices are communicated instantly and reliably (Papanastasiou et al., 2019).

Implementing integrated digital systems often represents one of the largest organisational transformations undertaken by universities. Such projects require substantial financial investment, technical expertise, staff training, and organisational restructuring. Many institutions encounter difficulties during implementation processes due to technological complexity, resistance to change, or incompatibility between older and newer

systems. This phenomenon, frequently discussed in organisational theory as "technological inertia", can paralyse implementations when academic and administrative staff feel that new systems disrupt established professional identities and workflows (Bates, 2019). Consequently, ERP rollouts in academia regularly experience scope creep, budget overruns, and initial dips in operational productivity before any efficiencies are realised (Markus & Tanis, 2000).

Universities must also address issues related to vendor dependency and technological sustainability. Reliance on external software providers may reduce institutional control over data management and long-term technological strategy. This dynamic, known as vendor lock-in, limits an institution's ability to pivot its operational strategies or negotiate competitive pricing once its critical operations are deeply embedded within a specific vendor's proprietary ecosystem (Sultan, 2010). Digital infrastructures therefore become not only technical systems but also strategic governance concerns, forcing university boards to balance the convenience of turnkey commercial solutions against the preservation of data sovereignty and academic independence (Altbach & de Wit, 2020).

The modernisation of institutional infrastructure consequently requires careful planning, long-term investment, and organisational coordination across multiple institutional levels. Successful implementation demands that technological strategy be closely aligned with the university's overarching academic mission rather than being treated as an isolated IT initiative. Higher education leadership must implement formal change management frameworks, cultivate digital competencies across all staff strata, and maintain transparent communication channels to ensure that the evolving digital infrastructure serves to empower, rather than fragment, the institutional community (Whitchurch, 2013).

Data analytics increasingly shapes administrative decision-making within universities. Professional service units now collect and analyse extensive amounts of institutional data related to student behaviour, financial performance, operational efficiency, and service usage patterns. This systemic move towards business intelligence within higher education reflects a broader public sector imperative to base policy and resource deployment on empirical evidence rather than tradition or intuition (Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2017). By capturing digital footprints across various touchpoints, academic institutions attempt to build unified intelligence frameworks that maximise operational transparency and strategic responsiveness (Daniel, 2019).

Student support services frequently use predictive analytics systems to identify students who may require academic or psychological assistance. By analysing attendance patterns, assessment results, online activity, and engagement indicators within learning management systems, universities attempt to identify risks related to student dropout, academic failure, or

well-being challenges. These predictive models rely on machine learning algorithms to flag anomalies in student engagement, serving as an early-warning radar for student affairs personnel. When implemented effectively, these systems empower advisors to shift from a reactive posture to proactive outreach, significantly improving retention rates and mitigating student crises before they escalate.

6.3 Data-Driven Decision-Making in Professional Services

Data-driven approaches also support institutional planning and resource allocation. Universities use analytics systems to forecast enrolment trends, optimise staffing levels, evaluate service performance, and monitor institutional outcomes. In an era characterised by volatile demographic shifts and fluctuating public funding, the capacity to model enrolment variables and tuition revenue precisely is vital for long-term fiscal sustainability. Through real-time data dashboards, university executives can simulate the financial and logistical impacts of new academic programmes, campus infrastructure expansions, or changes in financial aid policies, thereby aligning operational expenditures closely with strategic institutional targets.

Libraries increasingly rely on digital analytics to evaluate resource usage, online access patterns, and research behaviour. Student affairs offices similarly use data systems to assess participation in support programmes, counselling services, and extracurricular activities. Tracking digital library checkouts and institutional repository downloads helps librarians curate collections on the basis of actual demand rather than speculative purchasing, maximising the return on investment for costly academic databases (Garrison et al., 2015). In parallel, student affairs analytics provide clear evidence regarding which co-curricular programmes yield the highest correlation with student belonging and persistence, allowing administrators to defund underutilised initiatives and reinvest in high-impact practices (Whitchurch, 2013).

The growing use of analytics may improve institutional responsiveness and allow universities to provide more targeted support services. Early intervention systems may help students receive assistance before academic or personal difficulties become severe. This institutional agility reshapes the student experience, personalising help in a way that replicates the tailored interactions found in consumer industries. By removing the burden from students to self-identify their needs during moments of academic distress, data-informed universities foster an environment of continuous institutional care and tailored pathways towards graduation.

At the same time, the expansion of institutional analytics raises ethical concerns related to surveillance, consent, and privacy. Continuous monitoring of student behaviour may create environments characterised by control rather than trust. Students and staff may not fully understand

how institutional data is collected, interpreted, or used in administrative decision-making. The continuous tracking of card swipes at campus facilities, login times on Wi-Fi networks, and page views on digital platforms can morph the university into a digital panopticon, inadvertently damaging the psychological safety required for authentic intellectual exploration and personal growth (O'Neil, 2016).

Algorithmic systems may also reinforce biases and inequalities if predictive models rely on incomplete or discriminatory datasets. Universities therefore increasingly face questions regarding transparency, accountability, and ethical governance of institutional data. If historical data reflects lower retention rates for marginalised demographic groups, predictive algorithms may flag incoming students from similar backgrounds as high-risk, leading to systemic bias and self-fulfilling prophecies in advising interventions. Without rigorous algorithmic auditing and transparent data governance policies, automated predictive systems risk institutionalising equity gaps rather than closing them (O'Neil, 2016).

The challenge for professional services lies in using data responsibly while maintaining institutional trust, privacy protection, and respect for individual autonomy. To navigate this tension, university administrators must co-design data policies alongside student representatives and faculty councils, establishing clear boundaries regarding data retention, opt-out mechanisms, and algorithmic transparency (Altbach & de Wit, 2020). Ultimately, data analytics must be treated as a supportive diagnostic resource for human professionals, ensuring that numerical metrics never eclipse the qualitative complexity of individual student lives (Whitchurch, 2013).

6.4 Digital Transformation of Student Services

Student services have undergone particularly significant digital transformation in recent years. Universities increasingly provide academic advising, counselling, career guidance, financial support, and administrative assistance through online platforms and AI-supported systems. This migration to virtual environments represents a profound shift in the administrative architecture of higher education, moving from physical "one-stop shops" to omnipresent, cloud-based student success hubs. Driven by the consumer expectations of digital-native cohorts, universities are re-engineering their student-facing operations to ensure that critical administrative interventions are available on demand, anywhere, and across multiple devices.

Digital advising systems allow students to schedule appointments, monitor academic progress, receive personalised recommendations, and access institutional resources remotely. AI-supported advising platforms may recommend courses, identify graduation requirements, and provide early alerts regarding academic difficulties. By integrating academic degree-audit

tools with predictive recommendation engines, these digital environments help students map their academic journeys with fewer registration errors, thereby optimising time-to-degree and reducing the accumulation of excess credits. This automated baseline allows professional advisors to transcend routine scheduling duties and dedicate their energy to nuanced mentoring and holistic career planning (Whitchurch, 2013).

Online counselling and mental health services have also expanded rapidly, particularly during and after the COVID-19 pandemic. Universities increasingly provide virtual counselling sessions, digital well-being resources, and online peer-support communities designed to improve student accessibility and flexibility. The sudden surge in student anxiety and isolation during global campus closures forced an overnight move towards teletherapy and mobile mental health platforms (Crawford et al., 2020). Post-pandemic, these digital mental health infrastructures have remained an essential component of institutional support, successfully lowering boundaries for students who experience stigma, mobility restrictions, or scheduling conflicts when seeking traditional in-person clinical care (Marinoni et al., 2020).

Career services similarly use digital tools to connect students with employers, internships, networking opportunities, and professional development programmes. Virtual career fairs and online mentoring platforms have become increasingly common within higher education institutions. Adopting integrated career network platforms has democratised student access to the labour market, allowing regional universities to connect their graduates with multinational corporations without the logistical costs of traditional physical job fairs. These platforms use algorithmic matchmaking to pair students with mentorship and employment opportunities tailored specifically to their academic portfolios and skill profiles, thereby enhancing institutional graduate employability metrics (Marler & Boudreau, 2017).

Digital student services may improve accessibility for students balancing education with employment, family responsibilities, or geographical limitations. Online systems also allow universities to provide support outside traditional office hours. For adult learners, part-time students, and long-distance commuters, synchronous and asynchronous virtual support desks eliminate the administrative penalty of not being present on campus during the standard nine-to-five workday (Bates, 2019). Consequently, digital student services serve as a vehicle for equity and lifelong learning, expanding the boundaries of higher education to accommodate increasingly diverse and non-traditional student populations (Papanastasiou et al., 2019).

However, concerns remain regarding the quality of digitally mediated support services. Many forms of advising and counselling rely heavily on interpersonal interaction, empathy, and contextual understanding. Excessive digitalisation may weaken the relational aspects of student support and reduce

opportunities for meaningful human connection. Academic advising and psychological counselling are intrinsically relational practices that depend on non-verbal cues, trust building, and empathetic listening – human capacities that cannot be coded into digital interfaces or automated decision-making matrices (Whitchurch, 2013). Relying excessively on digital interfaces risks creating an environment of administrative alienation, where students feel processed by systems rather than cared for by a community.

Digital student services therefore require balanced approaches that combine technological convenience with human-centred support and institutional care. Higher education leaders must avoid treating technological platforms as absolute replacements for human professionals, opting instead for a "blended" support architecture where automation handles transactional logistics while human experts provide the critical emotional and contextual support (Bates, 2019). By positioning technology as an amplifier of human capability, universities can preserve the vital relational core of the academic experience while reaping the scalability and efficiency gains of the digital age.

6.5 Libraries and the Digital Knowledge Environment

University libraries have experienced some of the most profound transformations associated with digitalisation. Traditionally centred around physical collections and reading spaces, libraries increasingly operate as digital knowledge environments supporting online access to information, research data, and academic resources. This shift represents an epistemological and spatial revolution, turning the library from a geographic point of collection into a decentralised node within a global digital network (Bates, 2019). As digital literacy and open science become paramount, the library's mission transitions from the curation of physical artefacts to the coordination of dynamic, digital knowledge ecologies.

Digital repositories, electronic journals, e-books, and online databases now constitute central components of library services. Students and researchers increasingly access materials remotely through institutional authentication systems and cloud-based platforms. The cloud migration of scholarly communication has effectively uncoupled academic research from the physical university campus, allowing scholars to query vast digital archives from any global location (Garrison et al., 2015). This instantaneous access accelerates scientific discovery and supports the internationalisation of academic work, enabling real-time collaboration across disparate geographic zones (Crawford et al., 2020).

Libraries also play important roles in supporting digital literacy, research data management, open science initiatives, and academic publishing. Librarians increasingly act as digital information specialists assisting

researchers with data curation, citation management, copyright issues, and digital scholarship tools. This evolution has birthed new profiles within library professional cadres, operating in the "third space" between administrative support and direct academic partnership (Whitchurch, 2013). Modern digital librarians provide essential expertise in building institutional data management plans, ensuring compliance with open access mandates from research funding councils, and training faculty and students to navigate complex copyright and fair-use frameworks in digital media.

Some universities have significantly reduced physical collections in favour of predominantly digital library models. Such transformations often improve accessibility and reduce storage costs while supporting remote learning and international research collaboration. By shrinking their physical book stacks, institutions can repurpose prime campus real estate into technology-rich collaborative learning environments, makerspaces, and digital media labs. This spatial optimisation aligns with contemporary pedagogical trends towards collaborative, problem-based learning, re-engineering the library footprint to serve as a laboratory for student knowledge creation rather than just knowledge consumption.

However, digital library transformation also raises concerns regarding commercial dependency, long-term preservation, and equitable access. Universities often rely on expensive subscription agreements with large publishing corporations that control access to digital academic resources. This dynamic binds libraries to predatory pricing structures and annual cost increases driven by monolithic commercial oligopolies, a challenge that strains institutional operational budgets and limits the democratising potential of digital scholarship (Daniel, 2019). Furthermore, shifting from ownership of physical texts to lease-based licensing models compromises the library's historical role as a permanent archivist of human knowledge, leaving institutional memory vulnerable to shifting corporate terms and platform obsolescence (Altbach & de Wit, 2020).

There are also broader cultural questions regarding the changing role of libraries within university life. Physical libraries historically functioned not only as information repositories but also as communal intellectual spaces supporting concentration, interaction, and academic culture. The complete virtualisation of library resources risks eroding the library's role as the symbolic, secular heart of the campus community – a quiet space dedicated to focused reflection, scholarly serendipity, and civic socialisation. When learning and research are stripped of these shared physical environments, the overall student and faculty experience may become hyper-individualised and disconnected from the collective intellectual life of the institution (Altbach & de Wit, 2020).

The digital transformation of libraries therefore reflects broader tensions between accessibility, efficiency, commercialisation, and the preservation

of academic community within digital universities. To build a sustainable digital knowledge environment, universities must champion alternative open-access publishing frameworks, invest in sovereign institutional repositories, and design blended physical-digital library spaces that respect the enduring value of the human academic community. Balancing fiscal and technological efficiencies against the democratic and preservationist values of classical librarianship remains a fundamental governance challenge for modern higher education.

6.6 Organisational Culture and Resistance to Administrative Change

Administrative digitalisation frequently encounters organisational and cultural resistance within universities. Higher education institutions are traditionally decentralised organisations characterised by strong professional identities, institutional traditions, and complex governance structures. This unique structural configuration – often conceptualised in management theory as a "loosely coupled system" or a "professional bureaucracy" – makes universities particularly resistant to top-down, corporate-style technological implementations (Markus & Tanis, 2000). Because authority is distributed between executive managers, academic boards, and autonomous departments, the introduction of standardised digital platforms often collides with deeply entrenched traditions of localised decision-making and professional exceptionalism (Deem et al., 2007).

Staff members may resist digital transformation due to concerns regarding workload increases, technological uncertainty, job security, or loss of professional autonomy. Administrative modernisation often requires employees to adopt new skills, adjust to unfamiliar systems, and change established working practices. This cultural friction – often viewed as technological inertia – is exacerbated when staff perceive that technology is being used to monitor their productivity or replace their professional judgment with algorithmic scripts (Frey & Osborne, 2017). Without adequate psychological safety, the introduction of integrated systems like ERPs can trigger profound anxieties regarding deskilling and career obsolescence, leading to covert non-compliance or overt organisational resistance (Al-Mashari et al., 2003).

Cultural resistance may also emerge from scepticism towards managerial approaches associated with efficiency, automation, and performance measurement. Some staff members perceive digitalisation as part of broader trends towards the corporatisation and managerialisation of higher education. Under this lens, digital tools are frequently interpreted as instruments of "new public management", designed to reduce complex educational relationships to quantifiable key performance indicators and audit metrics

(Deem et al., 2007). When administrative staff feel that software parameters dictate their daily operations and strip them of the capacity to exercise contextual empathy and flexible problem-solving, a cultural defence mechanism is triggered to protect the traditional public-service values of the academy (Whitchurch, 2013).

Successful administrative transformation therefore requires effective change management strategies. Universities increasingly invest in staff training, participatory planning processes, and internal communication initiatives designed to support organisational adaptation. Rather than treating technology deployment as a pure engineering project, progressive higher education leaders implement holistic sociotechnical frameworks that engage front-line staff as co-creators of the digital workflow. By establishing feedback loops, conducting extensive user-acceptance testing, and providing structured time for upskilling, institutions can transform technology from an imposed threat into an empowering professional tool (Bondarouk et al., 2017).

Leadership plays a particularly important role in reducing resistance and building institutional trust. Employees are more likely to support digital transformation when they perceive institutional changes as transparent, inclusive, and aligned with broader educational missions rather than purely financial or managerial goals. Academic and administrative executives must articulate a compelling narrative that connects technological modernisation directly to the elevation of human care and academic excellence within the institution (Bates, 2019). When leadership actively models digital agility, demystifies system modifications, and demonstrates a genuine commitment to workforce development and employment stability, structural resistance gives way to institutional alignment and shared purpose.

Organisational culture consequently becomes a central factor shaping the success or failure of administrative digitalisation. Technology alone cannot solve institutional inefficiencies if the underlying human ecosystem remains fragmented, distrustful, or unaligned. Digital transformation in higher education is ultimately less about software configuration and far more about cultural renegotiation, requiring leaders to balance technological ambition with a profound respect for the human relations and professional dignity that constitute the foundation of the academy.

6.7 Ethical, Social, and Governance Implications

The digital transformation of administration raises important ethical and social questions. Universities now rely increasingly on systems that collect extensive amounts of personal and institutional data, raising concerns regarding privacy, surveillance, and data governance. As higher education infrastructures integrate deep tracking mechanisms across learning

management systems, enterprise resource planning software, and student support networks, the boundary between necessary institutional administration and invasive behavioural profiling becomes increasingly blurred (O'Neil, 2016). This hyper-collection of digital footprints places academic institutions at the vanguard of data ethics debates, forcing them to confront the sociotechnical consequences of operating in a data-rich society (Daniel, 2019).

Administrative systems may process sensitive information related to student performance, financial status, health conditions, employment records, and personal behaviour. Universities therefore carry significant ethical responsibilities regarding data security, transparency, and informed consent. Managing these rich datasets requires strict compliance with international legal frameworks, such as the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), but true ethical governance goes far beyond legal box-checking (Altbach & de Wit, 2020). Institutions must actively protect data against growing cybersecurity threats while ensuring that students and employees retain authentic agency and clarity over how their data is analysed, who has access to it, and the long-term consequences of institutional data profiling.

Algorithmic decision-making represents another important challenge. Automated systems used in admissions, financial aid, or student support may unintentionally reproduce inequalities or discriminatory patterns embedded within historical data. Because predictive algorithms train on historical institutional data, they risk codifying historical biases against low-income, minority, or non-traditional student groups, labelling them as systemic flight risks or denying them enrolment opportunities based on flawed historical trends (O'Neil, 2016). Higher education institutions must establish rigorous algorithmic auditing protocols, commit to transparency in automated workflows, and mandate that no high-stakes administrative decision is ever made without binding human-in-the-loop oversight.

Digital transformation also affects professional identities and labour relations within universities. Administrative work increasingly involves digital competencies, data analysis, and technological coordination rather than traditional bureaucratic procedures. For many long-serving institutional employees, this rapid redefinition of their daily roles causes significant professional identity and role stability friction, moving them away from relational, task-oriented public service towards highly structured data-driven systems management (Whitchurch, 2013). If this structural transition is mismanaged, it risks dividing the university workforce into a highly paid technocratic elite and a marginalised tier of clerical workers who face persistent role precarity and digital burnout (Frey & Osborne, 2017).

There are also concerns regarding the growing dependence of universities on commercial technology companies. Institutions increasingly rely on external software providers and cloud platforms, raising questions

regarding institutional autonomy, data ownership, and long-term technological sustainability. The widespread adoption of proprietary educational technology models creates a risk of vendor lock-in, where universities cede control over their core data models and long-term infrastructure roadmaps to profit-driven corporations (Sultan, 2010). This corporate dependency can lead to commercialisation pressures, where university data becomes an asset to be monetised, thus threatening the traditional sovereignty and public mission of the global academy (Altbach & de Wit, 2020).

The ethical governance of digital administration therefore requires universities to critically evaluate not only efficiency gains but also the broader social consequences of technological transformation. Academic institutions must establish multidisciplinary data governance boards composed of ethicists, faculty, students, and IT architects tasked with evaluating the social equity of new software rollouts. By anchoring digital strategy in core humanist values, universities can ensure that administrative modernisation preserves the fundamental democratic rights, professional autonomy, and ethical integrity of the academic community (Deem et al., 2007).

The digital transformation of administration and professional services is fundamentally reshaping universities today. Automation, integrated digital infrastructures, predictive analytics, AI-supported systems, and online service platforms increasingly influence how institutions operate and support academic communities. This shift represents a paradigm change, transitioning traditional paper-based university bureaucracy into an integrated, agile, and data-informed digital ecosystem. As these technological tools continue to mature, they permanently alter the structural backbone of higher education, redefining the daily realities of governance, labour, and student engagement across the global academic landscape.

These developments create important opportunities for improving efficiency, accessibility, institutional coordination, and decision-making grounded in evidence. Digital systems allow universities to modernise administrative processes and respond more effectively to changing educational and organisational demands. By automating transactional labour, helping to break down traditional institutional silos, and using predictive models to identify student vulnerabilities early, higher education institutions can maximise their resources and optimise their operational agility in a particularly volatile macroeconomic climate. When properly directed, these digital infrastructures turn back-office administration into a proactive engine of student success and institutional resilience (Daniel, 2019).

At the same time, administrative digitalisation generates significant organisational, ethical, and cultural challenges related to privacy, surveillance, staff transformation, algorithmic governance, and institutional dependence on technology providers. The rapid expansion of administrative data systems can easily compromise individual privacy, institutionalise historic biases

through flawed predictive analytics, and trigger intense labour alienation and cultural resistance from an anxious academic workforce (O'Neil, 2016; Deem et al., 2007). Furthermore, a total reliance on turnkey commercial SaaS ecosystems places the sovereignty of university data and the long-term direction of academic policy in the hands of external commercial entities (Sultan, 2010).

The chapter demonstrates that digital transformation in administration is not simply an IT modernisation process. It represents a broader organisational and cultural transformation requiring leadership, institutional adaptation, ethical governance, and change management. Successfully implementing these massive systems demands that university boards look past the hyperbole of technology vendors and address the complex sociotechnical systems that govern their campuses (Bates, 2019). It requires transparent change management frameworks that protect the well-being of the professional staff, dismantle technological inertia, and co-design digital environments alongside the campus community (Bondarouk et al., 2017).

The future of administrative digitalisation depends on the ability of universities to balance technological innovation with human-centred values such as inclusion, transparency, professional dignity, and institutional trust. Digital systems can strengthen higher education institutions only when they support rather than undermine the broader educational and social missions of the university. Academic institutions must confidently assert their values over their tools, ensuring that automation and data analytics are harnessed to expand educational equity, deepen human relationships, and preserve the university as a trusted, empathetic sanctuary for critical thought and collective human flourishing (Altbach & de Wit, 2020; Whitchurch, 2013).

6.8 Conclusion

The digital transformation of university administration, as this chapter has shown, reaches far beyond swapping paper forms for online portals. It touches how staff see their own professional worth, how students experience the institution day to day, and how much trust people place in the systems quietly making decisions about them.

The gains are hard to dismiss. Automated admissions, integrated enterprise systems, and predictive analytics let universities respond faster, allocate resources more wisely, and catch struggling students before a crisis develops. But the same chapter is equally clear about the costs of getting this wrong. Overly automated services can leave students feeling processed rather than cared for, predictive models trained on biased history can quietly punish the students who most need support, and staff who feel reduced to metrics rarely embrace change willingly.

What comes through most strongly is that successful digital transformation is a cultural project as much as a technical one. Systems succeed or fail depending on whether staff are brought in as partners rather than subjects, whether data governance protects people rather than just institutions, and whether leadership frames change as care for the community rather than cost-cutting dressed up as innovation.

Ultimately, the value of administrative digitalisation will be judged not by how efficient a university's back office becomes, but by whether that efficiency is used to deepen human support rather than replace it. Technology can free staff to do more relational, meaningful work, or it can hollow that work out entirely. Which path a university takes depends less on the software it buys and more on the values it insists that software serve.

References

Al-Mashari, M., Al-Mudimigh, A., & Zairi, M. (2003). Enterprise resource planning: A taxonomy of critical factors. *European Journal of Operational Research*, *146*(2), 352–364.

Altbach, P. G., & de Wit, H. (2020). Postpandemic outlook for higher education is bleakest for the poorest. *International Higher Education,* (102), 3–5. Retrieved from https://ejournals.bc.edu/index.php/ihe/article/view/14583

Anagnoste, S. (2018). Setting up a robotic process automation center of excellence. *Management Dynamics in the Knowledge Economy*, *6*(2), 307–322.

Bates, A. W. (2019). *Teaching in a digital age: Guidelines for designing teaching and learning* (2nd ed.). Tony Bates Associates.

Bondarouk, T., Parry, E., & Furtmueller, E. (2017). Electronic HRM: Four decades of research on adoption and consequences. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, *28*(1), 98–131.

Chassignol, M., Khoroshavin, A., Klimova, A., & Bilyatdinova, A. (2018). Artificial intelligence trends in education: A narrative overview. *Procedia Computer Science*, *136*, 16–24.

Crawford, J., Butler-Henderson, K., Rudolph, J., Malkawi, B., Glowatz, M., Burton, R., Magni, P. A., & Lam, S. (2020). COVID-19: 20 countries' higher education intra-period digital pedagogy responses. *Journal of Applied Learning and Teaching*, *3*(1), 1–20.

Daniel, B. K. (2019). Big data and data science: A critical review of issues for educational research. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, *50*(1), 101–113.

Deem, R., Hillyard, S., & Reed, M. (2007). *Knowledge, higher education and the new managerialism: The changing management of UK universities.* Oxford University Press.

Frey, C. B., & Osborne, M. A. (2017). The future of employment: How susceptible are jobs to computerisation? *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, *114*, 254–280.

Garrison, G., Wakefield, R. L., & Kim, S. (2015). The effects of IT capabilities and delivery model on cloud computing success and firm performance for

cloud supported processes and operations. *International Journal of Information Management*, *35*(4), 377–393.

Marinoni, G., Van't Land, H., & Jensen, T. (2020). *The impact of COVID-19 on higher education around the world: IAU global survey report*. International Association of Universities.

Markus, M. L., & Tanis, C. (2000). The enterprise systems experience—From adoption to success. In R. W. Zmud (Ed.), *Framing the domains of IT management: Projecting the future through the past* (pp. 173–207). Pinnaflex Educational Resources.

Marler, J. H., & Boudreau, J. W. (2017). An evidence-based review of HR analytics. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, *28*(1), 3–26.

O'Neil, C. (2016). *Weapons of math destruction: How big data increases inequality and threatens democracy*. Crown.

Papanastasiou, G., Drigas, A., Skianis, C., Lytras, M., & Papanastasiou, E. (2019). Virtual and augmented reality effects on K-12, higher and tertiary education students' twenty-first century skills. *Virtual Reality*, *23*(4), 425–436.

Pollitt, C., & Bouckaert, G. (2017). *Public management reform: A comparative analysis—Into the age of austerity* (4th ed.). Oxford University Press.

Sultan, N. (2010). Cloud computing for education: A new dawn? *International Journal of Information Management*, *30*(2), 109–116.

Syed, R., Suriadi, S., Adams, M., Bandara, W., Leemans, S. J. J., Ouyang, C., ter Hofstede, A. H. M., van de Weerd, I., Wynn, M. T., & Reijers, H. A. (2020). Robotic process automation: Contemporary themes and challenges. *Computers in Industry, 115*, 103162.

Whitchurch, C. (2013). *Reconstructing identities in higher education: The rise of third space professionals*. Routledge.

Part III

Organisational Dynamics of the Digital University



Taylor & Francis
Taylor & Francis Group
http://taylorandfrancis.com

7 Reimagining University Strategy in the Digital Age

7.1 Why University Strategy Must Be Reconfigured

Universities operate in strategic environments increasingly characterised by accelerated digitalisation and technology-driven shifts that affect educational delivery, internal processes, and governance. Under such conditions, static multi-year strategic plans have become insufficient as the dominant or sole strategic instrument (Fernández et al., 2023; Oktyabrski, 2025). Experiences from the pandemic period further demonstrated that disruptive shocks can rapidly reshape institutional priorities and operating models, intensifying the need for future-oriented planning and organisation-wide readiness for digitally mediated modes of teaching, research, and service delivery (Dagienė et al., 2022; Harits et al., 2022; Du et al., 2025).

Within this context, scholarship on university digital transformation (DT) increasingly treats strategy not as an optional add-on but as a central governance mechanism for aligning technological initiatives with the institutional mission and for coordinating investment, leadership attention, and change management across organisational functions (Kuzu, 2020; Pavlova, 2020; Fernández et al., 2023; Kushwaha, 2025). Recent systematic and scoping reviews reinforce this diagnosis. Mabotha and Ngcamu (2026) emphasise that technological acceleration requires institutional strategies capable of managing changing organisational models while addressing persistent implementation barriers. Abulibdeh (2025) similarly argues that universities must explicitly embed artificial intelligence (AI) within strategic planning frameworks because it simultaneously reorganises teaching, research, governance, and administration and exposes organisational, human, technological, and environmental constraints.

Accordingly, this chapter argues that contemporary university strategy must be reimagined as a continuous mission-aligned and foresight-driven process rather than as a fixed multi-year document. It develops a concept of digital-era academic strategy grounded in institutional recomposition and aligned with the broader framework of the *new academic wave*. The chapter

DOI: 10.4324/9781042001422-11
This chapter has been made available under a CC BY-NC-ND license.

(i) provides a conceptual justification for reconfiguring traditional strategic planning, (ii) synthesises key pillars of digital-era academic strategy, (iii) examines the integration of strategy with digital governance, (iv) elaborates the human, cultural, and participatory conditions of strategic legitimacy, and (v) proposes a roadmap for operationalising continuous, foresight-informed strategy in higher education institutions (HEIs).

7.2 Why Traditional Strategic Planning Is Being Reconfigured: Evidence and Implications

Recent strategic management scholarship frames strategy under disruption as an agile and continuously updated process rather than a fixed roadmap, emphasising iterative learning, resilience, stakeholder-centricity, and continuous adaptation to environmental change in HEIs (Kwasek et al., 2024; Hubbart, 2025). When translated into universities, this logic is reinforced by higher education-specific analyses arguing that digital practices and technologies are reshaping multiple operational and academic domains, thereby requiring strategic approaches that can evolve with competitive and technological conditions (Szalma, 2018; Fernández et al., 2023; Xie & Wang, 2023). In the pandemic context, higher education leaders identified the need to shift rapidly to online learning and to improve educational processes across organisational levels, underscoring that planning must support fast coordination and rapid learning rather than only long-cycle document production (Dagienė et al., 2022; Harits et al., 2022; Greben & Chyrva, 2025).

Two interacting environmental pressures intensify this reconfiguration. The first is the acceleration of AI as an institutional variable: AI is widely analysed as an accelerant of DT that can force HEIs to rethink strategic trajectories, governance, and educational planning due to its broad impact on institutional processes and planning assumptions (Abulibdeh, 2025; Gray et al., 2025; Oktyabrski, 2025). The second is the post-pandemic normalisation of hybrid and online delivery models, which – coupled with the recognised challenges of technology barriers, unequal access, and digital-literacy gaps – creates strategic imperatives around infrastructure, pedagogy, staff capabilities, and quality assurance (Juneja, 2021; Dagienė et al., 2022; Delgado & Cabilles, 2024; Ahmed, 2025). Taken together, these pressures make continuously revisable scenario-based strategic approaches more defensible than singular long-range plans that assume stable conditions (Alsubhi, 2025; Kushwaha, 2025; Hubbart, 2025).

Empirical evidence suggests that traditional strategic planning offers limited guidance for governing DT in higher education. Although digital tools are now widely adopted, most universities remain at an early stage of digital maturity, with initiatives typically driven by local units rather

than coordinated through institution-wide leadership and governance frameworks (Broberg & Golden, 2023; Fernández et al., 2023). Weak executive ownership and the frequent delegation of digital matters to information technology (IT) units contribute to fragmented governance arrangements, in which digital initiatives are poorly aligned with academic strategy and organisational development (Gaebel et. al, 2021). Even where formal IT plans exist, they tend to prioritise technical infrastructure over system-wide change, limiting the strategic reach of DT and reinforcing siloed practices (Fernández et al., 2023). From a governance perspective, this pattern points to a leadership deficit: without sustained senior-level coordination and responsibility, digital initiatives generate local benefits but fail to produce institutional learning or meaningful organisational transformation.

Where formal strategies and plans do exist, their thematic orientation reveals further structural patterns in how DT is governed within universities. Empirical analyses indicate that DT initiatives are most frequently framed around improving the quality and competitiveness of education, followed by enhancements in service provision, information security, and data-driven decision-making (Fernández et al., 2023). These priorities reflect an operational and performance-oriented understanding of digitalisation, with emerging technologies such as advanced analytics, cloud computing, and AI serving as the dominant infrastructural enablers.

At the same time, initiatives explicitly oriented towards advancing institutional vision or long-term strategic purpose remain comparatively rare. Evidence suggests that only a small proportion of digital initiatives are designed to support overarching institutional goals, reinforcing the tendency for DT efforts to remain fragmented and locally bounded rather than strategically integrated (Fernández et al., 2023). From a management and governance perspective, this distribution highlights a persistent gap between planning instruments and strategic coherence. It further substantiates the argument that static multi-year planning approaches are insufficient in digitally dynamic environments, and that mission-aligned institution-wide strategy – while widely advocated in principle – remains both uncommon in practice and essential for sustained organisational transformation.

A growing body of peer-reviewed research converges on the view that digital strategy in higher education cannot be reduced to technology adoption alone but requires broader organisational transformation encompassing processes, people, values, and institutional planning. Studies of DT initiatives consistently show that the notion of a "digital university" implies strategic change at the organisational level, rather than the incremental deployment of new systems or platforms (Fernández et al., 2023). From an institutional perspective, empirical analyses indicate that technological change reshapes not only operational practices but also institutional

values and modes of coordination, with digitally mature universities tending to adopt vision-driven and future-oriented approaches to transformation rather than narrowly utilitarian ones (Núñez Valdés et al., 2021). Strategic-level reviews further highlight that universities pursue diverse digital pathways – ranging from content digitisation to the expansion of online learning infrastructures – but without coherent strategic planning and adaptive capacity these efforts remain fragmented and uneven in their impact (Rivera-Gutiérrez et al., 2024). Together, this literature underscores DT as a governance and management challenge that demands institutional alignment, leadership commitment, and sustained organisational learning, rather than isolated technological upgrades.

Implementation nevertheless remains empirically challenged by several recurrent barriers. Singun's (2025) Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA)-based systematic review, synthesising twenty peer-reviewed studies published between 2019 and 2024, identifies a concept-centric matrix of DT barriers including resistance to change, insufficient Information and Communication Technology (ICT) infrastructure investment, inadequate digital skills among staff and students, weak governance, deficient leadership vision, and constrained resources (Singun, 2025). Alenezi's (2021) analysis of DT in higher education similarly identifies resistance to change among academic staff, inadequate IT infrastructure, budgetary constraints, and deficient vision among the primary impediments to institutional DT. Rivera-Gutiérrez et al. (2024) likewise report that resistance to change and the need for investment in technological infrastructure are some of the most commonly identified challenges in the strategic-transformation literature (Rivera-Gutiérrez et al., 2024). Mabotha and Ngcamu's (2026) systematic literature review converges on the same catalogue, identifying inadequate funding, employee resistance, limited digital literacy, and insufficient infrastructure as structural obstacles. Together, these four independent reviews converge on a stable finding: the principal constraints on institutional DT are organisational, human, and infrastructural, and they confirm that strategy – not technology per se – is the binding constraint.

7.3 Digital-Era Academic Strategy as Institutional Recomposition

A defensible synthesis of the referenced literature supports defining a digital-era academic strategy as a university-planning approach in which (i) DT is explicitly embedded in institutional strategy and plans, (ii) leaders align digital initiatives with mission-oriented goals, and (iii) the institution continuously develops organisational capabilities – human, structural, and governance – to execute and sustain digitally enabled change (Szalma, 2018;

Pavlova, 2020; Fernández et al., 2023). This definition aligns with research highlighting that DT has become an integral component of institutional strategies and development planning, while also drawing attention to the risks associated with underestimating digital security (Pavlova, 2020). It is further supported by qualitative studies showing that effective institutional leaders play a key role in articulating a clear vision and embedding technology use within the broader institutional mission through strategic planning processes (Du et al., 2025). In addition, multivocal reviews indicate that universities frequently initiate DT by formulating digital strategies and implementation plans that are intended to steer and structure subsequent transformation activities (Szalma, 2018; Kuzu, 2020).

Building on this definitional base, the argument developed below proceeds in two steps: first, a value-anchored reframing of strategic purpose that subordinates competitiveness and market logics to academic mission; second, a review of convergent recent evidence that DT is institutional and cultural rather than technological in character. A defensible digital-era academic strategy reads more convincingly when it is framed as value-anchored – that is, when the institution's academic mission and public-good obligations are treated as the strategic purpose, and competitiveness, efficiency, and market positioning are treated as constraints to be managed rather than ends in themselves. The scholarly literature repeatedly warns that market logics and business-oriented practices can contradict academic values and shift universities away from serving the public good towards serving the market. Strategic-leadership scholarship argues that external pressures can immobilise universities or push them towards overly market-driven behaviour that sacrifices academic legacy and values, thus requiring leadership frameworks that are attentive to values and stakeholders (Morrill, 2010; Szalma, 2018). Critical higher education scholarship on neoliberalisation and marketisation likewise documents how the importation of corporate governance styles and metric-based accountability can reorient universities away from their public-good mandate (Deem, 2004; Lynch, 2006; Ntshoe & Faller, 2025).

The literature increasingly presents digitalisation in higher education as a process that reshapes institutional values and modes of operation, rather than merely expanding the use of digital tools or IT systems. An institutional-level study based on data from the International Assosiation of Universities/ United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) World Higher Education Database shows that technological change affects a broad range of organisational dimensions, with particularly strong implications for institutional values and day-to-day operations (Núñez Valdés et al., 2021). This research highlights the central role of institutional vision in shaping DT outcomes, suggesting that

universities guided by clearly articulated missions and long-term orientation are more successful in embedding technology within their strategic purpose. By contrast, institutions that approach digitalisation primarily through short-term efficiency or utility considerations tend to encounter greater difficulties in sustaining meaningful transformation (Núñez Valdés et al., 2021). Taken together, these findings support a value-anchored understanding of digital strategy and caution against reducing DT to market-driven or purely instrumental logics.

This conceptual argument is paralleled by empirical evidence from co-created institutional strategy processes. Adachi (2024), reporting on the bottom-up co-creation of a digital education strategy at a London-based Russell Group medical faculty, identified five community-held core values driving strategy formation: (i) broadening access to education (inclusion and accessibility), (ii) flexibility, efficiency, and convenience, (iii) authentic learning for a post-digital world, (iv) a business proposition, and (v) pastoral care – explicitly positioning the business proposition as one of several values alongside, rather than above, academic, pedagogical, and relational commitments (Adachi, 2024). This empirical case demonstrates that when digital strategy is co-produced with academic and student communities, competitiveness and commercial expansion are retained as legitimate concerns but are constrained and balanced by commitments to inclusion, authentic learning, and community care. Building on earlier arguments that universities are not passive recipients of technological change but can actively shape their digital trajectories through collective action and participation, Adachi (2024) advances a value-anchored and co-created approach to digital strategy. This perspective is presented as an alternative to dominant instrumental narratives that frame DT in higher education as driven primarily by corporate edtech agendas or as an inevitable and predetermined future. By foregrounding shared values, collaboration, and agency, this line of thinking positions digital strategy as a space of institutional choice rather than technological determinism (Bayne & Gallagher, 2021; Adachi, 2024).

These strands support a coherent synthesis: a digital-era academic strategy is best articulated as mission-aligned, capability-building, inclusion-oriented, and continuously adaptive, rather than as a technology plan or a competitiveness doctrine. Competitiveness, ranking performance, and revenue expansion are legitimately part of the operating environment and can act as resource-unlocking constraints, but – following the cited literature – they should not displace the academic values, public-good mandate, and stakeholder-anchored purposes that give university strategy its legitimacy (Morrill, 2010; Pavlova, 2020; Valdés et al., 2021; Adachi, 2024; Du et al., 2025).

Recent scholarship reinforces the conceptual position outlined above by converging on a shared premise: DT in higher education is fundamentally an institutional, strategic, and cultural process rather than a narrow exercise in technology adoption. Evidence from cross-institutional and system-level reviews shows that while universities increasingly mobilise strategic instruments to frame DT, the diffusion of digital culture across the academic community remains limited, signalling the importance of institution-wide alignment beyond formal planning structures (Fernández et al., 2023). Systematic syntheses of the literature further indicate that successful DT is associated with a broad configuration of organisational conditions, including leadership, governance, strategic vision, cultural change, ethical orientation, and value creation, underscoring its complexity as a management challenge rather than a technical intervention (Bisri et al., 2023). In-depth institutional studies complement this perspective by demonstrating that DT reshapes core educational practices and roles, often creating new hybrid learning environments that transcend traditional organisational and physical boundaries (Bygstad et al., 2022). At the same time, these studies point to structural tensions arising from the parallel digitalisation of educational practices and disciplinary knowledge, highlighting the need for coordinated strategic pillars rather than isolated or sequential initiatives. Taken together, this body of work positions DT as a process that requires sustained institutional leadership, cultural integration, and strategic coherence across governance domains.

At the policy level, a closely aligned interpretation of DT is evident. International policy analyses consistently frame the strategic use of technology in education around broader institutional and societal objectives, rather than efficiency gains alone. Global assessments of technology in education emphasise that relevance, equity, scalability, and long-term sustainability should guide digital strategy, while cautioning against approaches that treat technology as a substitute for human interaction or pedagogical relationships. Within this perspective, learners' interests and educational purposes are positioned as central reference points for digital decision-making (UNESCO, 2023). Complementary regional policy studies further extend this view by situating DT in higher education within interconnected domains of governance, leadership, organisational digital culture, institutional support structures, managed organisational change, and equitable access. Rather than presenting digitalisation as a linear or technical reform, these analyses depict it as a systemic process requiring coordinated leadership and embedded institutional capacity (UNESCO-ICHEI, 2025). Taken together, such policy-level syntheses reinforce findings from the peer-reviewed literature and lend additional support to a value-anchored, institutionally embedded understanding of DT, consistent with the conceptual framework advanced earlier in this chapter.

7.4 Replacing (or Supplementing) Multi-Year Plans with Foresight and Scenario-Based Planning

Within higher education research, foresight studies are framed as a strategic approach to engaging with the future in a deliberate and constructive manner. Rather than predicting single outcomes, foresight is understood as a systematic practice that integrates multiple forecasting exercises across key domains of scientific and technological development, supporting anticipatory governance and long-term institutional planning. In this sense, foresight functions as a managerial and policy-oriented tool that helps HEIs navigate uncertainty, align strategic priorities, and shape future trajectories of scientific and technological change (Nalyvaiko, 2020). This conceptualisation supports the use of foresight not as speculative futurism but as an organised planning technology that links technology trajectories to institutional decision-making and coheres with crisis-management research arguing for integrating future thinking into crisis management to build a robust, future-oriented educational ecosystem (Dagienė et al., 2022; Thanitbenjasith & Kamkankaew, 2023). Complementing foresight, scenario planning operationalises this future-oriented stance as a concrete mechanism for strategic flexibility. Education-focused scenario frameworks argue for shifting policy from reactive interventions towards holistic, anticipatory, innovation-driven agendas (Bromley et al., 2023; Blankesteijn & Ghorbani, 2025).

Scenario approaches have been operationalised in distinct higher education contexts. A Saudi higher education scenario-planning study explores response options across funding and governance, infrastructure and digitisation, curricula, research and innovation, leadership, labour-market relationships, and social development, illustrating how scenarios can structure cross-domain strategic deliberation (Szalma, 2018; Alsubhi, 2025). In fragile contexts, a scenario approach for displaced universities identifies differentiated strategies spanning relocation, DT, security reinforcement, and programme adjustments, positioning digitalisation as critical for sustainability (Pavlova, 2020; Nestorenko, 2025). Alternative-futures exercises have been positioned as practical templates for future-proofing strategic plans, indicating that scenario work can be scaled and institutionalised rather than treated as a one-time elite exercise (Peñaranda, 2025). In synthesis, universities can prepare flexible strategies by (i) imagining multiple plausible futures, (ii) structuring cross-domain deliberation around those futures, and (iii) pre-committing to strategic options and triggers rather than relying on a single forecast-dependent plan (Alsubhi, 2025; Blankesteijn & Ghorbani, 2025; Peñaranda, 2025).

7.5 From Digital Strategy Documents to University-Wide Strategic Pillars

Evidence across DT-focused studies indicates that universities often formalise DT through digital strategies and plans that specify transformation initiatives and guide implementation sequencing (Szalma, 2018; Fernández et al., 2023). Strategic-alignment perspectives similarly argue that DT requires alignment among university system dimensions to enhance institutional position and navigate environmental changes, reinforcing the notion that a digital strategy is not merely technical but integrative across mission, services, and governance (Habib, 2023; Du et al., 2025). The "digital university" concept literature further treats the digital university as involving structure, management, and pedagogical process organisation – again implying that strategy must connect academic operations, management systems, and the educational process rather than focusing only on isolated IT projects (Ivanova, 2024). Building on this integrative logic, three strategic pillars consistently emerge across the literature as the operational substance of a digital-era academic strategy: online and hybrid education as a strategic operating model; information, analytics, and academic data infrastructures; and campus IT governance with alignment mechanisms. Each is developed in turn below.

Pillar 1 – Online/Hybrid Education as a Strategic Operating Model

Pandemic-era leadership perspectives emphasise shifting to online learning and improving educational processes across levels, positioning online capability as a university-wide strategic concern rather than a niche delivery channel (Juneja, 2021; Dagienė et al., 2022). Reviews of blended learning identify both transformative potential – improved engagement, learning outcomes, learner autonomy – and persistent constraints, including technological barriers, unequal access, and digital-literacy gaps, implying that strategy must integrate pedagogy, infrastructure, and capability development rather than assuming technology adoption automatically yields quality (Delgado & Cabilles, 2024; Ahmed, 2025). This aligns with university-leadership studies that stress professional development and continuous support to build faculty capacity for effective technology use, making human-capability investment a necessary companion pillar to online/hybrid expansion (Busquets et al., 2021; Du et al., 2025).

Pillar 2 – Information, Analytics, and Academic Data Infrastructures

Information-analytical systems (IAS) are argued to be not merely technical tools but conceptual foundations for building competitive and transparent

universities capable of meeting digital-era challenges and participating in the global higher education ecosystem (Szalma, 2018; Vdovenko & Marhasova, 2025). Complementary governance research on records management underscores that effective management of academic records is crucial for institutional success, implying that data infrastructure and stewardship are strategic enablers of operational reliability and accountability (Yidana & Akuna, 2025). Recent digital-maturity measurement work supports treating "digital capability" as multidimensional and assessable – strengthening the strategic case for explicit investment in data systems, integration, and measurement frameworks – rather than as fragmented upgrades (Fernández et al., 2023; Bravo-Jaico et al., 2025; Nguyen et al., 2025). A 2025 correlational analysis further identified digital governance as the most influential dimension shaping DT maturity among faculty, administrators, and managers, reinforcing that data-governance architecture is a strategic, not operational, matter (Bravo-Jaico et al., 2025).

Pillar 3 – Campus IT Governance and Strategic Alignment Mechanisms

COVID-19-based approaches to adapting information-systems strategic planning in universities explicitly connect the post-COVID acceleration of change to governance needs; for example, research describes COVID-19 as an external factor changing university governance and motivating structured information system-strategic-planning adaptations (Dagienė et al., 2022; Harits et al., 2022). Digital-leadership scholarship similarly argues that digitalisation has become a core governance decision issue and that leaders' digital leadership is key for promoting transformations that adapt to the "digital wave" (Xie & Wang, 2023; Du et al., 2025). Architectural approaches to university DT additionally emphasise enterprise architecture as a lens for decision-makers responsible for DT strategies, further grounding "campus IT governance" as a strategic pillar rather than a back-office technical function (Szalma, 2018; Sararuch at al., 2023).

7.6 Integrating Strategic Planning with Digital Governance: Structures, Roles, and Accountability

Policy analysis of DT in Vietnamese higher education conceptualises a three-layer implementation model grounded in national policy documents, illustrating that DT implementation is shaped by policy layering and governance structure rather than institutional intent alone (Do, 2020; Nguyen & Hong, 2026). At the institutional level, DT-leadership research identifies "vision and strategic planning" and mission alignment as core leadership practices, linking governance action to strategic-planning processes (Xie &

Wang, 2023; Du et al., 2025). Translating this multi-layer logic into concrete institutional arrangements, the literature substantiates the mechanism by which strategic alignment is operationalised: universities require leadership capacity and formal governance arrangements dedicated to aligning digital initiatives with mission and strategic goals. Agile-strategic-planning research frames agile planning as both a governance mechanism and a learning system, commonly operationalised through steering structures, committees, and designated roles (Hubbart, 2025; Kushwaha, 2025). Integrating strategy with digital governance thus reduces to a design principle: create institutional loci of responsibility for digital alignment, prioritisation, and learning.

The scope of digital governance extends beyond coordination to encompass security, integrity, and risk management. Cybersecurity-focused DT research emphasises that security aspects should not be underestimated when implementing new approaches in education and new modes of information-sharing (Pavlova, 2020), and multiple-case evidence reinforces cybersecurity as a strategic and governance issue rather than merely an operational concern (De Ramos & Esponilla, 2022). AI-era academic-integrity research argues that technical countermeasures such as digital proctoring are insufficient as stand-alone solutions and proposes ethical pedagogies and assessment redesign, implying that governance must integrate academic integrity with digital strategy as AI capabilities increase (Gray et al., 2025; Montes de Oca et al., 2025; Oktyabrski, 2025).

7.7 The Human Dimension: Culture, Faculty Capacity, and Change Acceptance

Qualitative DT-leadership evidence identifies professional development and support – including continuous training, mentorship, and communities of practice – as a major theme for building faculty capacity for effective technology use (Ahmed, 2025; Du et al., 2025; Gebhardt & Josua, 2025). Faculty-focused research finds that faculty training and pedagogical strategies dominate discussions of needs and concerns, reinforcing the view that faculty capability-building is central when institutions pursue new strategic directions requiring pedagogical change (Busquets et al., 2021). Personnel system reform research also emphasises strengthening awareness of transformation and innovative reform of university personnel systems, indicating that incentives, evaluation, and Human Resources structures condition the success of strategic renewal (Xu, 2023). Beyond formal training and HR structures, strategic renewal depends on adaptive cognition at the individual level: work on university-educator mindsets highlights that strategy depends on human sense-making and adaptive cognition rather than on

technique alone (Stewart & Wolodko, 2016; Kushwaha, 2025), and digital-leadership studies similarly position leadership capability as key to governing transformation (Xie & Wang, 2023; Du et al., 2025).

At the collective level, academic culture functions as a strategic asset that must itself be cultivated. Strategic-management research on developing academic culture in the digital era explicitly links effective education management to the development of positive academic culture and to quality improvement, indicating that culture is both affected by digital-era practices and is an input into institutional performance (Szalma, 2018; Dina et al., 2023). Studies of DT and intellectual capital argue that DT strategies shape universities' intellectual-capital components – human, relational, and structural – providing a theoretical basis for viewing cultural and capability development as part of strategic asset formation (Hartanti et al., 2024; Russo et al., 2025). Digital-era academic strategy can therefore be synthesised as a dual agenda: (i) technological and organisational redesign, and (ii) deliberate cultivation of the academic culture and intellectual capital needed to sustain change (Dina et al., 2023; Du et al., 2025; Russo et al., 2025).

7.8 Participation, Stakeholders, and Strategic Legitimacy

Stakeholder-based strategic-planning approaches are evidenced in studies that build strategic action plans from stakeholder assessments, proposing multi-themed initiatives – governance, curriculum innovation, faculty development, industry partnerships, infrastructure modernisation, and policy advocacy – grounded in stakeholder input (Libo-on et al., 2025; Zou et al., 2025), thus providing empirical examples of strategic frameworks constructed through structured stakeholder assessment rather than top-down design alone. Higher education strategic-response literature stresses that strategic planning should be based on thorough investigation of the environment (Do, 2020; Nguyen & Hong, 2026). Alongside structured stakeholder input, digital literacy functions as a second legitimacy-related capability: evidence that universities address digital literacy via requirements, course offerings, initiatives, and inclusion in strategic plans supports treating it as a strategic, institution-wide capability rather than a peripheral skill (Murray et al., 2022; Ahmed, 2025), and blended-learning literature identifies digital-literacy gaps among students and faculty, further supporting linkage of digital-literacy initiatives to strategic planning and professional-development investments (Fernández et al., 2023; Du et al., 2025).

Recent empirical evidence extends the stakeholder-legitimacy argument by demonstrating that DT reshapes how universities are perceived externally, with direct implications for institutional image, reputation, and strategic legitimacy. This research further expands the strategic scope of DT by

demonstrating its relevance for institutional image, legitimacy, and external positioning. Large-scale graduate survey analyses indicate that perceptions of university image are shaped not only by educational outcomes and labour-market insertion, but also by digitally mediated forms of communication, including the quality of institutionally shared information, the credibility of official websites, and patterns of electronic word-of-mouth. These findings suggest that universities actively construct their public image through digital presence and communication practices, rather than treating them as supplementary marketing functions (Luque-Martínez et al., 2026).

From a strategic management perspective, three broader implications follow. First, information and analytics capabilities have clear external-facing value: information quality functions simultaneously as an instrument of transparency and good governance and as a source of institutional legitimacy in the public domain (Vdovenko & Marhasova, 2025; Luque-Martínez et al., 2026). Second, digital communication and social-media engagement should be understood as strategic organisational capabilities that require coordination, investment, and leadership oversight, rather than being relegated to operational communication units. Third, the strong association between graduate identification with the institution and perceived image reinforces value-anchored approaches to strategy: institutions that foreground mission, community, and inclusion not only strengthen internal coherence but also generate durable reputational benefits in digitally mediated environments (Núñez Valdés et al., 2021; Adachi, 2024).

7.9 A Roadmap for Digital-Era Academic Strategy

This section synthesises the arguments developed across the chapter into a pragmatic roadmap for digital-era academic strategy. Drawing on research on DT, foresight, governance, leadership, and capability building, it outlines a configuration of recurring mechanisms rather than a prescriptive template. The roadmap is intended to support institutions seeking to operationalise a continuous mission-aligned strategy under conditions of technological acceleration and uncertainty.

The first cluster concerns the transition from static multi-year strategic plans to continuous strategy cycles, often described as a "living strategy". Adaptive and agile strategy research emphasises that effective planning under volatility relies on iterative alignment, experimentation, and organisational learning rather than on fixed plans revised at long intervals (Kushwaha, 2025; Hubbart, 2025). Empirical work on crisis governance in higher education further demonstrates the value of institutionalised review cadences that integrate environmental scanning, reflection on disruptions, and learning from past shocks into strategic processes (Dagienė et al., 2022; Harits et al., 2022; Thanitbenjasith & Kamkankaew, 2023).

The second cluster embeds foresight and scenario planning as formal components of academic strategy. Foresight studies conceptualise future-oriented planning as a structured institutional practice that integrates forecasting across key domains of scientific and technological development, enhancing anticipatory capacity without assuming linear progressions (Nalyvaiko, 2020; Oktyabrski, 2025). Scenario-planning research extends this approach by linking technological change to governance arrangements, infrastructure, curricula, research and innovation, leadership roles, labour-market relationships, and broader social development (Alsubhi, 2025; Blankesteijn & Ghorbani, 2025). The strategic value of scenarios emerges when they are translated into contingent strategies that define options, triggers, and preparedness measures aligned with alternative-futures frameworks, rather than remaining analytical exercises (Peñaranda, 2025; Nestorenko, 2025).

The third cluster operationalises alignment between digital initiatives, governance, and leadership. Studies of digital-transformation leadership consistently show that successful institutions articulate mission-aligned digital goals and embed them within shared strategic agendas rather than allowing technology adoption to proceed opportunistically or as a technical matter (Xie & Wang, 2023; Du et al., 2025). Governance research highlights the role of structured IT-governance frameworks, including adaptations of Control Objectives for Information and Related Technologies -oriented strategic-planning models, in supporting prioritisation, accountability, and coordination under conditions of accelerated change (Harits et al., 2022; Fitriyani & Muhammad, 2025). Within this governance logic, cybersecurity and academic-integrity concerns become core strategic responsibilities as DT increases exposure through data sharing, platform dependence, and AI-enabled misconduct risks (Pavlova, 2020; De Ramos & Esponilla, 2022; Gray et al., 2025).

The fourth cluster focuses on investment in the enabling pillars that make strategy executable. Research on online and hybrid education underscores the strategic importance of strengthening instructional planning, delivery, and assessment systems, while addressing digital-literacy gaps and participation barriers documented in blended-learning contexts (Juneja, 2021; Delgado & Cabilles, 2024; Ahmed, 2025). Parallel work on information and analytics systems positions academic records, data infrastructures, and analytics capacities as strategic foundations for institutional transparency, governance quality, and competitiveness rather than as ancillary administrative tools (Bravo-Jaico et al., 2025; Nguyen et al., 2026; Vdovenko & Marhasova, 2025; Yidana & Akuna, 2025). Architectural perspectives on the digital university further stress that transformation must be approached as a matter of organisational structures and process design, requiring coordinated management of digital architectures, academic workflows,

and pedagogical processes to avoid fragmentation (Sararuch et al., 2023; Ivanova, 2024; Bobro, 2025).

The fifth cluster foregrounds human capability and organisational culture as conditions for sustained strategic renewal. Leadership studies in DT highlight the role of continuous professional development, mentorship, and communities of practice in embedding change across academic organisations (Du et al., 2025; Gebhardt & Josua, 2025). Research on faculty needs reinforces the centrality of structured training and support systems in digital-transition contexts (Busquets et al., 2021). Human-resources scholarship further situates appointment criteria, evaluation systems, and incentive structures as integral components of institutional adaptation rather than as neutral administrative routines (Xu, 2023; Du et al., 2025). Complementary analyses of academic culture and intellectual capital position culture itself as a strategic asset essential for sustaining legitimacy, trust, and knowledge creation during prolonged transformation processes (Dina et al., 2023; Hartanti et al., 2024; Russo et al., 2025).

Taken together, the literature reviewed in this chapter supports interpreting digital-era academic strategy as a deliberate move towards continuous mission-aligned, scenario-capable governance of digital change. Rather than privileging the adoption of particular technologies, digital-transformation scholarship converges on the conclusion that successful institutional change depends on strategic capacity: the ability to align digital initiatives with academic mission, governance structures, organisational capabilities, and shared values (Kuzu, 2020; Fernández et al., 2023; Abulibdeh, 2025; Du et al., 2025). The comparative cases of the University of Helsinki and the University of Turku illustrate how such configurations can be realised at different scales. Together, they substantiate the chapter's central claim that contemporary universities should move beyond periodic fixed plans and instead develop continuous foresight-driven strategies embedded in digital governance, cultural renewal, and participatory legitimacy.

7.10 Conclusion

Traditional multi-year strategic plans are increasingly inadequate in contexts of accelerated technological change, post-pandemic uncertainty, and the rapid diffusion of AI across university functions. Research on foresight and scenario planning offers an alternative planning logic by enabling institutions to anticipate multiple plausible futures, preserve strategic flexibility, and embed preparedness mechanisms into institutional decision-making, rather than relying on single forecast-dependent plans (Nalyvaiko, 2020; Bromley et al., 2023; Peñaranda, 2025).

At the same time, the chapter shows that digital-era academic strategy cannot be reduced to planning techniques alone. Governance research

highlights that accelerated change intensifies the need for structured alignment mechanisms, clearly defined responsibilities, and institution-wide coordination of digital initiatives, particularly in relation to cybersecurity, data governance, and AI-era academic integrity (Harits et al., 2022; Pavlova, 2020; De Ramos & Esponilla, 2022; Gray et al., 2025). In this context, strategy becomes a central governance function that links priorities, accountability, and learning across organisational domains.

Crucially, the chapter reinforces that strategy in the digital era is inseparable from human and cultural dimensions. Empirical and theoretical research on faculty development, organisational culture, and intellectual capital repeatedly indicates that sustainable transformation depends on professional capability building, change acceptance, and shared legitimacy rather than on technical optimisation alone (Busquets et al., 2021; Dina et al., 2023; Du et al., 2025; Russo et al., 2025). Digital-era academic strategy therefore operates as a dual agenda: redesigning institutional structures and technologies while deliberately cultivating the academic cultures and competencies required to sustain change.

References

Abulibdeh, A. (2025). A scoping review of the strategic integration of artificial intelligence in higher education: Transforming university excellence themes and strategic planning in the digital era. *European Journal of Education*, *60*(1), e12908. https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12908

Adachi, C. (2024). "Discovery towards strategy" – Co-creating an institutional innovation strategy for digital and medical education. *International Medical Education*, *3*(4), 374–387. https://doi.org/10.3390/ime3040028

Ahmed, K. (2025). Blended learning: A comprehensive review of recent insights and challenges. *Journal of Research in Education and Pedagogy*, *2*(3), 334–345. https://doi.org/10.70232/jrep.v2i3.64

Alenezi, M. (2021). Deep dive into digital transformation in higher education institutions. *Education Sciences*, *11*(12), 770. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci11120770

Alsubhi, W. O. (2025). Anticipating future challenges of Saudi higher education and response options through scenario planning. *Journal of the Arabian Peninsula Center for Educational and Humanity Researches, 3*(26), 1–25. https://doi.org/10.56793/pcra2213261

Bayne, S., & Gallagher, M. (2021). Near future teaching: Practice, policy and digital education futures. *Policy Futures in Education*, *19*(5), 607–625. https://doi.org/10.1177/14782103211026446

Bisri, A., Putri, A., & Rosmansyah, Y. (2023). A systematic literature review on digital transformation in higher education: Revealing key success factors. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning (iJET)*, *18*(14), 164–187. https://doi.org/10.3991/ijet.v18i14.40201

Blankesteijn, M. L., & Ghorbani, A. (2025). Embracing the digital horizon: Future scenarios for the Dutch higher education system. *Futures, 174*, 103702. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2025.103702

Bobro, N. (2025). Transforming information architecture in the context of university digitalization. *Journal of Information Technologies in Education (ITE)*, *1*(57), 7–13.

Bravo-Jaico, J., Maquen-Niño, G. L. E., Germán, N., Valdivia, C., Alarcón, R., Aquino, J., & Serquén, O. (2025). Assessing digital transformation maturity in higher education institutions: A correlational analysis by actors and dimensions. *Frontiers in Computer Science, 7*, 1549262. https://doi.org/10.3389/fcomp.2025.1549262

Broberg, N., & Golden, G. (2023). How are OECD governments navigating the digital higher education landscape? Evidence from a comparative policy survey. *OECD Education Working Papers, No. 303*. OECD Publishing. doi:10.1787/93468ccb-en.

Bromley, P., Furuta, J., Kijima, R., Overbey, L., Choi, M., & Santos, H. (2023). Global determinants of education reform, 1960 to 2017. *Sociology of Education*, *96*(2), 149–167. www.jstor.org/stable/48746135

Busquets, P., Coral, J., Gomera, A., Antúnez, M., Ruíz-Morales, J., Albareda-Tiana, S., … & Rubio, R. (2021). Sustainability education in the Spanish higher education system: Faculty practice, concerns and needs. *Sustainability*, *13*(15), 8389. https://doi.org/10.3390/su13158389

Bygstad, B., Øvrelid, E., Ludvigsen, S., & Dæhlen, M. (2022). From dual digitalization to digital learning space: Exploring the digital transformation of higher education. *Computers & Education*, *182*, 104463. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2022.104463

Dagienė, V., Jasutė, E., Navickienė, V., Butkienė, R., & Gudonienė, D. (2022, February). Opportunities, quality factors, and required changes during the pandemic based on higher education leaders' perspective. *Sustainability*, *14*(3), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.3390/su14031933

De Ramos, N., & Esponilla, F. (2022). Cybersecurity program for Philippine higher education institutions: A multiple-case study. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, *11*(3), 1198–1206. https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v11i3.22863

Deem, R. (2004). The knowledge worker, the manager-academic and the contemporary UK university: New and old forms of public management? *Financial Accountability and Management*, *20*(2), 107–128. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0408.2004.00189.x

Delgado, D.A., & Cabilles, R. (2024). Challenges in the implementation of online teaching and learning in Thailand: Insights for educational policy. *Isabela State University Linker Journal of Education, Social Sciences and Allied Health*, *1*(2), 70. https://doi.org/10.65141/jessah.v1i2.n6

Dina, S., Phangesti, D., & Hafizh, M. (2023). Manajemen strategik pengembangan budaya akademik perguruan tinggi keagamaan Islam negeri di era digital. *Munaddhomah: Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan Islam*, *4*(3), 569–580. https://doi.org/10.31538/munaddhomah.v4i3.482

Do, N., M. (2020). An overview of strategic responses of Vietnamese higher education institutions. *International Journal of Educational Management*, *34*(1), 35–44. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-02-2019-0074

Du, B., Zhang, Y., Wu, Z., Li, R., Gan, X., & Cao, L. (2025). Leadership strategies for digital transformation in higher education: A qualitative study of Heilongjiang universities. *Malaysian Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, *10*(8), e003557. https://doi.org/10.47405/mjssh.v10i8.3557

Fernández, A., Gómez, B., Binjaku, K., & Meçe, E. (2023). Digital transformation initiatives in higher education institutions: A multivocal literature review. *Education and Information Technologies*, *28*(10), 12351–12382. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-022-11544-0

Fitriyani, B. Y., & Muhammad, A. H. (2025). COBIT 2019 for enhanced ICT governance: A case study at a higher education institution. *Journal of Information Systems and Informatics, 7*(1), 46–52. https://doi.org/10.51519/journalisi.v7i1.972

Gaebel, M., Zhang, T., Stoeber, H., & Morrisroe, A. (2021). *Digitally enhanced learning and teaching in European higher education institutions*. European University Association.

Gebhardt, L., & Josua, L. (2025). A reflection on the transformational leadership approach to e-learning ecologies towards the pedagogy for enhanced student learning. *NJMS*, *6*(1), 137–155. https://doi.org/10.64375/prjkas52

Gray, S., Edsall, D., & Parapadakis, D. (2025). AI-based digital cheating at university, and the case for new ethical pedagogies. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, *23*(4), 2069–2086. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-025-09642-y

Greben, S., & Chyrva, H. (2025). Challenges and opportunities in Ukrainian higher education governance. *Public Administration and Law Review*, *1*(21), 15–25. https://doi.org/10.36690/2674-5216-2025-1-15-25

Habib, A. (2023). Digital transformation strategy for developing higher education in conflict-affected societies. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open, 8*(1), 100627. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2023.100627

Harits, A., Gernowo, R., & Suseno, D. (2022). Adaptation of information systems strategic planning of universities using COBIT 2019 in post Covid-19. *JST (Journal Sains dan Teknologi)*, *11*(2), 339–350. https://doi.org/10.23887/jstundiksha.v11i2.48365

Hartanti, I., Irawan, D., & Juanda, A. (2024). The role of intellectual capital and core competencies in building competitive advantage in higher education. *Jurnal Ilmiah Akuntansi*, *9*(2), 478–496. https://doi.org/10.23887/jia.v9i2.81827

Hubbart, J. A. (2025). Lean and agile strategic planning: Reframing organizational strategy for competitive advantage (2025). *International Journal of Innovation Management and Technology*, *16*(4), 65–71. https://doi.org/10.18178/ijimt.2025.16.4.979

Ivanova, O. (2024). A model of digital transformation of the learning process in higher education. *RUDN Journal of Informatization in Education*, *21*(3), 394–412. https://doi.org/10.22363/2312-8631-2024-21-3-394-412

Juneja, K. K. (2021). Challenges and benefits of online teaching in higher education. *Journal of Global Resources*, *8*(1), 118–126. https://doi.org/10.46587/jgr.2022.v08i01.014 https://isdesr.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/01/14.-Kuldeep-Kaur-Juneja.pdf

Kushwaha, H. (2025). Adaptive strategy in the age of disruption: Rethinking strategic management for 2025 and beyond. *Tuijin Jishu/Journal of Propulsion Technology*, *46*(4), 41–52. https://doi.org/10.52783/tjjpt.v46.i04.9942 https://propulsiontechjournal.com/index.php/journal/article/view/9942

Kuzu, Ö. (2020). Digital transformation in higher education: A case study on strategic plans. *Vysshee Obrazovanie v Rossii (Higher Education in Russia)*, *29*(3), 9–23. https://doi.org/10.31992/0869-3617-2019-29-3-9-23

Kwasek, A., Kocot, M., Gąsiński, H., & Soboń, J. (2024). Navigating change: Assessing organizational agility in higher education management, examining the implementation of educational processes, and understanding student expectations for program characteristics and principles. *European Research Studies Journal, 27*(1), 215–227. https://doi.org/10.35808/ersj/3357

Libo-on, R., Mingmin, Z., & Maoyun, X. (2025). A strategic action plan for building modern industry colleges at Jiangxi University of Technology in China: Insights from stakeholder assessments. *Journal of Innovation and Partnerships*, *3*(9), 52–58. https://doi.org/10.69569/jip.2025.541

Luque-Martínez, T., Faraoni, N., & Doña-Toledo, L. (2026). Reflecting university image in the era of digitalization. *Social Sciences and Humanities Open*, *13*, 102350. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2025.102350

Lynch, K. (2006). Neo-liberalism and marketisation: The implications for higher education. *European Educational Research Journal*, *5*(1), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.2304/eerj.2006.5.1.1

Mabotha, P. A. P., & Ngcamu, B. S. (2026). Digital transformation in the higher education sector: A aystematic literature review. *Administrative Sciences*, *16*(1), 1. https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci16010001

Montes de Oca, M. A., Cavazos Salazar, R. L., Govea Berrones, M., & Solís Segovia, G. (2025). Transformación docente con IA: Agenda institucional para universidades de México y la región. *Ibero Ciencias – Revista Científica y Académica, 4*(3), 3694–3724. https://doi.org/10.63371/ic.v4.n3.a307

Morrill, R. (2010). *Strategic leadership: Integrating strategy and leadership in colleges and universities.* Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Murray, M., Pérez, J., & Fluker, J. (2022). Digital literacy in the core: The emerging higher education landscape. *Issues in Informing Science and Information Technology*, *19*, 1–13. https://doi.org/10.28945/4957

Nalyvaiko, O. (2020). Foresight – Studies in institutions of higher education. *Scientific Notes of the Pedagogical Department*, *46*, 67–74. https://doi.org/10.26565/2074-8167-2020-46-09

Nestorenko, T. (2025). A scenario approach to ensuring sustainable development of displaced universities during war. *Ukrainian Journal of Applied Economics*, *2025*(1), 232–236. https://doi.org/10.36887/2415-8453-2025-1-38

Nguyen, H., & Hong, Y. (2026). National policy analysis of digital transformation in Vietnamese higher education: Conceptualising a three-layer model for implementation. *Policy Futures in Education,24I*(*1*), 35–58. https://doi.org/10.1177/14782103251348089

Nguyen, P. M., Luu, T. M. N., Nghiem, X. H., Tran, H. T. T., & Dinh, V. T. (2025). Mea-suring the digital maturity of universities: A literature review and a proposed model for Vietnam. *Journal of Economics and Management, 47*, 485–513. https://doi.org/10.22367/jem.2025.47.18

Ntshoe, I., & Faller, F. (2025). Reframing conversations on institutional autonomy, academic freedom, and accountability in the context of emerging managerialism and corporatism in South African higher education. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, *39*(4), 217–235. https://doi.org/10.20853/39-4-7507

Oktyabrski, H. (2025). Artificial intelligence–driven transformation: Rethinking the strategic trajectories of higher education institutions. *Global Spectrum of Research and Humanities*, *2*(5), 350–360. https://doi.org/10.69760/gsrh.0250205039

Pavlova, E. (2020). Enhancing the organisational culture related to cybersecurity during university digital transformation. *Information & Security: An International Journal*, *46*(3), 239–249. https://doi.org/10.11610/isij.4617

Peñaranda, J. (2025). The "weaving of worthiness" continues? Alternative futures for a Philippine state university to 2051. *Open Access Research Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, *9*(2), 46–51. https://doi.org/10.53022/oarjms.2025.9.2.0031

Rivera-Gutiérrez, E., Higuera-Zimbrón, A., & Argüello, G. (2024). Strategic approach to digital transformation in higher education institutions. *ECORFAN Journal-Spain*, *11*(20), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.35429/EJS.2024.20.11.1.14

Russo, G., Nappo, F., Manzari, A., Cicchini, D., & Santis, S. (2025). Intellectual capital under institutional pressures: The role of digital transformation in shaping university processes. *Business Process Management Journal*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1108/bpmj-04-2025-0455

Sararuch, S., Wannapiroon, P., & Nilsook, P. (2023). The development of agile enterprise architecture for digital transformation in higher education institutions. *Higher Education Studies*, *13*(3), 69–83.

Singun, A. (2025). Unveiling the barriers to digital transformation in higher education institutions: A systematic literature review. *Discover Education,* **4**, 37. https://doi.org/10.1007/s44217-025-00430-9

Stewart, C., & Wolodko, B. (2016). University educator mindsets: How might adult constructive-developmental theory support design of adaptive learning? *Mind, Brain, and Education*, *10*(4), 247–255. https://doi.org/10.1111/mbe.12126

Szalma, E. (2018). Transforming universities for the digital age: Policies, business models, resources. *Opus et Educatio*, *5*(4), 397–404. https://doi.org/10.3311/ope.281

Thanitbenjasith, P., & Kamkankaew, P. (2023). Preparing for tomorrow's challenges: Integrating future thinking into crisis management in Thai higher education. *International Journal of Social and Administrative Sciences*, *3*(5), 215–230. https://doi.org/10.60027/ijsasr.2023.3353

UNESCO. (2023). *Global education monitoring report 2023: Technology in education – A tool on whose terms?* UNESCO. https://doi.org/10.54676/UZQV8501

UNESCO-ICHEI. (2025). *Report on digital transformation in higher education in South Asia*. UNESCO Regional Office in Bangkok & International Centre for Higher Education Innovation under the auspices of UNESCO. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000394970

Valdés, K. N., y Alpera, S. Q., & Cerdá Suárez, L. M. (2021). An institutional perspective for evaluating digital transformation in higher education: Insights from

the Chilean case. *Sustainability*, *13*(17), 9850. https://doi.org/10.3390/su13179850

Vdovenko, N., & Marhasova, V. (2025). Information-analytical system for supporting educational activities of higher-education institutions (in Ukrainian). *Herald of Khmelnytskyi National University*, *342*(*3*(1)), 279–285. https://doi.org/10.31891/2307-5740-2025-342-3(1)-39

Xie, Y., & Wang, N. (2023). The connotation evolution and enhancement strategies of digital leadership in China's universities in the context of digital transformation. *Advances in Education Humanities and Social Science Research*, *8*(1), 221. https://doi.org/10.56028/aehssr.8.1.221.2023

Xu, Y. (2023). Research on the personnel system reform of college teachers in China during the digital transformation of education. *The Northeast Asian Business and Economics Association*, *4*(1), 47–58. https://doi.org/10.51156/jnabe.2023.4.1.47

Yidana, P., & Akuna, E. (2025). Academic records management practices in African higher education institutions: Empirical review. *British Journal of Contemporary Education*, *5*(1), 93–113. https://doi.org/10.52589/bjce-jryjwent

Zou, M., Xu, M., & Libo-on, R. (2025). Stakeholders' assessment of status, challenges, and pathways of modern industry colleges at universities in China: Inputs to development strategies. *Pacific Economic and Management Journal*, *39*(4), 544–550. https://doi.org/10.70838/pemj.390409

8 Evolving Organisational Culture in Academia

8.1 From Digital Strategy to Digital Culture

Chapter 7 positioned digital-era academic strategy as a continuous, foresight-driven and mission-aligned governance process rather than a fixed multi-year document. The present chapter argues that even when strategy is well designed, governance carefully structured, and platforms appropriately resourced, sustainable digital innovation in universities depends on a slower, less visible, and more contested transformation: the evolution of organisational culture (Tierney, 1988; Trowler, 2008; Schein, 2017; Khwaja, 2020). The pivot from strategy to culture is necessary because strategies do not implement themselves and platforms do not teach themselves; both depend on the daily judgements, dispositions, and shared meanings through which academic actors interpret what the institution is doing and decide whether to engage with it (Cameron & Quinn, 2011; Padua, 2024).

Recent empirical and conceptual scholarship has consolidated the case for a cultural reading of digital transformation. Padua (2024), reflecting on the Sustainable Development Goal 4 commitment to inclusive and equitable quality education, argues that the integration of artificial intelligence and other digital technologies in education will neither produce equity nor lifelong learning unless it is anchored in a deliberately cultivated digital culture, understood not as a technical skillset but as a set of values, mindsets, and practices that guide how individuals interact with digital environments. Luthra et al. (2025) report strong positive associations between digital culture and digital knowledge management and between digital knowledge management and employee performance. The authors conclude that higher education institutions characterised by a well-developed digital culture tend to achieve higher levels of digital knowledge-management adoption, which in turn is associated with improved employee performance (Luthra et al., 2025). Similarly, Aquino et al. (2025) conceptualise digital culture as one of six core dimensions of digital transformation, alongside principles and definitions, technological support, digital tools, disruptive technologies,

DOI: 10.4324/9781042001422-12
This chapter has been made available under a CC BY-NC-ND license.

and information technology (IT) security. Their empirical findings suggest that while training interventions led to meaningful improvements across most dimensions, cultural readiness – particularly the willingness to actively engage in digital transformation – showed the least change, underscoring that cultural shifts evolve more slowly and are more resistant to change than technical competencies.

These studies converge on a proposition that cultural readiness is a precondition, not a by-product, of sustainable digital innovation in universities. The chapter therefore advances a cultural reading of digital transformation in higher education. It treats organisational culture as the historically accumulated, socially shared, and largely tacit pattern of meanings, values, norms, and practices through which institutional members interpret their work, recognise legitimate behaviour, and reproduce or contest collective identity (Bolman & Deal, 2017; Schein, 2017). Such culture is multilayered (Schein, 2017), disciplinarily plural (Becher & Trowler, 2001), politically contested (Bolman & Deal, 2017), and increasingly mediated by the digital infrastructures through which contemporary academic work is performed (Williamson, 2018). Within this register, digital transformation is best understood as the systematic reconfiguration of the alignment between cultural conditions and technological infrastructures (Vial, 2019; Verhoef et al., 2021). Where the alignment is constructed deliberately, transformation can be sustainable; where it is left to emerge accidentally, transformation tends to produce parallel cultures of compliance, fatigue, and the quiet reassertion of pre-digital habits (Marshall, 2010; Hanley, 2025).

Three premises follow from this framing. First, culture is the medium in which digital transformation occurs, not an obstacle external to it; consequently, cultural work is a first-order strategic concern rather than an adjunct to technology and governance reform (Schein, 2017; Padua, 2024; Hanley, 2025). Second, academic culture is inherently heterogeneous. It operates across multiple, overlapping levels – institutions, disciplines, departments, and informal workgroups – meaning that digital initiatives encounter a constellation of micro-cultures rather than a single, unified organisation (Becher & Trowler, 2001; Lattuca et al., 2009; Roxå & Mårtensson, 2015; Kottmann et al., 2024).

Third, cultural change in the context of digital transformation is reflexive. Digital systems do not merely function within existing academic cultures; they actively reshape them by redefining what becomes visible, comparable, governable, and rewarded within the institution. Processes of datafication, analytics, platformisation, and algorithmic evaluation subtly recalibrate academic practices and values, often beyond the scope of explicit institutional choice or control (Williamson et al., 2020; Knox et al., 2020; Raffaghelli & Sangrà, 2023; Brooks and Timms, 2025; Komljenovic & Williamson, 2025). A culturally serious account of digital transformation must therefore

attend simultaneously to how academic culture enables digital innovation and to how digital infrastructures, in turn, reconfigure culture in ways that are gradual, distributed, and not always consciously steered by institutional actors.

8.2 Digital Transformation as a Cultural (Not Only Technical) Challenge in Universities

Contemporary scholarship on the digital university has largely converged on the view that adaptation to digitally mediated teaching, research, and service constitutes a transformation that extends far beyond the introduction of new tools or platforms. Digital change is increasingly understood as a process that reconfigures organisational practices, professional identities, and the conditions under which academic work is carried out (Smith, 2006; Keengwe & Georgina, 2012; Qin, 2023). This perspective is consistent with longer-standing analyses of digitally driven shifts in scholarly knowledge infrastructures, including digital libraries, open-access repositories, and evolving information environments, which have been shown to reshape how academic actors search for, evaluate, circulate, and produce knowledge. These developments affect academic norms and routines, rather than merely enhancing technical capacity (Alhoori et al., 2019).

Conceptually, a cultural reading of digital transformation can be sharpened by drawing on three intersecting bodies of theory. The first is the classical organisational-culture literature, which conceptualises culture as a multi-layered phenomenon comprising visible artefacts, espoused values, and deeply embedded basic assumptions that operate largely beneath conscious awareness (Schein, 2017). When applied to universities, this framework suggests that the cultural challenge of digital transformation is not confined to artefacts such as learning-management systems, digital signage, or online portals but is located at deeper levels of espoused values – collegiality, scholarly autonomy, peer evaluation – and underlying assumptions about what constitutes legitimate knowledge or appropriate teaching. Where these deeper layers remain unaddressed, digital adoption tends to be fragile, superficial, and easily reversible (Smith, 2006; Marshall, 2010).

The second body of theory concerns academic culture as a distinctive form of organisational culture, characterised by professional autonomy, peer-based governance, slow accumulation of credibility, and a persistent tension between disciplinary affiliation and institutional identity (Tierney, 1988; Becher & Trowler, 2001; Henkel, 2005). From this perspective, universities function as constellations of "tribes and territories" in which disciplinary cultures operate as semi-autonomous moral and epistemic communities. Digital transformation strategies that overlook this internal plurality risk treating the university as a homogeneous organisation – an

assumption that has rarely held in practice (Lattuca et al., 2009; Dillon et al., 2014).

The third strand draws on the strategic-management literature that distinguishes digital transformation from digitisation and digitalisation. From this viewpoint, digital transformation entails a systemic re-imagining of value propositions, organisational structures, and stakeholder relationships through digital affordances. Because it addresses what an organisation is for, rather than merely how it operates, digital transformation is intrinsically entangled with cultural reconfiguration, linking strategic choice, institutional purpose, and academic identity into a single process of organisational change (Vial, 2019; Verhoef et al., 2021).

A complementary sociological lens, articulated forcefully by Padua (2024), grounds these arguments in classical sociology of education. Drawing on Bourdieu's (1977) account of the reproduction of social inequalities through education and Bernstein's (1971) analysis of educational codes, Padua (2024) argues that digital transformation in universities can either reinforce existing hierarchies through new digital divides that mirror older socio-economic divides, or it can open up genuinely inclusive learning environments, depending on whether it is accompanied by deliberate cultural work. Castells's (2009) account of the network society and Beck's (1992) analysis of risk society and lifelong learning provide further sociological scaffolding for the claim that digital change cannot be reduced to technical adoption but is embedded in broader transformations of how individuals interact, learn, and participate in society. From this perspective, the cultural framing of digital transformation in universities is an instance of a more general truth: technological change is never neutral, and educational institutions that engage with it without sociological self-awareness are likely to reproduce, rather than transform, the patterns they inherit.

Within this composite perspective, research on the diffusion of educational technologies cautions against attributing limited progress primarily to individual academic reluctance. Instead, scholars point to the constraining role of organisational culture in shaping patterns of adoption, legitimacy, and everyday teaching practice (Smith, 2006; Bridge et al., 2023). Empirical evidence from Irish higher education institutions reinforces this interpretation: institutional leaders identify resistance to change, conservative academic norms, and risk-averse cultures as the most significant barriers to digital transformation, ranking them above governance or procedural obstacles (Hanley, 2025). From this viewpoint, difficulties in adapting to rapidly evolving technologies reflect not individual deficits but the cultural conditions of academic work itself: how learning is organised, how risk and responsibility are distributed, and how collegial relations are maintained. These cultural arrangements function as decisive enablers or constraints

on digital change, shaping institutional preparedness and the pace of transformation.

Parallel scholarship on innovative culture, reviewed across multi-decade horizons, emphasises that innovation is studied as a cultural and organisational phenomenon rather than a discrete event, underscoring that sustained innovation depends on the cultural conditions stabilising experimental practices (Shuhui, Gan & Liu, 2024). Luthra et al. (2025) extend this insight by demonstrating empirically that digital culture functions as the upstream condition that enables digital knowledge management, which in turn enables employee performance, with digital knowledge management mediating the relationship between digital culture and performance. Their account of digital culture is broad and deliberately substantive, encompassing "norms, principles, actions, and customs of using digital technology within organisations" (Luthra et al., 2025, p. 9), and including the integration of digital technologies into pedagogical practices and curriculum development, encouragement of risk-taking with emerging technologies, equitable access to digital resources, and ongoing skill development.

Critical scholarship in educational technology adds an important corrective that prevents the cultural reading from drifting into managerial optimism. Selwyn (2016) has argued that mainstream EdTech discourse often combines technological enthusiasm with limited attention to social/political/economic conditions, leading to a recurring solutionism in which complex educational problems are reframed as engineering ones. Williamson (2018) shows that the platforms through which digital education is delivered embed particular pedagogical assumptions, data practices, and surveillance affordances into the infrastructural fabric of academic life. A culturally grounded view of digital transformation needs to look beyond how culture supports digital innovation and consider how digital systems themselves subtly shape culture, influencing what becomes visible, what is valued, and what is rewarded.

8.3 Characteristics of a "Digital-Ready" Academic Culture

A digital-ready academic culture can be articulated by integrating empirical and conceptual research that examines the cultural conditions supporting educational-technology innovation, organisational learning, digital readiness, and entrepreneurial behaviour in universities. Across these bodies of literature, four interrelated features recur with sufficient consistency to define a core cultural profile conducive to digital transformation. These include the legitimisation of experimentation, the institutionalisation of continuous learning, the routinisation of interdisciplinary collaboration, and an entrepreneurial orientation that frames problems as opportunities for value creation while remaining anchored in academic purposes (Leron & Baconguis,

2021; Farias-Gaytan et al., 2023; Chounta et al., 2024; Luthra et al., 2025; Poszytek, 2024; Wardani et al., 2024).

Collectively, these characteristics align closely with dimensions of digital culture shown to predict effective digital knowledge management and employee performance, with data-informed approaches to assessing institutional digital readiness, and with digital-transformation maturity models developed specifically for higher education institutions (Luthra et al., 2025; Chounta et al., 2024; Bravo-Jaico et al., 2025). At the same time, each of these characteristics is more demanding in practice than it may initially appear. Their enactment runs counter to deeply embedded academic conventions, including traditions of gradual review, strong disciplinary specialisation, and individualised scholarly accountability (Becher & Trowler, 2001; Trowler, 2008). Moreover, empirical research consistently documents structural barriers – including resistance to change, uneven digital literacy, resource constraints, and limitations in strategic coordination, training provision, and institutional support – that collectively complicate efforts to cultivate such a culture in digital-transformation processes (Farias-Gaytan et al., 2023; Kayanja et al., 2025).

Legitimised experimentation is the cultural condition that makes it acceptable, and even expected, for academic actors to try new pedagogical, research, or service practices in the knowledge that some attempts will not succeed. Studies of educational technology innovation emphasise that realising the potential of digital tools is constrained by surrounding organisational culture and that experimentation must be located as a cultural attribute rather than the private preference of unusually enthusiastic individuals (Zhu & Engels, 2014; Bridge et al., 2023). Innovation-culture research in public higher education institutions similarly treats creativity and flexibility as core elements enabling innovation performance (Leron & Baconguis, 2021). Luthra et al. (2025) provide complementary empirical support, reporting that digital cultures characterised by encouragement of risk-taking and experimentation with emerging technologies are positively associated with innovation in teaching, learning, and research outcomes, and that such cultures explicitly create conditions in which "people feel free to give information, experiment with new technologies, or adjust to digitization" (Luthra et al., 2025, p. 7). From an organisational-learning perspective, this maps onto Edmondson's (1999) finding that the willingness of team members to surface mistakes, propose untested ideas, and ask naïve questions depends on the level of psychological safety the surrounding culture sustains.

Structured continuous learning repositions professional development from a discretionary individual activity to an organisational necessity. Evidence from workforce education needs assessments emphasises that training needs are evolving rapidly and that understanding faculty and

staff priorities is critical for allocating resources to genuinely valuable learning opportunities (Dean et al., 1992; Loucks et al., 2022). In online and hybrid teaching contexts, readiness research substantiates faculty concerns and highlights institutional responsibilities extending beyond technical access to professional development, training, mentoring, and compensation (Bolliger & Halupa, 2022). Wenger's (1998) work on communities of practice contributes a complementary framing: continuous learning becomes durable when embedded in identifiable communities co-producing knowledge through shared practice, joint enterprise, and mutual engagement, rather than delivered through one-off training events. Faculty learning communities, as developed by Cox (2004), operationalise this principle by combining structured curriculum, peer learning, and protected time across an academic year. Aquino et al. (2025) show that structured exposure can advance both technical and cultural understanding within a relatively short period. At the same time, ongoing structured learning needs to be differentiated to account for diverse needs and preferences (Herman, 2012; Linder, 2017), as faculty vary widely in disciplinary cultures, career stages, prior digital experience, and pedagogical commitments. From a more sociological perspective, Padua (2024) frames a similar issue by drawing on the idea of liquid modernity (Bauman, 2000): in a context of constant skill obsolescence, lifelong learning is no longer an optional addition to formal education but a structural condition of academic work itself.

The routinisation of interdisciplinary collaboration constitutes the third cultural characteristic. Interdisciplinary collaboration is consistently linked to creative problem-solving and innovation, but it requires cultural competence, an awareness of one's own disciplinary culture, and sensitivity to others – framing collaboration as a cultural practice that demands explicit norms and skills rather than goodwill alone (Herman, 2012; Reich & Reich, 2006). Work emphasising the need to break down academic silos argues that interdisciplinary approaches foster holistic problem-solving and adaptability (Kaur, 2023; Singh, 2023). Becher and Trowler's (2001) mapping of disciplines along dimensions of pure–applied and hard–soft knowledge remains particularly instructive here: interdisciplinary collaboration is not simply a matter of bringing scholars together but of negotiating across genuinely different epistemic and social conventions. Padua (2024) points to an important pedagogical shift by treating interdisciplinarity as a core feature of Education 4.0 rather than a supplementary element. Within this perspective, teachers increasingly take on the role of designers of interdisciplinary learning environments, working as facilitators and project leaders who balance convergent and divergent modes of thinking. Addressing complex challenges such as climate change brings together insights from science, geography, economics, and ethics; it also requires teachers to develop a

more flexible and innovative mindset that moves beyond rigid disciplinary boundaries and supports deeper engagement with real-world issues.

The fourth characteristic, an entrepreneurial orientation, rounds out the digital-ready cultural profile by adding a future-facing posture in which problems are framed as opportunities for new value creation, including educational, research, and societal value. Studies of academic innovation incubators depict universities as hubs of entrepreneurial activity, aligning entrepreneurship education with cultures of innovation and creativity in technology-intensive contexts (Kaur, 2023; Singh, 2023). Empirical studies operationalise internal entrepreneurship through dimensions such as risk-taking, autonomy, and self-renewal, reinforcing that entrepreneurial culture comprises measurable organisation-level practices rather than isolated individual initiatives (Albaddawi et al., 2025). Clark's (1998) classic concept of the entrepreneurial university cautions against reducing entrepreneurial orientation to commercial activity alone. When this caveat is observed, entrepreneurship becomes a cultural posture compatible with academic missions; when it is not, the entrepreneurial label can become a vehicle for managerialism that erodes scholarly autonomy (Ruan, 2021).

A digital-ready culture, on this account, is not a single attribute but a cultural configuration in which experimentation legitimacy, learning infrastructure, interdisciplinary collaboration, and entrepreneurial orientation reinforce one another. The configuration is structurally demanding because each component is in tension with at least one well-established academic norm: experimentation can clash with peer-review conservatism; structured continuous learning can clash with the sovereignty of individual professional judgement; interdisciplinary collaboration can clash with disciplinary identity; entrepreneurial orientation can clash with collegial governance (Becher & Trowler, 2001; Henkel, 2005; Ruan, 2021). Digital readiness therefore requires not the elimination of these tensions but their explicit, ongoing negotiation. Where this design work is neglected, institutions tend to oscillate between periods of enthusiastic adoption and periods of cultural retrenchment, with technologies arriving and departing without meaningfully altering the underlying patterns of academic work (Marshall, 2010; Hanley, 2025).

8.4 Obstacles and Cultural Tensions in Digitally Driven Change

Cultural change towards digital readiness is rarely a straightforward matter of overcoming resistance. In higher education, hesitation towards digital transformation often reflects deeper tensions between institutional routines, professional autonomy, disciplinary identities, governance arrangements, and the perceived purposes of the university. For this reason, resistance should not be interpreted simply as individual reluctance, generational

conservatism, or insufficient competence. It is more productively understood as evidence of misalignment between the cultural order of academic work and the managerial, technological, and strategic demands associated with digital change.

This distinction is important for the management of digital transformation in higher education institutions. Technical implementation may proceed relatively quickly: platforms can be procured, systems integrated, dashboards introduced, and policies approved. Cultural legitimacy, however, develops more slowly. Academic actors are more likely to engage with digital change when they perceive it as intellectually defensible, pedagogically meaningful, ethically acceptable, and compatible with the values of academic work. Where digital initiatives are experienced as externally imposed, excessively managerial, weakly evidenced, or disconnected from disciplinary practice, they are likely to produce compliance rather than commitment.

A culturally sensitive interpretation therefore shifts the analytical focus from resistance itself to the conditions under which participation becomes meaningful and professionally credible. Digital transformation can expand institutional capacity, but it can also unsettle established norms of collegiality, academic freedom, disciplinary autonomy, pedagogical judgement, and scholarly identity. The key managerial challenge is not simply to persuade academic staff to accept new technologies, but to build the cultural legitimacy of digital transformation as part of the university's mission.

One major difficulty lies in the fact that universities are not culturally unified organisations. They are composed of disciplines, departments, professional groups, research communities, and informal networks, each of which interprets digital change through its own assumptions about knowledge, teaching, evidence, and professional worth. Disciplinary differences in faculty values and dispositions affect curricular and pedagogical change, meaning that digital innovation initiatives confront multiple micro-cultures rather than a single institutional culture (Becher & Trowler, 2001; Dillon et al., 2014; Albaddawi et al., 2025). Becher and Trowler's distinction between hard-pure, hard-applied, soft-pure, and soft-applied disciplinary territories remains useful here because it shows why the same digital initiative may carry very different meanings across academic fields.

This has significant implications for leadership. A cultural change strategy that treats the university as a homogeneous organisation will almost inevitably be experienced as a one-size-fits-all imposition. A more effective approach recognises disciplinary variation and asks how digital transformation can be translated into locally meaningful academic terms. The same principle applies to interdisciplinary work. Although interdisciplinarity is often valorised rhetorically, reward systems, promotion criteria, workload models, and publication conventions may still make interdisciplinary and digitally mediated work difficult to evaluate (Reich & Reich, 2006; Lattuca

et al., 2009; Klein & Falk-Krzesinski, 2017; Frogeri & Júnior, 2025). Digital transformation therefore requires not only new forms of collaboration, but also new systems for recognising and legitimising work that crosses established boundaries.

A further tension arises when digitalisation becomes associated with managerial control. Digital transformation can be perceived as threatening when it appears to import corporate governance styles into academic environments, especially when it is framed primarily through efficiency, performance measurement, standardisation, or institutional competitiveness. Top-down digital change may be read as a challenge to professional autonomy and collegial governance, particularly when decisions about platforms, data, analytics, or teaching models are made without substantive academic deliberation (Selwyn, 2014, 2016; Williamson, 2018; Ruan, 2021; Bridge et al., 2023). The cultural problem is not technology as such, but the managerial meanings attached to it.

This tension is intensified by the datafication of academic work. Digital platforms make activities visible, comparable, traceable, and governable in new ways. Learning analytics, student engagement dashboards, automated monitoring tools, and performance indicators may offer useful evidence for improvement, but they may also produce a culture of surveillance, standardisation, and anticipatory self-discipline. In such contexts, academic staff may reasonably ask whether digital transformation is being used to enhance educational quality or to increase managerial control. If this question is not addressed directly, the cultural legitimacy of digital transformation weakens.

The problem is compounded by workload, digital overload, and technostress. Digital innovation frequently adds new layers of communication, coordination, documentation, and monitoring to already demanding academic work. Empirical research on technostress shows that digital systems can intensify work pace, multiply communication channels, and blur boundaries between work and non-work time (Bell et al., 2015; Tarafdar et al., 2007; Salanova et al., 2013). Luthra et al. (2025) bring this issue into the digital-culture register by warning that digital overload may undermine precisely the engagement that digital transformation is intended to support.

This obstacle is managerial as well as cultural. If universities introduce digital tools without retiring older systems, simplifying processes, or recalibrating workload expectations, digital transformation is experienced as accumulation rather than improvement. Staff then learn a cultural lesson that is damaging to future change: innovation means more work, more exposure, and less time for deep academic practice. Sustainable digital transformation therefore requires institutional attention to workload, boundary-setting, system integration, and the reduction of unnecessary digital complexity.

Digital transformation also touches professional identity. For many academic actors, it does not arrive merely as a new set of tools. The literature

on academic identity suggests that such changes are not neutral. They can produce a sense of loss or dispossession, particularly for academics whose professional identity was formed in a pre-digital or less data-intensive institutional environment (Henkel, 2005; Clegg, 2008). This identity dimension is often underestimated in digital transformation strategies. Training programmes may teach staff how to use a system, but they do not necessarily address what the system means for professional self-understanding. Resistance will intensify if digital transformation is narrated as a correction of academic inadequacy. If it is narrated as an extension of academic vocation – supporting better learning, wider access, more robust knowledge practices, and stronger public engagement – it is more likely to become culturally acceptable.

Questions of equity add a further layer of complexity. Digital transformation does not land evenly across institutional populations. Staff and students differ in access to infrastructure, digital confidence, time, support, contractual security, language, disability status, and prior educational opportunity. Padua (2024), drawing on the Sustainable Development Goal 4 commitment to inclusive and equitable quality education, argues that digital transformation can either mitigate or reproduce inequality, depending on the culture in which it is embedded. A digital divide may reflect not only access to devices or connectivity, but also unequal access to confidence, recognition, support, and the capacity to shape digital environments. The same issue applies within academic labour. Staff on precarious contracts, early-career academics, professional service staff, and those in under-resourced units may carry a disproportionate share of digital adaptation labour without corresponding authority, support, or recognition. A serious digital-culture strategy must therefore include an equity strategy.

Finally, universities face what may be termed the evidence paradox of academic change. They are institutions whose members produce, evaluate, and contest evidence. Yet digital transformation initiatives are sometimes launched on a thinner evidentiary base than would be acceptable in the scholarly disciplines housed within the same institution. Institutional credibility is damaged when academic staff perceive that major decisions about platforms, pedagogies, or analytics are justified by managerial enthusiasm, vendor claims, or sector fashion rather than robust evidence. A culturally coherent transformation strategy must therefore demonstrate evidentiary self-discipline. It should articulate the evidence base for major digital decisions, identify assumptions, acknowledge uncertainty, and commit to evaluation and course correction.

Taken together, these tensions show that digital transformation in higher education is not only a technical, financial, or strategic challenge. It is a cultural and managerial challenge that concerns legitimacy, identity, workload, equity, evidence, and trust. The task of leadership is therefore not

to remove all friction, but to interpret friction as information. Resistance, hesitation, and scepticism may reveal where digital change has not yet been made meaningful, credible, or fair.

8.5 Mitigation Strategies: Building Ownership, Usability, and Support Networks

The mitigation strategies most strongly supported in the literature converge around ownership, development, and support. These strategies do not eliminate cultural friction. Rather, they re-channel it into productive forms by treating friction as evidence about the gap between intended change and lived experience (Dean et al., 1992; Bolliger & Halupa, 2022; Bridge et al., 2023; Hanley, 2025). Ownership begins with participatory diagnosis. Needs-assessment research shows that engaging support staff, faculty, administrators, and other institutional actors provides a stronger basis for selecting performance-improvement solutions than relying on top-down assumptions about institutional needs (Dean et al., 1992; Loucks et al., 2022). In the context of digital transformation, participatory diagnosis means asking how systems are actually used, where friction occurs, which practices are valued, which forms of labour remain invisible, and which groups are likely to be disadvantaged. It also means involving end-users before major procurement, platform design, policy implementation, or pedagogical redesign decisions are finalised.

This principle is particularly important in universities because legitimacy is closely tied to voice. Academic actors are more likely to accept change when they have been treated as participants in judgement rather than targets of intervention. Faculty-voice approaches to e-learning adoption reinforce this point by showing that digital implementation becomes more acceptable when it is responsive to the experience of those expected to use the systems (Bridge et al., 2023).

Participatory diagnosis also has symbolic value. It communicates that the institution regards academic and professional staff as knowledgeable agents rather than implementation obstacles. Hanley (2025) makes this point in relation to Irish higher education by advocating a values-based approach to co-design that builds trust, reduces resistance to change, and aligns institutional needs with professional identities. A complementary tradition is appreciative inquiry, which begins not with deficits but with existing strengths and successful practices (Cooperrider & Whitney, 2005). In cultural terms, appreciative approaches help institutions develop a vocabulary of digital transformation that emerges from their own history and mission rather than from generic managerial language. Ownership must be accompanied by structured and differentiated development. Online teaching readiness research identifies technical support, professional development,

training, mentoring, and appropriate compensation as necessary conditions for effective digital adoption (Keengwe & Georgina, 2012; Bolliger & Halupa, 2022). Aquino et al. (2025) provide recent empirical support for the view that structured developmental interventions can produce measurable gains in digital-transformation knowledge. Their findings are especially important because they also show that effects differ by role and that some cultural dimensions remain resistant to short interventions. This supports the argument that training pathways should be sustained, differentiated, and designed to address both technical knowledge and cultural willingness.

A culturally inclusive development strategy should therefore allow different routes into digital capability. Staff with limited digital experience may need foundational support, while experienced practitioners may require advanced opportunities to experiment with analytics, artificial intelligence, simulation, or hybrid pedagogy. Discipline-specific workshops can translate digital transformation into local epistemic practices, while peer demonstration sessions can make innovation visible without turning it into prescription. Such differentiation respects the heterogeneity of the academic workforce and reduces the stigma that can accompany remedial forms of training (Herman, 2012; Linder, 2017). Development should also be connected to recognition. If digital capability-building remains invisible in promotion, workload, teaching awards, leadership pathways, or professional development records, it is likely to be perceived as an additional burden. Conversely, when digital learning is linked to institutional recognition, it becomes part of professional identity. This does not mean that all academics should be required to become educational technologists. It means that the institution should recognise the forms of effort, experimentation, mentoring, curriculum redesign, and student support that digital transformation requires.

Support networks provide the social infrastructure through which such development becomes durable. Professional learning community research shows how faculty development and organisational change can be integrated through shared inquiry, collective responsibility, and sustained collaboration (DuFour, 2004; Mooney, 2018). Wenger's communities of practice and Cox's faculty learning communities are especially relevant because they show how learning becomes embedded in groups that share problems, develop repertoires, and construct meaning through practice (Wenger, 1998; Cox, 2004). In the digital context, such communities can reduce isolation, normalise experimentation, and transform individual difficulty into collective learning. These networks should include both peer and professional expertise. Peer networks are culturally powerful because academics often trust colleagues who understand their disciplinary realities. Professional service teams, learning technologists, librarians, data specialists, accessibility experts, and IT staff bring complementary forms of expertise

without which digital transformation cannot be sustained. Effective digital culture depends on the quality of collaboration between these groups. When academic and professional staff are positioned as partners, digital transformation becomes a shared institutional capability. When they are positioned hierarchically or instrumentally, transformation becomes fragmented.

Mentoring and coaching also have a role. Mentoring and coaching, well established as supports for junior and minority faculty navigating institutional change (Leron & Baconguis, 2021; Dutta et al., 2010; Han, 2019; Ruan, 2021), can similarly help staff integrate digital tools into credible academic practice.

A further mitigation strategy concerns the deliberate reduction of cognitive and tool overload. The proliferation of platforms, logins, dashboards, messaging systems, and administrative workflows can corrode engagement and reduce the perceived value of transformation. A culturally mature institution curates its digital ecosystem. The cultural payoff is considerable: staff experience digital transformation as simplification and support rather than accumulation and surveillance. Luthra et al. (2025) reinforce this prescription by recommending policies that limit excessive digital communication outside working hours and recognise digital boundary-setting as an institutional responsibility. Digital innovation also needs to be framed as an extension of academic vocation rather than as a managerial imposition. Padua (2024) argues that the success of digital transformation depends on teachers' ability to embrace new roles with confidence and adaptability, including roles as curators of knowledge and designers of learning environments. The cultural consequence of this framing is significant. When digital change is presented as a continuation of the teacher's calling, supporting critical thinking, inclusion, creativity, and access, it becomes more compatible with academic identity. When it is presented as a compliance requirement or efficiency exercise, it is more likely to be resisted.

Finally, mitigation depends on feedback and course correction. Digital transformation initiatives are vulnerable to what may be called frozen optimism: once plans are announced, institutions may find it difficult to revise them even when implementation experience shows that change is needed. Feedback loops counter this tendency by treating digital strategy as a living hypothesis rather than a fixed truth. The managerial significance of such loops is that they convert learning into governance. The cultural significance is that they show the institution is willing to listen, adapt, and revise. Mitigation, in this sense, is not a defensive activity. It is a core dimension of digital transformation management. Universities build digital readiness when they create conditions under which staff and students can participate in change with ownership, support, clarity, and trust. The more digital transformation is experienced as a collective academic project rather than

an externally imposed administrative programme, the more likely it is to become culturally embedded.

8.6 Preserving Core Academic Values while Enabling Adaptability

A persistent danger in any account of cultural change is that adaptability is presented as virtue without limit, and that core academic values – intellectual rigour, scholarly integrity, academic freedom, collegial deliberation, public-good commitment – are treated as legacy constraints to be negotiated away. The argument of this chapter is that the opposite framing is needed: it is precisely because adaptability matters that core values must be re-stated and operationalised more sharply in the digital age, since the adaptive forces unleashed by digital transformation include market pressures, platform incentives, and metric regimes that, if left to themselves, have a tendency to displace academic values rather than embody them (Selwyn, 2014; Williamson, 2018; Ruan, 2021).

Padua (2024) develops this argument through the lens of the United Nations (2015) Sustainable Development Goal 4, which calls for inclusive and equitable quality education and lifelong learning opportunities for all. She argues that the integration of artificial intelligence and other digital technologies in education is consistent with this goal only insofar as the surrounding educational culture is explicitly and operationally committed to digital citizenship, ethical engagement, and critical thinking. Drawing on Bourdieu (1977), Bernstein (1971), and Castells (2009), Padua (2024) frames quality education as fundamentally a matter of equity and inclusion. Her account of value-oriented digital culture emphasises three core commitments: cultivating "responsible netizens who respect core human values, such as empathy, integrity, and respect for others"; equipping students with the critical-thinking skills needed to "assess the credibility of online information, understand how algorithms shape what we see, and engage in responsible online discourse"; and ensuring that teachers themselves are "equipped with the digital literacy needed to foster an empowering educational experience" (Padua, 2024, pp. 187–188).

Research on academic culture in national educational discourses highlights academic culture and integrity as shaping educational strategies, implying that integrity norms are not peripheral but constitutive of academic institutions' legitimacy (Shooshtari et al., 2017). Interdisciplinary and international teaching contexts demonstrate that implicit beliefs and norms should be made explicit to ensure that participants have equal opportunities to succeed, reinforcing collegiality and fairness as forms of cultural work that become more important – not less – in digitally networked, culturally diverse universities (Kustritz & Hacopian, 2024; Herman, 2012; Han, 2019).

The literature on academic freedom in the digital age has begun to articulate the specific challenges that platforms, datafication, and surveillance pose for the conditions of free academic enquiry. Where platforms, feedback systems, and learning analytics operate outside institutional control, the structural foundations of academic freedom may be eroded even where formal protections remain intact (Williamson, 2018). Preserving academic freedom in the digital age is therefore not merely a matter of restating the principle, but of designing digital infrastructures and policies that safeguard the conditions on which it depends, including academic discretion over teaching and research, protection from excessive surveillance, transparency in data governance, and meaningful participation in decisions about digital tools.

The slow scholarship movement, articulated most influentially by Mountz et al. (2015), offers a complementary articulation: it argues that the temporal pressures of contemporary academic life, intensified by digital connectivity and metric regimes, threaten the conditions of careful, generous, and ethically attentive intellectual work, and it calls for explicit institutional commitment to slowness as a value rather than a deficiency. Padua (2024) sharpens this concern by emphasising that, even as artificial intelligence accelerates and personalises certain learning processes, "the teacher remains central in guiding these experiences, ensuring that AI aligns with broader pedagogical goals of fostering critical thinking, creativity, and collaboration" (Padua, 2024, p. 191).

A related dimension concerns the preservation of collegial governance. Universities have historically combined elements of bureaucratic, professional, and collegial governance in distinctive proportions (Shattock, 2010). Digital transformation tends to amplify the bureaucratic and managerial elements – through dashboards, performance reporting, and centralised platform decisions – while attenuating the collegial elements.

8.7 Towards an Integrated Model: An Innovative-and-Inclusive Culture for the Digital University

The argument of this chapter can be drawn together as a synthetic working model of organisational culture for the digital university. The model treats culture as a configuration rather than a checklist, and as an ongoing accomplishment rather than a state to be reached. It is built around five interlocking elements: (i) experimentation legitimacy, (ii) learning infrastructure, (iii) cross-boundary collaboration, (iv) entrepreneurial orientation, and (v) explicit integrity and inclusion norms. The first four describe the cultural conditions under which digital innovation can occur and be sustained; the fifth holds the configuration in alignment with academic mission and prevents it from drifting into managerial enthusiasm.

Experimentation legitimacy: Experimentation legitimacy is the cultural condition under which novel digital practices can be tried, observed, and refined without imposing disproportionate professional risk on those who try them. It is supported by treating innovation as organisational rather than merely individual, and by valorising flexibility and creativity as cultural attributes visible in resource allocation, recognition systems, and the everyday discourse of leadership (Edmondson, 1999; Leron & Baconguis, 2021; Luthra et al., 2025).

Learning infrastructure: Learning infrastructure is operationalised through systematic professional development and robust support, which the readiness literature identifies as prerequisite conditions for online teaching adoption (Bolliger & Halupa, 2022; Keengwe & Georgina, 2012; Linder, 2017). Aquino et al. (2025) provide direct empirical evidence that structured developmental interventions can produce significant cognitive and behavioural shifts, provided that they are sustained over time and differentiated according to participants' institutional roles. Learning infrastructure must therefore be differentiated to accommodate disciplinary, career-stage, and role variation, and supported by recognition systems that prevent professional development from being perceived as an unrewarded burden.

Cross-boundary collaboration: Cross-boundary collaboration depends on cultural competence and the explicit handling of disciplinary differences (Herman, 2012; Becher & Trowler, 2001). It requires structured opportunities for interdisciplinary engagement, recognised conventions for cross-disciplinary authorship and credit, and mechanisms such as innovation labs and cross-faculty programmes that make boundary-crossing visible and rewarded. In the digital context, cross-boundary collaboration also includes collaboration between academic and professional service staff, between faculty and students as co-designers, and between the institution and external partners (Healey et al., 2014; Padua, 2024).

Entrepreneurial orientation: Entrepreneurial orientation becomes culturally constructive when it is linked to education, incubators, and intrapreneurship practices that preserve academic missions while enabling innovation (Kaur, 2023; Singh, 2023; Clark, 1998). Hanley shows how a regionally focused, public-value-oriented entrepreneurial culture can produce digital-transformation outcomes aligned with civic mission, whereas a narrowly competitive entrepreneurial culture risks "reinforcing the status quo rather than driving meaningful change" (Hanley, 2025, p. 208). Entrepreneurial orientation is therefore best operationalised in academic terms as the willingness to take initiative, to pursue value creation in research and teaching, and to convert opportunities into projects, rather than as a transposition of corporate forms.

Integrity and inclusion norms: Integrity and inclusion norms remain essential cultural anchors. Academic integrity is positioned as foundational to educational strategy and scholarly practice, and inclusive norm-making is vital in culturally diverse academic settings (Kustritz & Hacopian, 2024; Padua, 2024). Together, these norms function as the criteria against which experimentation, learning, collaboration, and entrepreneurial activity are tested. Without their explicit articulation, the other four elements can drift in directions that are productive in the short run but corrosive over time.

If any of the five is missing, the configuration loses coherence: experimentation without integrity risks becoming reckless; learning infrastructure without experimentation legitimacy becomes ritual without effect; collaboration without inclusion norms can reproduce existing hierarchies under new infrastructural cover; entrepreneurial orientation without integrity norms can drift into instrumentalism (Hanley, 2025; Luthra et al., 2025).

Three additional observations are necessary to complete the model. The cultural change is not uniformly distributed. Within any university, some units will move faster, some slower, and some not at all. Luthra et al. (2025) emphasise this point at the institutional level, noting that research-centred and teaching-centred institutions, and public versus private institutions, embed digital culture differently, and that a single template is unlikely to suit all. A coherent institutional strategy accommodates this heterogeneity rather than seeking false uniformity (Lattuca et al., 2009; Dillon et al., 2014). The cultural change is reflexive. The institution that engages in digital transformation is itself changed by the engagement. Hanley's HEI-DT framework formalises this reflexivity by treating digital transformation as "an emergent, non-linear process shaped by multidimensional factors" (Hanley, 2025, p. xi), with feedback loops between external change forces, institutional enabling constraints, and organisational capabilities.

The model is directly connected to the wider argumentative structure of the volume. Cultural readiness is presented here as a necessary condition for the digital reconstitution of research, teaching, and the third mission. Without it, digital transformation remains confined to surface-level adoption rather than becoming embedded in academic practice. Similarly, cultural alignment is essential if new governance paradigms and leadership practices are to become durable. In its absence, institutional change may generate formal compliance but not sustained commitment. Cultural translation performs a related function in relation to human capital, marketing, and finance. It enables data-driven reforms to acquire institutional meaning rather than remaining merely measurable outputs. Cultural work is therefore best understood as the connective tissue of the new academic wave. It is less visible than the structures, strategies, and technologies it links, yet it is indispensable to their effective operation.

8.8 Conclusion

This chapter has argued that sustainable digital innovation in universities depends fundamentally on the evolution of organisational culture, and that cultural readiness is a precondition rather than a by-product of digital transformation. Even well-designed strategies and well-resourced platforms are unlikely to produce durable change in the absence of cultural conditions that legitimise experimentation, support continuous learning, enable interdisciplinary collaboration, and align entrepreneurial energy with academic mission (Schein, 2017; Luthra et al., 2025; Padua, 2024).

The cultural reading of digital transformation advanced here treats culture as a multi-layered, disciplinarily plural and infrastructurally mediated phenomenon, rather than as a homogeneous attribute that can be redesigned through managerial fiat. Drawing on organisational-culture theory, the literature on academic tribes and territories, and strategic-management work distinguishing digital transformation from digitisation and digitalisation, the chapter has framed digital transformation as the systematic reconfiguration of the alignment between cultural conditions and technological infrastructures (Becher & Trowler, 2001; Schein, 2017; Vial, 2019; Verhoef et al., 2021).

The analysis has identified four core characteristics of a digital-ready academic culture – legitimised experimentation, structured continuous learning, interdisciplinary collaboration, and entrepreneurial orientation – and three logics through which institutions can shift cultural conditions: resourcing as cultural permission, recognition as identity formation, and recombination across organisational boundaries. It has also outlined the principal obstacles to cultural change, including disciplinary heterogeneity, managerialist friction, identity costs, equity unevenness, digital overload, and the evidence paradox, alongside mitigation strategies most strongly supported in the literature, such as participatory diagnosis, differentiated development pathways, communities of practice, and reflexive feedback loops (Wenger, 1998; Bridge et al., 2023; Aquino et al., 2025).

Across the chapter, adaptability without clearly anchored values has been shown to risk cultural drift rather than meaningful transformation. Preserving academic integrity, freedom, collegiality, and inclusion in the digital age requires deliberate institutional design rather than rhetorical reaffirmation. This includes platform choices that safeguard pedagogical autonomy, governance arrangements that sustain substantive collegial deliberation, assessment regimes that frame integrity as an educational commitment rather than a surveillance concern, and equity strategies that prevent digital change from reinforcing internal hierarchies (Mountz et al., 2015; Williamson, 2018; Padua, 2024).

The integrated five-element model comprises legitimised experimentation, learning infrastructure, cross-boundary collaboration, entrepreneurial

orientation, and norms of integrity and inclusion. It offers a heuristic synthesis of these arguments. It conceptualises academic culture as a configuration in which innovation and inclusion are mutually reinforcing rather than competing objectives, and in which strategic adaptability is anchored in enduring institutional values.

Taken together, the arguments developed here position cultural work as a first-order strategic concern for higher-education leaders navigating the new academic wave. Cultural change is slow, contested, and reflexive; it cannot be accelerated by declaration or sustained by managerial enthusiasm alone. Yet when cultural work is neglected, digital transformation risks producing sophisticated platforms alongside exhausted staff and unconvinced academic communities. When cultural work is treated as integral to transformation, universities can absorb digital change while remaining recognisably universities – institutions whose distinctive value lies not in technological sophistication alone, but in the quality of intellectual life, scholarly community, and educational relationships that their cultures sustain. This conceptualisation provides an analytical foundation for the subsequent chapters addressing power dynamics, human capital, and the broader new-academic-wave argument.

References

Albaddawi, E., Alzoubi, M., & Alrahahleh, M. (2025). The impact of internal entrepreneurship practices on performance: A field study in Jordanian universities. *International Journal of Innovative Research and Scientific Studies*, *8*(4), 1282–1292. https://doi.org/10.53894/ijirss.v8i4.8056

Alhoori, H., Samaka, M., Furuta, R., & Fox, E. A. (2019). Anatomy of scholarly information behavior patterns in the wake of academic social media platforms. *International Journal on Digital Libraries*, *20*(4), 369–389. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00799-018-0255-9

Aquino, J., Alarcón, R., Guevara, L., Bravo-Jaico, J., Germán, N., Valdivia-Salazar, C., Serquén, O., Maquen-Niño, G. L. E., & Tesén-Arroyo, A. (2025). Impact of digital transformation: Assessing the knowledge and adoption of disruptive technologies in a higher education institution. *Frontiers in Computer Science*, *7*, 1611952. https://doi.org/10.3389/fcomp.2025.1611952

Bauman, Z. (2000). *Liquid modernity*. Polity Press.

Becher, T., & Trowler, P. R. (2001). *Academic tribes and territories: Intellectual enquiry and the cultures of disciplines* (2nd ed.). Buckingham Open University Press/SRHE.

Beck, U. (1992). *Risk society: Towards a new modernity*. SAGE Publications.

Bell, P., Coates, R., Colombo, E., Dolgon, C., Hernández, S., Margulis, M., & Romo, H. (2015). Globalizing the classroom. *Humanity & Society*, *39*(2), 236–253. https://doi.org/10.1177/0160597615574742

Bernstein, B. (1971). *Class, codes and control*, *Volume 1: Theoretical studies towards a sociology of language*. Routledge & Kegan Paul. http://dx.doi.org/10.4324/9780203014035

Bolliger, D. U., & Halupa, C. (2022). An investigation of instructors' online teaching readiness. *TechTrends, 66*(2), 185–195. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-021-00654-0

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (2017). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership* (6th ed.). Jossey-Bass. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119281856

Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice* (R. Nice, Trans.). Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1972).

Bravo-Jaico, J., Alarcón, R., Valdivia, C., Germán, N., Aquino, J., Serquén, O., Guevara, L., & Moreno Heredia, A. (2025). Model for assessing the maturity level of digital transformation in higher education institutions: A theoretical-methodological approach. *Frontiers in Education, 10*, 1581648. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1581648

Bridge, C., Horey, D., Loch, B., Julien, B., & Thompson, B. (2023). The impact of an innovators group on the development of a culture of innovation in the use of educational technologies. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, *39*(5), 17–32. https://doi.org/10.14742/ajet.8575

Brooks, R., & Timms, J. (2025). Institutional constraints to higher education datafication: An English case study. *Higher Education*, *90*(4), 1049–1063. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-024-01363-2

Cameron, K. S., & Quinn, R. E. (2011). *Diagnosing and changing organizational culture: Based on the competing values framework* (3rd ed.). Jossey-Bass.

Castells, M. (2009). *The rise of the network society* (2nd ed.). Wiley-Blackwell. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444319514

Chounta, I.-A., Ortega-Arranz, A., Daskalaki, S., Dimitriadis, Y., & Avouris, N. (2024). Toward a data-informed framework for the assessment of digital readiness of higher education institutions. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 21*, 1. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-024-00491-0

Clark, B. R. (1998). *Creating entrepreneurial universities: Organizational pathways of transformation*. IAU Press / Pergamon.

Clegg, S. (2008). Academic identities under threat? *British Educational Research Journal*, *34*(3), 329–345. https://doi.org/10.1080/01411920701532269

Cooperrider, D., & Whitney, D. (2005). *Appreciative inquiry: A positive revolution in change*. Berrett-Koehler.

Cox, M. D. (2004). Introduction to faculty learning communities. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, *2004*(97), 5–23. https://doi.org/10.1002/tl.129

Dean, P. J., Dean, M. R., & Guman, E. C. (1992). Identifying a range of performance improvement solutions through evaluation research. *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, *5*, 16–31. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1937-8327.1992.tb00563.x

Dillon, P., Hacklin, S., Kantelinen, R., Kokko, S., Kröger, T., Simola, R., & Vesisenaho, M. (2014). Developing a cross-disciplinary framework for collaborative research in multi- and intercultural education, In: V. C. X. Wang (ed.), *Handbook of Research on Education and Technology in a Changing Society* (pp. 593–606). vol. Volume 1, Chapter 44, Advances in Educational Technologies and Instructional Design Book Series. ICI Global,. https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-4666-6046-5.ch044, https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-4666-6046-5

DuFour, R. (2004). What is a „professional learning community"? *Educational Leadership*, *61*(8), 6–11. Retrieved from www.ascd.org/el/articles/what-is-a-professional-learning-community

Dutta, A., Kundu, M., & Chan, F. (2010). The conduct of socially valid investigation by culturally diverse researchers: A Delphi study. *Rehabilitation Research, Policy and Education*, *24*(3-4), 113–121. https://doi.org/10.1891/2168-6653.24.3.113

Edmondson, A. C. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *44*(2), 350–383. https://doi.org/10.2307/2666999

Farias-Gaytan, S., Aguaded, I., & Ramirez-Montoya, M.-S. (2023). Digital transformation and digital literacy in the context of complexity within higher education institutions: A systematic literature review. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications, 10*, 386. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-023-01875-9

Freeman, S., Eddy, S. L., McDonough, M., Smith, M. K., Okoroafor, N., Jordt, H., & Wenderoth, M. P. (2014). Active learning increases student performance in science, engineering, and mathematics. *PNAS Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 111*(23), 8410–8415. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1319030111

Frogeri, R., & Júnior, P. (2025). Interdisciplinary frontiers. *Revista Mythos*, *17*(1), 238–243. https://doi.org/10.36674/mythos.v22i1.986

Han, P. (2019). Social constructivism as a theoretical foundation of cross-cultural mentoring for foreign-born faculty. In V. Wang (Ed.), *Advances in library and information science handbook of research on transdisciplinary knowledge generation* (pp. 201–215). https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-5225-9531-1.ch015

Hanley, M. (2025). *The impact of digital transformation on higher education institutions in Ireland: A managership perspective [Doctoral dissertation, Maynooth University]*. Maynooth University Department of Education. https://mural.maynoothuniversity.ie/

Healey, M., Flint, A., & Harrington, K. (2014). *Engagement through partnership: Students as partners in learning and teaching in higher education*. Higher Education Academy. www.advance-he.ac.uk/knowledge-hub/engagement-through-partnership-students-partners-learning-and-teaching-higher-education

Henkel, M. (2005). Academic identity and autonomy in a changing policy environment. *Higher Education*, *49*(1–2), 155–176. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-004-2919-1

Herman, J. H. (2012). Faculty development programs: The frequency and variety of professional development programs available to online instructors. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, *16*(5), 87–107. https://doi.org/10.24059/olj.v16i5.282

Kaur, H. (2023). Interdisciplinary approaches in social sciences education: Breaking down academic silos. In R. Kavitha, O. R. Katoch, N. Leelavathi, N. R. Kumar, S. Dhillon, R. Tripathi, D. Shukla, A. Kritika, D. D. P. Raj, Jagadeesh, S. Mallick, & A. A. Reddy (Eds.), *Futuristic trends in social sciences V3B8* (Vol. 3), (pp. 125–132). Iterative International Publishers. https://doi.org/10.58532/V3BGSO8P2CH5

Kayanja, W., Kyambade, M., & Kiggundu, T. (2025). Exploring digital transformation in higher education setting: The shift to fully automated and paperless systems. *Cogent Education, 12*(1), 2489800. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2025.2489800

Keengwe, J., & Georgina, D. (2012). The digital course training workshop for online learning and teaching. *Education and Information Technologies, 17*(4), 365–379. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-011-9164-x

Khwaja, T. (2020). Academic culture. In Academic culture. In M. E. David & M. J. Amey (Eds.), *The SAGE encyclopedia of higher education* (Vol. *4*, pp. 29–30). SAGE Publications. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781529714395.n13

Klein, J. T., & Falk-Krzesinski, H. J. (2017). Interdisciplinary and collaborative work: Framing promotion and tenure practices and policies. *Research Policy, 46*(6), 1055–1061. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2017.03.001

Knox, J., Williamson, B., & Bayne, S. (2020). Machine behaviourism: Future visions of 'learnification' and 'datafication' across humans and digital technologies. *Learning, Media and Technology*, *45*(1), 31–45. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2019.1623251

Komljenovic, J., & Williamson, B. (2025). The political economy of datafication and platformization: Digital transformation in higher education. *International Higher Education*, (123), 15–16. https://doi.org/10.6017/895b9e0d.7313a00b

Kottmann, A., Schildkamp, K., & van der Meulen, B. (2024). Determinants of the innovation behaviour of teachers in higher education. *Innovative Higher Education*, *49*, 397–418. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-023-09689-y

Kustritz, A., & Hacopian, A. (2024). Invisible intersections: Cultural and disciplinary diversity among faculty in the international classroom. In *HEAd 2024 – 10th International Conference on Higher Education Advances. International Conference on Higher Education Advances* (pp. 921–928). Universidad Politechnica de Valencia. https://doi.org/10.4995/ HEAd24.2024.17260

Lattuca, L. R., Terenzini, P. T., Harper, B. J., & Yin, A. C. (2009). Academic environments in detail: Holland's theory at the subdiscipline level. *Research in Higher Education*, *51*(1), 21–39. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-009-9144-9

Leron, P. J., & Baconguis, R. (2021). Exploring the dimensions of innovation culture in the public higher education institutions: Towards improved organizational performance in research and development. *Journal of Research Management and Administration*, *1*(1), 36–57. https://doi.org/10.18552/jorma.v1i1.759

Linder, K. E. (2017). Training faculty to teach in hybrid settings. *Teaching and Learning*, *2017*(149), 47–58. https://doi.org/10.1002/tl.20226

Loucks, T. L., Harvey, J., Lee-Chavarria, D., Paranal, R., Lenert, K. A., Bonilha, H. S., & Feghali-Bostwick, C. (2022). Clinical and translational research workforce education survey identifies needs of faculty and staff. *Journal of Clinical and Translational Science*, *6*(1), e8. https://doi.org/10.1017/cts.2021.875

Luthra, A., Pancholi, N., Dixit, S., Singh, A., & Garg, S. (2025). Cultivating digital culture: Exploring the impact of digital knowledge management on employee performance in higher educational institutions. *International Journal of System Assurance Engineering and Management.* https://doi.org/10.1007/s13198-024-02648-6

Marshall, S. (2010). Change, technology and higher education: are universities capable of organisational change?. *Research in Learning Technology*, *18*(3), 179–192. Retrieved from https://journal.alt.ac.uk/index.php/rlt/article/view/886

Mooney, J. A. (2018). Emergent professional learning communities in higher education: Integrating faculty development, educational innovation, and organizational change at a Canadian college. *Journal of Teaching and Learning, 12*(2), 38–53. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1313779

Mountz, A., Bonds, A., Mansfield, B., Loyd, J., Hyndman, J., Walton-Roberts, M., & Curran, W. (2015). For slow scholarship: A feminist politics of resistance through collective action in the neoliberal university. *ACME: An International Journal for Critical Geographies*, *14*(4), 1235–1259.

Padua, D. (2024). Artificial intelligence and quality education: The need for digital culture in teaching. *Journal of Educational, Cultural and Psychological Studies (ECPS Journal*), *30*, 179–197. https://doi.org/10.7358/ecps-2024-030-padd

Poszytek, P. (2024). *Digital transformation in educational organisations: Leadership, innovation and Industry 4.0.* Routledge.

Qin, D. (2023). Research on university library and intelligence information service in the new period. *Academic Journal of Humanities & Social Sciences*, *6*(23), 124–128. https://doi.org/10.25236/AJHSS.2023.062320

Raffaghelli, J. E., & Sangrà, A. (Eds.). (2023). *Data cultures in higher education: Emergent practices and the challenge ahead (Higher Education Dynamics*, Vol. *59*). Springer Nature. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-24193-2

Reich, S. M., & Reich, J. A. (2006). Cultural competence in interdisciplinary collaborations: A method for respecting diversity in research partnerships. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 38*(1–2), 51–62. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-006-9064-1

Roxå, T., & Mårtensson, K. (2015). Microcultures and informal learning: A heuristic guiding analysis of conditions for informal learning in local higher education workplaces. *International Journal for Academic Development*, *20*(2), 193–205. https://doi.org/10.1080/1360144X.2015.1029929

Ruan, N. (2021). Female professors developing intellectual leadership in Hong Kong. *Journal of Comparative & International Higher Education*, *12*(6S1), 82–90. https://doi.org/10.32674/jcihe.v12i6S1.3010

Salanova, M., Llorens, S., & Cifre, E. (2013). The dark side of technologies: Technostress among users of information and communication technologies. *International Journal of Psychology*, *48*(3), 422–436. https://doi.org/10.1080/00207594.2012.680460

Schein, E. H. (2017). *Organizational culture and leadership* (5th ed.). Wiley.

Selwyn, N. (2014). *Distrusting educational technology: Critical questions for changing times.* Routledge.

Selwyn, N. (2016). *Education and technology: Key issues and debates.* Bloomsbury Academic. https://doi.org/10.5040/9781474235952

Shattock, M. (2010). *Managing successful universities* (2nd ed.). Open University Press.

Shooshtari, Z., Jalilifar, A., & Shahri, S. (2017). Ethnolinguistic influence on citation in English and Persian hard and soft science research articles. *3L: The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies*, *23*(2), 58–74. https://doi.org/10.17576/3L-2017-2302-05

Shuhui, O., Gan, J.L., Liu, L., (2024). Innovative culture: A fifty-year (1972-2023) analysis and future direction. *Journal of Innovation Management*, *12*(3), 72–101. https://doi.org/10.24840/2183-0606_012.003_0004

Singh, A. (2023). Challenges of a multidisciplinary approach in higher education. *International Journal of Advanced Academic Studies*, *5*(9), 30–32. https://doi.org/10.33545/27068919.2023.v5.i9a.1049

Smith, K. (2006). Higher education culture and the diffusion of technology in classroom instruction. In A. S. Metcalfe (Ed.), *Knowledge management and higher education: A critical analysis* (pp. 222–240). https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-59140-509-2.ch011

Tarafdar, M., Tu, Q., Ragu-Nathan, B. S., & Ragu-Nathan, T. S. (2007). The impact of technostress on role stress and productivity. *Journal of Management Information Systems, 24*(1), 301–328. https://doi.org/10.2753/MIS0742-1222240109

Tierney, W. G. (1988). Organizational culture in higher education: Defining the essentials. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *59*(1), 2–21. https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.1988.11778301

Trowler, P. R. (2008). *Cultures and change in higher education: Theories and practices*. Palgrave Macmillan.

United Nations. (2015). Transforming our world: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. United Nations General Assembly Resolution A/RES/70/1. https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/3923923?v=pdf

Verhoef, P. C., Broekhuizen, T., Bart, Y., Bhattacharya, A., Qi Dong, J., Fabian, N., & Haenlein, M. (2021). Digital transformation: A multidisciplinary reflection and research agenda. *Journal of Business Research*, *122*, 889–901. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.09.022

Vial, G. (2019). Understanding digital transformation: A review and a research agenda. *Journal of Strategic Information Systems*, *28*(2), 118–144. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsis.2019.01.003

Wardani, D. K., Sabandi, M., Setyowibowo, F., & Andriyati, R. (2024). The relationship of university entrepreneurial orientation, academic innovation performance, and accreditation as moderation. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity, 10*(4), 100373. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joitmc.2024.100373

Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge University Press.

Williamson, B. (2018). The hidden architecture of higher education: Building a big data infrastructure for the 'smarter university'. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *15*(1), 12. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-018-0094-1

Williamson, B., Bayne, S., & Shay, S. (2020). The datafication of teaching in higher education: Critical issues and perspectives. *Teaching in Higher Education, 25*(4), 351–365. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2020.1748811

Zhu, C., & Engels, N. (2014). Organizational culture and instructional innovations in higher education: Perceptions and reactions of teachers and students. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 42*(1), 136–158. https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143213499253

9 Reconfiguring Power Dynamics in the University

9.1 Why Digital Change Is Political Change

Digital transformation in higher education is often presented as operational modernisation: the replacement of paper-based processes by online systems, the extension of teaching through learning-management platforms, and the provision of dashboards for administrative decision-making. This description is not wrong, but it is too narrow. Critical higher-education studies, science and technology studies (STS), and public-management scholarship show that digital infrastructures also function as instruments of governance. They help determine what counts as quality, performance, productivity, and risk, and they redistribute the authority to define and act upon these categories (Triantafillou, 2015; O'Neill, 2015; Deem, 2004; Williamson, 2017; Komljenovic et al., 2025).

The digital stack of the contemporary university therefore materialises a particular distribution of power composed of student information systems, learning analytics platforms, research-information systems, plagiarism-detection tools, and artificial intelligence (AI)-augmented decision-support systems. This strengthens actors who can produce, interpret, and operationalise quantified indicators. At the same time, it weakens forms of contribution that depend on professional judgement, deliberation, tacit knowledge, or forms of academic labour that are difficult to quantify (Morrish & Sauntson, 2016; Seyama-Mokhaneli, 2020; Gourlay, 2024; Prinsloo, 2020).

Recent scholarship has reinforced the need to read digital infrastructure as a political-economic project rather than as a neutral technical layer. Pybus et al. (2025) argue that data infrastructures are built through specific configurations of public policy, commercial interest, technical standards, and governance rationalities. Hardy and Liu (2022) show how policy networks in China mobilise data infrastructures to bring private firms, outsourcing companies, cloud providers, and consultancies into educational governance. Saura and Caballero (2021) describe this configuration as digital academic capitalism, in which platforms, rankings, and proprietary analytics

DOI: 10.4324/9781042001422-13
This chapter has been made available under a CC BY-NC-ND license.

infrastructures reshape competition, hiring, and institutional behaviour. Across these accounts, the central point is consistent: choices about infrastructure are choices about who governs the university, on what terms, and in whose interests.

The chapter develops one central argument. Digitalisation in higher education is politically consequential because every major digital decision – what is measured, how it is displayed, who can access the data, and how the data may be used – allocates authority among faculty, executive managers, professional services, technical staff, students, and commercial actors (Komljenovic, 2021, 2022; Williamson et al., 2020; Komljenovic et al., 2025). This redistribution is not one-directional. Enterprise platforms, executive dashboards, and standardised indicators can centralise strategic visibility, while open data, shared analytics, social media, and platform-mediated collaboration can distribute information and amplify previously marginal voices (Selwyn & Gašević, 2020; Cheong & Nyaupane, 2022). The institutional outcome depends less on the technology itself than on the governance arrangements through which these competing tendencies are mediated.

Comparative scholarship also shows that the digital wave is not a uniform story of technical adoption. Ustyuzhantseva (2025) demonstrates that national strategies in China, India, and South Africa mobilise digital infrastructures as instruments of institutional futures-making, with different mixtures of central control, market-oriented restructuring, and developmental ambition. Szadkowski and Krzeski (2021), writing from a Polish and wider European perspective, warn that without deliberate instituent praxis – the collective political work of constituting the institution – universities risk becoming objects of external governance rather than political subjects capable of agency. These contributions indicate that digital higher education consists of plural political projects that universities can shape, contest, or absorb.

These claims connect directly to the analytical framework of this volume. The "new academic wave" extends Burton R. Clark's influential analysis of the entrepreneurial university (Clark, 1998) by arguing that the digital age reconfigures, rather than replaces, Clark's elements of mission, governance, funding, and culture. In Clark's "triangle of coordination", higher-education systems are positioned along axes of state authority, market forces, and academic oligarchy (Clark, 1983). The digital wave introduces a fourth, cross-cutting axis: the data-and-platform infrastructure through which the other three increasingly act. Decisions once mediated by senates, faculties, or ministerial circulars are now mediated by application programming interfaces, dashboards, and algorithmically generated reports (Komljenovic et al., 2025; Weinberg, 2025). This chapter shows that this

shift produces predictable redistributions of internal influence, but that these redistributions can be governed and contested by deliberate institutional design.

9.2 Conceptual Foundations and Infrastructural Authority in the Datafied University

To understand how digital transformation reshapes university power, it is useful to bring together several bodies of scholarship that are often discussed separately: the political sociology of higher-education governance, the literature on new managerialism, STS research on quantification and audit, and critical work on datafication and assetisation. Their vocabularies differ, but they converge on a common proposition: the artefacts through which universities are measured, compared, managed, and represented are not neutral instruments. They are political arrangements that help decide whose judgement counts, which activities become visible, and how institutional priorities are translated into action.

Clark's "triangle of coordination" remains a useful starting point because it locates higher-education systems within tensions among state authority, market mechanisms, and academic oligarchy (Clark, 1983). Later accounts showed how managerial cores increasingly mediate these forces inside universities (Clark, 1998; Salazar & Leihy, 2013), while historical analyses traced a gradual migration of decision-making authority from collegial faculty bodies towards senates, executive offices, and administrative centres (Musselin, 2009; Deem, 2004). New managerialism intensified this movement by importing accountability regimes and private-sector management techniques into academic organisations, linking funding, status, and individual careers to performance indicators (Lynch, 2006; Waring, 2013; Clarke & Knights, 2015; Parker et al., 2021). In the digital era, as Saura and Caballero (2021) argue, these tendencies become part of a wider formation of digital academic capitalism, in which platforms, rankings, and proprietary analytics infrastructures reshape the very categories through which academic value is produced and recognised.

The STS literature on quantification clarifies why this matters. Numerical instruments do not simply describe institutional reality; they help constitute it by making selected activities visible, comparable, and actionable (Triantafillou, 2015; Hillebrandt & Huber, 2020). Governing by numbers works through visibilisation, comparability, and conditional incentivisation: practices are rendered legible to scrutiny, placed on common scales, and then linked to rewards, sanctions, or reputational consequences. Each step involves value-laden choices about what to count, how to count it, and how much authority the resulting indicators should carry. Prinsloo's

(2020) work on algorithmic decision-making extends this concern to systems whose internal logic may be difficult to inspect for affected students, staff, or even institutional leaders.

Digital infrastructures greatly reduce the cost and increase the frequency of these governance operations. Learning-management systems, research-information systems, attendance applications, dashboards, and analytics platforms generate persistent data trails, standardise categories across organisational units, and allow indicators to be refreshed continuously rather than assembled periodically (Williamson, 2017; Selwyn & Gašević, 2020; Weinberg, 2025). What was once an annual review, a five-year audit, or a manually compiled report can become an always-on informational regime. The political effect is not simply more data, but a changed temporality of governance: monitoring becomes continuous, comparison becomes routine, and contesting the assumptions behind the numbers becomes harder for actors who do not control the infrastructure.

The data-driven university should therefore be understood not only as a matter of datafication but also as assetisation. Komljenovic (2020, 2022) and Komljenovic et al. (2024) show how educational content, user traces, and institutional records can be converted into proprietary economic assets controlled by EdTech firms, publishers, and cloud providers. This shifts the central question from privacy alone to the wider distribution of value: Who captures the economic and epistemic value generated by datafied academic life, and through which infrastructural and contractual arrangements? Komljenovic, Sellar, and Birch (2025) add that datafication operates across technological, legal, commercial, organisational, political, and ethical dimensions, which means that it is always uneven, contested, and institutionally mediated rather than a smooth technical transition.

These conceptual claims become visible when one examines the infrastructures now embedded in university operations. Williamson's (2017, 2018, 2019) analysis of the hidden architecture of higher education documents systems that capture traces of academic life across teaching, assessment, library use, research administration, citation practices, and survey regimes. Bygstad, et al. (2022) refine the picture by showing that digital transformation proceeds through both top-down administrative digitalisation and bottom-up pedagogical digitalisation. When these tracks converge in shared digital learning spaces, older divisions of authority become unstable. Executive teams may gain strategic visibility across the institution, while departments and faculties work with derivative, delayed, or selectively curated extracts of the same data (Selwyn & Gašević, 2020; Williamson et al., 2020; Komljenovic et al., 2025).

Weinberg's (2025) study of Power BI in Danish higher education illustrates the point with particular clarity. The platform integrates

student-information systems, learning-management data, and human-resource records into executive dashboards. Its significance is not merely technical. By privileging what can be dashboarded – making some activities continuously visible and leaving others informationally thin – the platform helps relocate interpretive authority towards dashboard designers, analytics units, and the senior managers they serve. A procurement decision can therefore reorganise institutional attention, judgement, and authority.

Commercial platform dependence reinforces this asymmetry. Learning management system providers, plagiarism-detection firms, research-information systems, and major cloud-and-AI providers have become embedded in university operations through licensing arrangements that control monetary and data flows (Decuypere et al., 2021; Komljenovic et al., 2024). The result is a partial externalisation of governance: decisions about how academic work is represented, monitored, and acted upon are partly delegated to vendors whose accountability to academic communities is indirect. Hardy and Liu's (2022) analysis of vocational education reform in China shows that comparable dynamics can also operate at the system level through policy networks that connect state actors, firms, and consultancies.

Inside universities, the redistribution of authority is equally significant. Executive offices and strategic-planning units gain influence because they sit at the apex of data aggregation; professional services units specialising in analytics gain agenda-setting power because their interpretive labour becomes indispensable; and information technology (IT) or digital-transformation units acquire de facto policy roles because decisions about access rights, logging, system configuration, and data retention instantiate governance choices that may never have been formally debated in academic bodies (Parker et al., 2021; Triantafillou, 2015; Di Giulio & Vecchi, 2023; Bygstad et al., 2022). Expertise in producing, interpreting, and contesting indicators becomes a strategic resource, while the boundary between management and academic work becomes increasingly porous (Morrish & Sauntson, 2016; Gourlay, 2024).

Whitchurch's (2008, 2013) concept of the third space is essential to this analysis. The digital university relies on learning designers, educational technologists, data stewards, research-software engineers, and learning-analytics specialists whose work blends academic and professional expertise but rarely fits into established organisational categories. Popescu et al. (2024) show that data stewards may develop local forms of privacy activism while navigating the gap between formal privacy rules and everyday data practice. These actors are not merely implementers of executive strategy; they may support, temper, or contest the centralising pull of datafication. However, their influence is seldom matched by formal participation rights in collegial governance, thus leading to a paradox: those who understand

the systems most closely are often least visible in the forums where their implications are debated.

AI adds another layer to this governance stack. As generative AI and predictive analytics enter admissions, advising, content moderation, assessment support, and administrative decision-making, authority moves towards actors who select, configure, and supervise such systems. McConvey and Guha (2024) show how algorithmic decision-making in Canadian public universities can concentrate institutional power, expand student surveillance, and automate elements of the faculty-student relationship under the language of financial sustainability. Prinsloo (2020) identifies opacity as the central governance challenge: when algorithmic systems operate as black boxes, those affected by decisions lose the conditions for meaningful contestation. The gap between rapid AI adoption and mature institutional policy therefore reallocates power by default to whichever actors control deployment decisions (EDUCAUSE, 2024; Azevedo et al., 2025).

Comparative evidence prevents this argument from becoming an Anglo-American or Northern European narrative. Ustyuzhantseva (2025) shows that strategies for the digital university in the Global South often embed geopolitical and developmental rationales into infrastructure choices. Hardy and Liu (2022) make a parallel argument for China, where vocational education reform has been shaped by policy networks spanning government, industry, and education. The politics of digital transformation is therefore irreducibly comparative: digital infrastructures may centralise, decentralise, commercialise, or nationalise authority, depending on the governance arrangements within which they are embedded.

Taken together, these literatures and examples indicate that digital infrastructures have become a distinct centre of gravity in university governance. They operate beside, and often in tension with, the collegial and bureaucratic structures that organisational theory has traditionally described. The new academic wave is therefore not a matter of new tools layered upon stable foundations; it is a structural reconfiguration in which the foundations themselves become partly digital.

9.3 Centralisation, Participation, and Autonomy in the Datafied University

Digitalisation exerts a centralising pull when it expands the visibility, comparability, and sanctionability of academic work. Under the language of evidence-based decision-making, student success, or operational excellence, digital infrastructures can strengthen executive and managerial actors at the expense of distributed professional autonomy. This centralisation operates through surveillance-capable performance management, metric fixation, the construction of academic glass cages, and algorithmic opacity.

Performance-management systems can shift from instruments of accountability to instruments of micromanagement when they are coupled with continuous digital monitoring. Annual review systems, workload models, teaching-observation regimes, and citation dashboards may produce anxiety, defensive behaviour, and reduced professional risk-taking when their outputs are linked to consequential decisions (Seyama-Mokhaneli, 2020; Morrish & Sauntson, 2016; Deem, 2004). Weinberg's (2025) Power BI case shows how dashboard routines reframe academic activity through a managerial gaze, while Calderwood (2025) and Ross and Macleod (2018) show how surveillance-rich teaching and plagiarism-detection systems alter the relational conditions of pedagogy.

The deeper concern in these literatures is not that digital tools are misused in particular instances but that pervasive monitoring, when sustained over time, may corrode the conditions under which academic work flourishes. Morrish and Sauntson (2016) argue that academic freedom is unlikely to be sustained in environments characterised by continuous compliance demands and unattainable performance targets. The argument is structural rather than rhetorical: when professional autonomy depends on protected spaces for judgement, dissent, and exploratory work, the elimination of such spaces through data infrastructures that render every activity legible to managerial review gradually transforms the institution's operating culture, regardless of the intentions of any individual manager (Boden & Epstein, 2011; Badamchi, 2022; Saura & Caballero, 2021).

The digitisation of academic performance measurement extends research evaluation into a broader infrastructure of research analytics (Krüger & Petersohn, 2022). Citation databases, bibliometric platforms, current research-information systems, and altmetric aggregators transform scholarly activity into comparable data points and shape what counts as academic performance (González et al., 2025). Rankings, h-indices, journal impact factors, and altmetrics become operational proxies for value, even when their construct validity is contested. As resources, hiring, and strategy follow these proxies, academic citizenship – peer review, mentorship, institutional service, and collegial care – can be crowded out because it remains weakly represented in performance systems (Vernon et al., 2018; Saura & Caballero, 2021; Tagliaventi et al., 2019; Teymourifar, 2026). As O'Neill (2015) argues, indicators designed to measure institutional purposes can begin to define them.

Digital infrastructures do not create metric fixation, but they intensify it. Evaluation that once required an audit, a survey, or a panel now occurs as a continuous background process: dashboards refresh, comparative tables update, and risk flags appear before any deliberative judgement has been formed (Prinsloo, 2020; Weinberg, 2025). This shortens the horizon of institutional decision-making and reduces the space in which numbers

can be interpreted, questioned, or contextualised (Triantafillou, 2015; Williamson, 2019).

Seyama-Mokhaneli's (2020) metaphor of the academic glass cage captures the lived experience of this shift. Digital infrastructures leave the formal language of professional autonomy in place while changing the conditions of visibility under which academics teach, research, and serve. Survey-based regimes such as the United Kingdom's National Student Survey, teaching evaluations linked to promotion, research-output trackers embedded in workload models, and AI-driven detection systems all make academic work more permanently scoreable (Thiel, 2019; Shah & Nair, 2012; Calderwood, 2025; Vehviläinen et al., 2017).

Algorithmic opacity intensifies these dynamics. Where conventional bureaucratic decisions could, at least in principle, be traced through a documented chain of reasoning, algorithmic decisions are often produced by proprietary models trained on data whose provenance and limitations are not disclosed in usable form (Prinsloo, 2020; McConvey & Guha, 2024). De facto authority then concentrates on the actors who configure, calibrate, and retrain such systems, while the academic community's ability to contest outcomes contracts. Even relatively transparent visualisation systems, such as those examined by Weinberg (2025), can entrench particular framings of academic activity; opaque AI systems can further entrench such framings and make them more difficult to scrutinise.

This critique is not an argument against measurement. Universities need performance information, and some digital systems can strengthen institutional learning. The decisive question is governance: Who decides what is measured, how results may be used, and what countervailing protections exist? Centralising effects are often cumulative and may appear only after infrastructures have become routine (Parker et al., 2021; Komljenovic et al., 2025). Precisely for that reason, governance design must precede normalisation rather than follow it.

The same infrastructures can also support the distribution of authority, but only when participation is designed into governance rather than added as consultation after key decisions have already been made.

Shared governance scholarship is useful here because it shows that meaningful participation requires formal support. Minor and Tierney (2005) warn against polite governance, in which ritualised consultation masks asymmetries of authority. McNaughtan et al. (2025) show that financial, political, and demographic pressures make shared governance more necessary and more fragile. Zhuang, Liu, and Hu (2022) demonstrate the importance of legal anchoring: participatory arrangements survive pressure more effectively when embedded in binding institutional rules. The implications for digital governance are direct. If data infrastructure, learning analytics, and AI deployments are decided through ad hoc executive processes,

centralisation will dominate; if they are routed through formally constituted bodies with real authority, decentralising possibilities become institutionally credible.

The argument for the formal anchoring of participation requires further specification of the motivations underlying student and faculty engagement in decisions about digital infrastructure. Bergmark and Westman (2018) distinguish three categories of justification for student participation in higher education: extrinsic motivations (benefits to the university, such as completion rates, quality indicators, and ranking position), intrinsic motivations (deeper learning, agency, and ownership of the educational process), and altruistic motivations (citizenship learning, democratic socialisation, and preparation for a future profession). This distinction matters directly for the design of digital governance. When participation is mobilised solely within an extrinsic logic – that is, as an instrument for improving the institution's measurable outcomes – it is readily absorbed by the very managerial rationality it was meant to counterbalance. This risk is reinforced by the competitive and ranking-oriented pressures that structure contemporary higher education, where quality, excellence, and institutional success are increasingly translated into measurable indicators and comparative performance metrics (Naidoo, 2018). Student and faculty involvement in decisions about learning-management systems, learning-analytics platforms, or AI tools can then be reduced to ritualised consultation or symbolic inclusion, without substantive redistribution of decision rights (Tierney & Minor, 2003; Minor & Tierney, 2005; Minor, 2006). A second contribution of Bergmark and Westman (2018) is their critique of the assumption that participation must manifest in visible public acts. Drawing on Gourlay (2015), the authors warn against treating engagement as a category that is "ubiquitous, positive and unproblematic", thereby excluding less visible forms of cognitive and academic activity, such as listening, reflection, critical silence, or considered hesitation. In the datafied university, this insight gains additional weight: dashboards, attendance applications, and engagement analytics measure only operationalisable manifestations of activity and thereby constitute a narrow definition of participation that marginalises reflective and contestatory forms of academic engagement. Recent reviews of learning analytics similarly indicate that engagement is often operationalised through behavioural traces, such as clicks, logins, task duration, or platform activity, while more complex dimensions of engagement remain harder to capture (Bergdahl et al., 2024; Johar et al., 2023). Invisibility in the data is thus transmuted into invisibility in decisions. Bergmark and Westman (2018) further document that, under neoliberal trends oriented towards performance, individualisation, and competition, the democratic values associated with participation are at risk of marginalisation. This reinforces the present chapter's claim that the statutory anchoring of co-governance in digital

infrastructure is not an optional add-on but a structural condition for preserving the political subjectivity of the academic community. This argument is also supported by research on shared governance, which shows that formal statutes and institutional frameworks can legitimise participation only when they are connected with real decision-making authority rather than merely consultative procedures (Zhuang et al., 2022; see also Szadkowski & Krzeski, 2021). Joint governance bodies can provide one route to such credibility. When faculty, IT and analytics professionals, professional services staff, third-space professionals, and students share authority over the scoping, procurement, and evaluation of digital initiatives, technical choices can be assessed against academic, ethical, and student-experience criteria before deployment (Boland, 2005; Zhuang et al., 2022). Student participation is especially important when systems monitor or shape students' educational experience. Cheong and Nyaupane (2022) show that students develop sophisticated data-governance imaginaries and articulate substantive tensions about consent, autonomy, and trust; these imaginaries are governance resources rather than inconveniences.

External expertise can strengthen this architecture when it complements, rather than substitutes for, participation. Jarernsiripornkul and Pandey (2018) show that university councils can incorporate technical and managerial expertise without undermining academic participation if participatory mechanisms are genuine. Aghion et al. (2009) similarly find that institutional autonomy and effective governance correlate with research performance, suggesting that pluralised governance and academic performance need not be opposed.

Digital infrastructures can themselves be designed for distributed deliberation. Open-data dashboards, transparency portals for algorithmic decision criteria, online deliberation platforms, and learning-analytics interfaces made available to educators rather than only to managers can all reduce informational asymmetry (Selwyn & Gašević, 2020; Komljenovic et al., 2025). The key principle is not openness as display but symmetry of access and interpretation: comparable data, with comparable support, available across institutional levels.

Third-space professionals should also be recognised as legitimate participants in governance. Because they work at the interface where digital choices become organisational consequences, their involvement improves both the technical and ethical quality of decisions (Whitchurch, 2008, 2013; Popescu et al., 2024; Fragouli, 2025). Treating them as merely administrative implementers wastes expertise and weakens legitimacy.

Szadkowski and Krzeski's (2021) concept of instituent praxis extends this argument. The decentralising potential of digital infrastructures is realised not by technical openness alone but by collective practices through which academic communities, third-space professionals, students, and external

partners re-author institutional purposes and procedures. Where such work is supported by stable forums, recognised standing, and access to comparable information, decentralisation becomes a durable feature of institutional life rather than an episodic protest against managerial decisions.

Decentralisation through digital means is therefore possible but not automatic. Dashboards can create an appearance of openness while leaving interpretive authority with executive teams; feedback exercises can solicit participation without altering decisions; and participatory language can be absorbed into managerial logics if it is not accompanied by shifts in decision rights, resources, and recognition (Williamson et al., 2020; Gourlay, 2024; Saura & Caballero, 2021).

These shifts directly affect academic freedom and institutional autonomy. Institutional autonomy refers to the university's capacity to govern its own affairs without undue external interference, while individual academic freedom protects scholars' capacity to teach, research, and speak in their professional roles (Boden & Epstein, 2011; Badamchi, 2022). It is also necessary to distinguish formal autonomy, expressed in statutes or constitutional provisions, from de facto autonomy, expressed in the everyday conditions under which academic work is conducted (Maassen et al., 2025). Digital transformation can weaken substantive academic freedom even where formal protections remain intact.

Boden and Epstein (2011) provide a particularly incisive analysis of how the transformation from collegial collectivities to managed hierarchies in universities has been mediated by techniques of accounting, audit, and surveillance. Their argument is directly relevant to the digital wave: data infrastructures extend and intensify exactly these techniques, making academic work continuously visible to managerial review and embedding evaluative logics into the routines of teaching and research. Where individual academic freedom requires protected space for judgement that may contradict institutional priorities, the systematic visibilisation of academic activity narrows that space, regardless of whether formal protections remain in force (Morrish & Sauntson, 2016; Badamchi, 2022; Saura & Caballero, 2021).

Kinzelbach et al. (2025) and Lovakov (2025) show that academic freedom can be tracked comparatively across national systems, while Reichman (2025) links such pressures to broader changes in the global knowledge order. Although many of these pressures are political rather than technological, university data infrastructures can be repurposed for surveillance, content moderation, and targeted scrutiny. Architectures that support efficiency in stable environments can support restrictive control in less stable ones. This dual-use property should be treated as a governance concern rather than as an exceptional risk.

Privacy is therefore not merely a compliance issue. Popescu et al. (2024) show that data stewards often confront a gap between formal privacy

regimes and the actual flows of personal data through systems, vendors, and dashboards. Their finding that privacy scepticism varies across organisational roles is significant because it reveals how digital architecture shapes what insiders regard as possible. Their evidence of situated privacy-protective practices among data stewards reinforces this conclusion, showing that privacy is negotiated not only through formal rules but also through everyday organisational decisions about data access, risk, and accountability. Cheong and Nyaupane (2022) identify comparable tensions among students, while Komljenovic (2020, 2022) argues that privacy debates must be situated within a broader political economy of value extraction in digital education.

Plagiarism-detection technologies illustrate the tensions at a more granular level. Originally introduced as tools to support academic integrity, these systems now operate as standing surveillance infrastructures, generating detailed records of student writing practices and shaping the trust relationships within which teaching is conducted (Ross & Macleod, 2018; Halbert et al., 2025). Vehviläinen, Löfström, and Nevgi (2017) document the emotional engagement and moral distress that educators experience in operating these systems, indicating that integrity governance is not only a technical matter but a relational and ethical one. Recent extensions of similar logics to AI-detection tools, attendance-tracking applications, and proctoring software have raised parallel concerns, often without comparable institutional deliberation about the trade-offs involved (Calderwood, 2025; McConvey & Guha, 2024; Prinsloo, 2020).

The governance implications are substantial. Protecting academic freedom in the digital era requires enforceable limits on data collection, retention, and secondary use, especially where data can feed individual evaluation (Boden & Epstein, 2011; Badamchi, 2022; Popescu et al., 2024). Institutional autonomy also becomes partly digital: a university whose data flows and whose analytical capabilities and decision-support systems are controlled by external commercial actors has ceded part of its capacity for independent governance (Komljenovic, 2020, 2022; Komljenovic et al., 2025). Finally, protections need to include third-space professionals and students, whose interactions with digital systems increasingly shape the institution's intellectual climate (Whitchurch, 2013; Boland, 2005; Cheong & Nyaupane, 2022).

Cross-national perspectives reinforce the claim that academic freedom is shaped not only by formal legal protections but also by the institutional and digital infrastructures through which autonomy, oversight, and accountability are organised. Academic freedom requires institutional independence from economic, political, and ideological pressures, yet digital infrastructures can intensify managerial oversight, and external accountability regimes can impose metric priorities (Kaczmarska & Yıldız, 2022; Gorman & Furlong,

2023). Ntshoe and Faller (2025) frame the challenge in South Africa as one of reconciling autonomy, academic freedom, and accountability under managerialism and corporatism. Ustyuzhantseva (2025) shows that the same infrastructures can be embedded in different institutional logics across the Global South, with markedly different consequences for autonomy and freedom.

9.4 Constitutional Design for the Digital University: Transparency and Checks and Balances

The preceding analysis points to a practical conclusion: power realignment in the digital university is predictable in the absence of deliberate governance design, but it is not inevitable. A constitutional response is needed: a coherent set of institutional arrangements that anchors digital decision-making in plural, transparent, and accountable processes. The framework below is not a universal prescription; it identifies design principles that must be adapted to national systems and institutional types (Ustyuzhantseva, 2025).

A constitutional response begins with joint governance bodies for digital systems. These bodies should include faculty representatives, IT and analytics professionals, professional services staff, third-space professionals, and student representatives. They should have a formal mandate to scrutinise the scoping, procurement, evaluation, and decommissioning of major infrastructures, including learning-management systems, learning-analytics platforms, AI tools, and research-information systems. Within this mandate, student representatives should have substantive participatory rights rather than a merely advisory role, especially where digital systems affect learning, assessment, privacy, accessibility, or the student experience. Following Minor and Tierney's (2005) warning about polite governance, decision rights need to be substantive and exercised through documented deliberation (Boland, 2005; Whitchurch, 2013; Cheong & Nyaupane, 2022; Zhuang et al., 2022; Popescu et al., 2024; McNaughtan et al., 2025).

Such bodies need formal anchoring in statutes, charters, or equivalent foundational documents. Shared-governance mechanisms that depend on goodwill are vulnerable to financial stress and executive urgency, while those embedded in binding rules are more durable (Zhuang et al., 2022; Yidana, 2025). Foundational documents should therefore specify which categories of digital decisions require collective approval, what information must be disclosed before approval, and what procedural protections apply.

Digital governance also requires enforceable limits on surveillance and secondary use. Learning-analytics data collected to support students should not be repurposed for individual instructor evaluation without explicit safeguards; teaching-observation outputs should have retention limits; plagiarism-detection records should not become individual surveillance

profiles; and AI-generated risk flags should inform human deliberation rather than automatically trigger adverse consequences (Morrish & Sauntson, 2016; Seyama-Mokhaneli, 2020; Boden & Epstein, 2011; Popescu et al., 2024). These limits do not prohibit performance data. They distinguish institutional learning from individual monitoring.

Metrics and indicators should be subject to regular deliberative review. O'Neill (2015), Thelwall and Kousha (2025), and Teymourifar (2026) all show that indicator systems can produce perverse incentives and distortion effects. Universities should therefore examine whether their key indicators still serve institutional purposes, whether they have produced unintended behaviours, and whether they should be revised or retired. Weinberg's (2025) analysis adds that visualisation infrastructures should also be reviewed because the decision about what to surface and how to surface it frames academic work.

AI governance requires particular attention to transparency, human oversight, accountability, and equitable access (McConvey & Guha, 2024; Azevedo et al., 2025; EDUCAUSE, 2024; Prinsloo, 2020). Standing committees with explicit decision rights, public registers of deployed AI tools, procedures for pre-deployment assessment, and routes for contesting AI-influenced decisions are emerging as minimum conditions for legitimate use.

Critical reflection on digital governance also requires situating the analysis within a wider debate about the model of development that digital infrastructures in practice support. In their editorial introduction to a special section of *Comparative Education Review* on critical perspectives on universities and the Sustainable Development Goals, McCowan and Buckner (2025) advance three observations of direct relevance to the present argument. First, they argue that the growing prominence of international and national university rankings, alongside internal performance metrics, has pushed institutions along a path of endless searching for elite indicators at the expense of community engagement, social justice, and slow scholarship (McCowan & Buckner, 2025). This observation extends the chapter's analysis of metric fixation. Drawing on Seyama-Mokhaneli's (2020) critique of academic constraint, it reconceptualises this condition as an academic glass cage: a digitally mediated regime of visibility, measurement, and comparison in which academics and institutions appear to operate in open and transparent environments, yet are increasingly constrained by rankings, dashboards, indicators and performance metrics. Rankings and managerial dashboards are therefore not merely technical tools of measurement but manifestations of a broader fetishisation of competition (Naidoo, 2018) that structurally reinforces disparities in both resources and symbolic capital within and between institutions.

McCowan and Buckner (2025) argue that the dominant model of the university – anchored in Enlightenment ideals of empiricism and rationalism – rests on an epistemic monoculture in which progress is conceived linearly and knowledge is accumulated within a historically specific Western-derived framework. In global higher education policy and evaluation, this framework is frequently presented as epistemically neutral and broadly transferable across contexts, rather than as one tradition among others. Applied to the analysis of datafication, this implies that digital infrastructure does not merely reflect such a monoculture but actively reproduces it. Standardised data categories, international taxonomies of indicators, and bibliometric platforms impose a single epistemological order on diverse national and cultural contexts (compare Ustyuzhantseva, 2025; Hardy & Liu, 2022). This consideration strengthens the chapter's comparative argument that the digital transformation of the university is not a neutral process of technological globalisation but a vehicle for a particular geopolitics of knowledge. The authors introduce a distinction between the projective, expressive, and constructive roles of the university, emphasising the last – namely, the institution's capacity to question and reformulate the very idea of development (McCowan, 2023, as discussed in McCowan & Buckner, 2025). In the context of the constitutional design of digital governance, this implies that procedural safeguards, such as joint decision-making bodies, data retention limits, and indicator reviews, should be complemented by deeper constructive work that revises the epistemic assumptions embedded in infrastructure. Alternative traditions invoked in the volume edited by these authors, including sumak kawsay in the Andean region, Ubuntu in southern Africa, the Tao of Great Learning in the Confucian tradition, and the Realm of Relations articulated by the Ecoversities Alliance, offer alternative visions of the university in which reciprocity, care, and a plurality of knowledge systems function as institutional principles rather than rhetorical embellishments (Mandel et al., 2021; Mutanga & Marovah, 2023, both discussed in McCowan & Buckner, 2025).

Universities must also negotiate digital sovereignty. Dependence on a few commercial EdTech vendors cannot be solved by internal governance alone (Komljenovic, 2020, 2022; Williamson et al., 2020; Komljenovic et al., 2025). Institutions, preferably through national or regional consortia, should protect control over data flows, intellectual property, interoperability, audit rights, and algorithmic transparency. Open standards, migration capacity, and contractual rights of inspection matter because individual universities bargaining with planetary-scale vendors occupy a structurally weak position (Komljenovic et al., 2024). Bygstad et al. (2022) add that institutional architectures should allow top-down and bottom-up digitalisation to coexist without one colonising the other.

Digital governance should be evaluated against its effects on autonomy, trust, and legitimacy. Aghion et al. (2009) show that institutional autonomy and academic performance are positively related; autonomy is therefore not only a normative principle but also a condition for excellence. Governance arrangements should ask whether a system expands or contracts the space for professional judgement, whether it supports or erodes trust between faculty, students, colleagues, and publics, and whether its reputational effects strengthen or weaken institutional legitimacy (Ntshoe & Faller, 2025; Luque-Martínez et al., 2026).

In this sense, constitutional design is not an anti-digital stance. It is the condition under which digital transformation can remain aligned with academic purposes rather than becoming a vehicle for unexamined managerial, commercial, or political control.

9.5 Conclusion

Digital transformation in higher education is unavoidably political. It expands the capacity to measure, monitor, and manage academic activity, thereby redistributing organisational authority towards those positioned to design, operate, and interpret data systems. Whether the result is a centralised university governed through executive dashboards or a more distributed university supported by pluralised expertise depends on the formal structures through which institutions mediate these tensions.

This conclusion sits at the heart of the new academic wave framework. Clark's (1983, 1998) analysis identified state authority, market mechanisms, academic oligarchy, and managerial cores as forces shaping higher education. The digital wave does not displace these forces: it changes the media through which they operate. State accountability increasingly works through reporting infrastructures rather than paper audits (Hardy & Liu, 2022). Market signals increasingly reach universities through continuous flows of comparative data – such as rankings, benchmarks, dashboards, and performance indicators – rather than solely through discrete competitive shocks, such as enrolment losses, ranking declines, or funding failures (Saura & Caballero, 2021; Teymourifar, 2026). Academic authority is mediated by quantified outputs, and managerial cores operate through dashboards and algorithmic decision support (Prinsloo, 2020; McConvey & Guha, 2024; Komljenovic et al., 2025; Weinberg, 2025). The new variable is the architecture of digital and governance infrastructure.

The implications are clear. Decisions about digital systems must be treated as governance decisions. Choosing a learning-management system also shapes how teaching may be monitored; adopting a research-information system helps define research productivity; deploying an AI advising tool

redraws the boundary between automation and professional judgement. Treating such matters as technical procurement delegates governance to the actors who control technical decisions, often executive offices working with commercial vendors (Komljenovic, 2020, 2022; Williamson et al., 2020; Pybus et al., 2025).

Participatory governance must therefore be formally anchored and substantively activated. Polite consultation is insufficient. Statute-based authorisation, plurally composed bodies with real decision rights, and informational symmetry across institutional levels are the conditions under which participation can do meaningful work (Minor & Tierney, 2005; Zhuang et al., 2022; Szadkowski & Krzeski, 2021; McNaughtan et al., 2025). These arrangements do not simply slow action; they make action legitimate, contestable, and durable.

Academic freedom and institutional autonomy also require digital-era protections. Limits on surveillance, deliberative review of metrics, transparency in algorithmic decision-making, meaningful human oversight, and negotiated limits on dependence on commercial infrastructures are not obstacles to transformation: they are conditions under which digital transformation can serve, rather than undermine, the public mission of the university (Boden & Epstein, 2011; Badamchi, 2022; Komljenovic et al., 2024; Popescu et al., 2024).

Speculatively, the universities most likely to navigate the new academic wave successfully will be those that treat digital infrastructure as a constitutional matter: an arena in which the values of academic life – collegiality, professional autonomy, academic freedom, and public service – are re-instantiated in code, contracts, and governance protocols. This is not an empirical finding but a theoretically grounded proposition that follows from the chapter's analysis.

The chapter has shown that digitalisation is both a centralising and a decentralising force; that outcomes depend on governance design; and that the available design choices are already visible in existing scholarship, even if their adoption remains uneven. The new academic wave is not something universities merely undergo. It is a process whose trajectory they can shape, provided they recognise its political character and respond institutionally rather than merely technically.

References

Aghion, P., Dewatripont, M., Hoxby, C. M., Mas-Colell, A., & Sapir, A. (2009). *The governance and performance of research universities: Evidence from Europe and the U.S.* National Bureau of Economic Research. https://doi.org/10.3386/w14851

Azevedo, L., Robles, P., Best, E., & Mallinson, D. J. (2025). Institutional policies on artificial intelligence in higher education: Frameworks and best practices for faculty. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, 2025*(188), 70–78. https://doi.org/10.1002/ace.70013

Badamchi, D. K. (2022). Academic freedom: How to conceptualize and justify it? *Philosophy & Social Criticism, 48*(4), 619–630. https://doi.org/10.1177/01914537211072888

Bergdahl, N., Nouri, J., Fors, U., & Knutsson, O. (2024). Unpacking student engagement in higher education learning analytics: A systematic review. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 21*, 62. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-024-00493-y

Bergmark, U., & Westman, S. (2018). Student participation within teacher education: Emphasising democratic values, engagement and learning for a future profession. *Higher Education Research & Development*, *37*(7), 1352–1365. https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2018.1484708

Boden, R., & Epstein, D. (2011) A Flat Earth Society? Imagining academic freedom. *The Sociological Review*, *59*, 476–495. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-954X.2011.02014.x

Boland, J. A. (2005). Student participation in shared governance: A means of advancing democratic values?. *Tertiary Education and Management, 11*, 199–217. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11233-005-5099-3

Bygstad, B., Øvrelid, E., Ludvigsen, S., & Dæhlen, M. (2022). From dual digitalization to digital learning space: Exploring the digital transformation of higher education. *Computers & Education, 182*, 104463. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2022.104463

Calderwood, S. (2025). Surveillance digitisation, performativity, and teacher-student relationships in a blended learning setting. *Postdigital Science and Education*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1007/s42438-024-00537-6

Cheong, P. H., & Nyaupane, P. (2022). Smart campus communication, Internet of Things, and data governance: Understanding student tensions and imaginaries. *Big Data & Society, 9*(1), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1177/20539517221092656

Clark, B. R. (1983). *The higher education system. Academic organization in cross-national perspective*. University of California Press .

Clark, B. R. (1998). *Creating Entrepreneurial Universities: Organizational pathways of transformation*. IUA Press & Pergamon.

Clarke, C. A., & Knights, D. (2015). Careering through academia: Securing identities or engaging ethical subjectivities? *Human Relations*, *68*(12), 1865–1888. https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726715570978

Decuypere, M., Grimaldi, E., & Landri, P. (2021). Introduction: Critical studies of digital education platforms. *Critical Studies in Education*, *62*(1), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1080/17508487.2020.1866050

Deem, R. (2004). The knowledge worker, the manager-academic and the contemporary UK university: New and old forms of public management? *Financial Accountability & Management*, *20*(2), 107–128. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0408.2004.00189.x

Di Giulio, M., & Vecchi, G. (2023). Implementing digitalization in the public sector: Technologies, agency, and governance. *Public Policy and Administration, 38*(2), 197–220. https://doi.org/10.1177/09520767211023283

EDUCAUSE. (2024). *2024 EDUCAUSE AI landscape study*. EDUCAUSE.www.educause.edu/

Fragouli, E. (2025). Leading and managing pedagogical innovation in hybrid universities: A case study of faculty adaptation to digital work. *The Business & Management Review*, *16*(3), 28–40.

González, P., Fors, M., & Torres, A. (2025). Altmetrics in the evaluation of scholarly impact: A systematic and critical literature review. *Frontiers in Research Metrics and Analytics, 10*, 1693304. https://doi.org/10.3389/frma.2025.1693304

Gorman, A., & Furlong, C. (2023). Partnership or prescription: a critical discourse analysis of HEI-school partnership policy in the Republic of Ireland. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, *51*(2), 198–212. https://doi.org/10.1080/1359866X.2023.2177139

Gourlay, L. (2015). 'Student engagement' and the tyranny of participation. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *20*(4), 402–411. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2015.1020784

Gourlay, L. (2024). Generative AIs, more-than-human authorship, and Husserl's phenomenological 'horizons'. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Networked Learning*, *14*(1), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.54337/nlc.v14i1.8078

Halbert, J. D., DiMatteo-Gibson, D., Cabrera, M., Mazurowski, T., & Ingram, M. (2025). Artificial intelligence and plagiarism. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration, 28*(1), 1–15 . https://ojdla.com/articles/artificial-intelligence-and-plagiarism

Hardy, I., & Liu, S. (2022). Complex connectivities: Policy networks, data infrastructures and vocational education reform in China. *International Journal of Educational Research, 116*, 102045. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2022.102045

Hillebrandt, M., & Huber, M. (2020). Editorial: Quantifying higher education: Governing universities and academics by numbers. *Politics and Governance, 8*(2), 1–5. https://doi.org/10.17645/pag.v8i2.2585

Jarernsiripornkul, S., & Pandey, I. M. (2018). Governance of autonomous universities: Case of Thailand. *Journal of Advances in Management Research*, *15*(3), 288–305. https://doi.org/10.1108/JAMR-12-2016-0103

Johar, N. A., Tham, J. S., Kew, S. N., & Tan, C. L. (2023). Learning analytics on student engagement to enhance students' learning performance: A systematic review. *Sustainability, 15*(10), 7849. https://doi.org/10.3390/su15107849

Kaczmarska, K., & Yıldız, Y. Y. (2022). Introduction to the special issue on academic freedom and internationalisation. *The International Journal of Human Rights, 26*(10), 1691–1697. https://doi.org/10.1080/13642987.2022.2152573

Kinzelbach, K., Lindberg, S. I., Lott, L., & Panaro, A. V. (2025). *Academic Freedom Index 2025 update*. FAU Erlangen-Nürnberg and V-Dem Institute. https://doi.org/10.25593/open-fau-1637

Komljenovic, J. (2020). The future of value in digitalised higher education: Why data privacy should not be our biggest concern. *Higher Education*, *83*, 119–135. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-020-00639-7

Komljenovic, J. (2021). The rise of education rentiers: Digital platforms, digital data and rents. Learning, *Media and Technology*, *46*(3), 320–332. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2021.1891422

Komljenovic, J. (2022). The future of value in digitalised higher education: Why data privacy should not be our biggest concern. *Higher Education*, *83*(1), 119–135. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-020-00639-7

Komljenovic, J., Sellar, S., & Birch, K. (2025). Turning universities into data-driven organisations: Seven dimensions of change. *Higher Education*, *89*(5), 1369–1386. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-024-01277-z

Komljenovic, J., Williamson, B., Eynon, R., & Davies, H. C. (2024). When public policy "fails" and venture capital "saves" education: Edtech investors as economic and political actors. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, *22*(1), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1080/14767724.2023.2272134

Krüger, A. K., & Petersohn, S. (2022). From research evaluation to research analytics: The digitization of academic performance measurement. *Valuation Studies, 9*(1), 11–46. https://doi.org/10.3384/VS.2001-5992.2022.9.1.11-46

Lovakov, A. (2025). Is academic freedom associated with strong science? Evidence from a cross-national time-series analysis. *International Journal of Educational Research, 134*, 102845. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2025.102845

Luque-Martínez, T., Faraoni, N., & Doña-Toledo, L. (2026). Reflecting university image in the era of digitalization. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open, 13*, 102350. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2025.102350

Lynch, K. (2006). Neo-liberalism and marketisation: The implications for higher education. *European Educational Research Journal*, *5*(1), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.2304/eerj.2006.5.1.1

Maassen, P., Elken, M., & Jungblut, J.(2025). De facto academic freedom in the European Union: Threats and trends. *European Review*, S28–S43. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1062798725000134

Mandel, U., Lopez-Amaro, G., & Teamey, K. (2021). Ecoversities Alliance: A five-year experiment in cosmopolitical learning. *Educação & Realidade, 46*(4), e118644. https://doi.org/10.1590/2175-6236118644

McConvey, K., & Guha, S. (2024). "This is not a data problem": Algorithms and power in public higher education in Canada. In *Proceedings of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI '24)*. Association for Computing Machinery. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2403.13969

McCowan, T. (2023). *Tertiary education and the sustainability agenda* (Centre for Global Higher Education Working Paper No. 90). Centre for Global Higher Education, University of Oxford

McCowan, T., & Buckner, E. (2025). Critical perspectives on universities and the Sustainable Development Goals. *Comparative Education Review, 69*(4), 697–702. https://doi.org/10.1086/738299

McNaughtan, J., Enright, E. A., Xie, W., Billings, M. S., & Harris, N. F. (2025). Shared governance in wicked times: Perceptions of faculty senate presidents on faculty and administrator relationships. *Teachers College Record: The Voice of Scholarship in Education, 127*(1), 33–68. https://doi.org/10.1177/01614681251322581

Minor, J. T. (2006). A case of complex governance: A structural analysis of university decision-making. *Journal of the Professoriate, 1*(2), 22–37.

Minor, J. T., & Tierney, W. G. (2005). The danger of deference: A case of polite governance. *Teachers College Record, 107*(1), 137–156. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ727551

Morrish, L., & Sauntson, H. (2016). Performance management and the stifling of academic freedom and knowledge production. *Journal of Historical Sociology*, *29*(1), 42–64. https://doi.org/10.1111/johs.12122

Musselin, C. (2009). The side effects of the Bologna Process on national institutional settings: The case of France. In A. Amaral, G. Neave, C. Musselin, & P. Maassen (Eds.), *European integration and the governance of higher education and research* (pp. 181–205). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-9505-4_8

Mutanga, O., & Marovah, T. (Eds.). (2023). *Southern theories: Contemporary and future challenges*. Taylor & Francis. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003358879

Naidoo, R. (2018). The competition fetish in higher education: Shamans, mind snares and consequences. *European Educational Research Journal, 17*(5), 605–620. https://doi.org/10.1177/1474904118784839

Ntshoe, I., & Faller, F. (2025). Reframing conversations on institutional autonomy, academic freedom, and accountability in the context of emerging managerialism and corporatism in South African higher education. *South African Journal of Higher Education, 39*(4), 217–235. https://doi.org/10.20853/39-4-7507

O'Neill, O. (2015). Trust, trustworthiness, and accountability. In N. Morris & C. Vines (Eds.), *Capital failure: Rebuilding trust in financial services* (pp. 172–189). Oxford University Press.

Parker, L. D., Martin-Sardesai, A., & Guthrie, J. (2021). The commercialized Australian public university: An accountingised transition. *Financial Accountability & Management*, *39*(1), 125–150. https://doi.org/10.1111/faam.12310

Popescu, M., Baruh, L., & Sudhakar, S. (2024). Role-based privacy cynicism and local privacy activism: How data stewards navigate privacy in higher education. *Big Data & Society*, *11*(1), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1177/20539517241240664

Prinsloo, P. (2020). Of "black boxes" and algorithmic decision-making in (higher) education – A commentary. *Big Data & Society*, *7*(1). 1–6. https://doi.org/10.1177/2053951720933994

Pybus, J., Lomborg, S., Gandini, A., & Lai, S. S. (2025). Empirical approaches to infrastructures for datafication: Introduction to the special issue. *New Media & Society*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1177/14614448251314396

Reichman, H. (2025). *Understanding academic freedom*. Johns Hopkins University Press.

Ross, J., & Macleod, H. (2018). Surveillance, (dis)trust and teaching with plagiarism detection technology. In *Proceedings of the 11th International Conference on Networked Learning*. Networked Learning Conference.

Salazar, J. M., & Leihy, P. S. (2013). Keeping up with coordination: From Clark's triangle to microcosmographia. *Studies in Higher Education*, *38*(1), 53–70. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2011.564609

Saura, G., & Caballero, K. (2021). Digital academic capitalism. *Revista Española de Educación Comparada*, *37*, 192–211. https://doi.org/10.5944/reec.37.2021.27797

Selwyn, N., & Gašević, D. (2020). The datafication of higher education: Discussing the promises and problems. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *25*(4), 527–540. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2019.1689388

Seyama-Mokhaneli, S. (2020). The glass cage: Performance management and the dehumanisation of academic work. *Education as Change, 24*(1), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.25159/1947-9417/7223

Shah, M., & Nair, C. (2012). The changing nature of teaching and unit evaluations in Australian universities. *Quality Assurance in Education*, *20*(3), 274–288. https://doi.org/10.1108/09684881211240321

Szadkowski, K., & Krzeski, J. (2021). The future is always-already now: Instituent praxis and the activist university, Policy Futures in Education, *Symposium Journals Ltd.*, *19*(5), 554–567. https://doi.org/10.1177/14782103211003445

Tagliaventi, M. R., Carli, G., & Cutolo, D. (2019). Excellent researcher or good public servant? The interplay between research and academic citizenship. *Higher Education*, *79*(6), 1057–1078. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-019-00456-7

Teymourifar, A. (2026). Understanding the ABS journal ranking system: A critical review. *Frontiers in Education, 11*, 1773655. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2026.1773655

Thelwall, M., & Kousha, K. (2025). Technology assisted research assessment: algorithmic bias and transparency issues. *Aslib Journal of Information Management*, *77*(1), 175–190. https://doi.org/10.1108/AJIM-04-2023-0119

Thiel, J. (2019). The UK National Student Survey: An amalgam of discipline and neoliberal governmentality. *British Educational Research Journal*, *45*(3), 538–553. https://doi.org/10.1002/berj.3512

Tierney, W. G., & Minor, J. T. (2003). *Challenges for governance: A national report*. Center for Higher Education Policy Analysis, University of Southern California. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED482060

Triantafillou, P. (2015). Doing things with numbers: The Danish National Audit Office and the governing of university teaching. *Policy and Society, 34*(1), 13–24. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polsoc.2015.03.002

Ustyuzhantseva, O. (2025). Imagining the digital university: Infrastructural logics and institutional futures in the Global South. *Foresight and STI Governance, 19*(4), 81–99. https://doi.org/10.17323/fstig.2025.29082

Vehviläinen, S., Löfström, E., & Nevgi, A. (2017). Dealing with plagiarism in the academic community: Emotional engagement and moral distress. *Higher Education*, *75*(1), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-017-0112-6

Vernon, M. M., Balas, E. A., & Momani, S. (2018). Are university rankings useful to improve research? A systematic review. *PLOS ONE, 13*(3), e0193762. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0193762

Waring, M. (2013). All in this together? HRM and the individualisation of the academic worker. *Higher Education Policy*, *26*(3), 397–419. https://doi.org/10.1057/hep.2013.7

Weinberg, L. (2025). Power BI and the datafication of Danish higher education. *Big Data & Society, 12*(3), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1177/20539517251365230

Whitchurch, C. (2008). Shifting identities and blurring boundaries: The emergence of third space professionals in UK higher education. *Higher Education Quarterly*, *62*(4), 377–396. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2273.2008.00387.x

Whitchurch, C. (2013). *Reconstructing identities in higher education: The rise of 'third space' professionals* (1st ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203098301

Williamson, B. (2017). *Big data in education. The digital future of learning, policy and practice*. SAGE Publications. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781529714920

Williamson, B. (2018). The hidden architecture of higher education: Building a big data infrastructure for the "smarter university". *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *15*(1), 12. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-018-0094-1

Williamson, B. (2019). Policy networks, performance metrics and platform markets: Charting the expanding data infrastructure of higher education. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, *50*(6), 2794–2809. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12849

Williamson, B., Bayne, S., & Shay, S. (2020). The datafication of teaching in higher education: Critical issues and perspectives. *Teaching in Higher Education, 25*(4), 351–365. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2020.1748811

Yidana, P. (2025). Factionalism in higher education institutions: A case study of public universities in Northern Ghana. *British Journal of Education, Learning and Development Psychology, 8*(2), 104–127. https://doi.org/10.52589/BJELDP-IZ7FNXUK

Zhuang, T., Liu, B., & Hu, Y. (2022). Legitimising shared governance in China's higher education sector through university statutes. *European Journal of Education, 57*(1), 33–48. https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12493



Taylor & Francis
Taylor & Francis Group
http://taylorandfrancis.com

Part IV

Digital Transformation of Management Functions



Taylor & Francis
Taylor & Francis Group
http://taylorandfrancis.com

10 Managing Human Capital and Talent in a Digital Environment

10.1 Digital Transformation as a Human Capital Challenge

Most accounts of digital change in higher education give pride of place to platforms, data systems, and infrastructure. The harder problem usually concerns people rather than machines. When a university takes on new tools and data-driven ways of working, it changes what staff are expected to know and do, and this turns human capital into a central management concern rather than a by-product of procurement (Vial, 2019). This human capital challenge became difficult to ignore during the pandemic, when institutions moved much of their teaching online in a matter of weeks. They are now adjusting once more to tools such as generative artificial intelligence (AI) in teaching, assessment, and research (Walker & Voce, 2023). Each wave of change has widened the distance between the skills an institution holds and the skills it needs, which means that investment in people has to keep pace with investment in systems (Oberländer et al., 2020).

This challenge reaches into leadership as well. Under managerial models of university governance, heads of department and deans now carry administrative and strategic duties that earlier generations of academics rarely faced, and they frequently take on these duties without any preparation for them (Hagerer, 2022). An institution whose leaders are unready for the demands of digital strategy and change management is exposed in ways that no new software can mitigate. The human side of transformation is therefore not a detail of implementation. It is a strategic question in its own right, and one that is easy to underestimate because its costs are less visible than the price of a new platform. Two cautions are worth carrying through the chapter. The first concerns the evidence. Much of what is known about digital change in universities comes from single institutions or single national systems, so claims about what works should be read as suggestive rather than settled. The second concerns language. The vocabulary of transformation can imply a smooth and orderly process, but in practice the human transition is uneven, contested, and slow (Bygstad et al., 2022).

DOI: 10.4324/9781042001422-15
This chapter has been made available under a CC BY-NC-ND license.

Universities that treat digital change as both a technical and a human project and resist the habit of leaving staff development until last are better placed to manage it without avoidable damage.

The frame should also widen beyond academics. Human capital in a university includes researchers and the large body of professional and administrative staff whose work has been reshaped by the same forces. As registration, admissions, finance, and student support are digitised and partly automated, the people who run these functions are asked to learn new systems and take on responsibilities that older arrangements never demanded. This part of the workforce is often left out of discussions of digital strategy, yet its readiness shapes whether a transformation succeeds in practice. A view of human capital that covers the whole institution, rather than the teaching staff alone, gives a more honest picture of what digital change asks of universities and of the people who carry it forward.

10.2 Changing Academic Roles and Skill Requirements

The work of university staff is widening. Academics are still judged on teaching and research, but they are increasingly expected to handle learning management systems, online assessment, basic data analysis, and the steady arrival of new tools each academic year (Basilotta-Gómez-Pablos et al., 2022). Digital competence has moved from a useful extra to a recognised part of the academic role, and frameworks such as DigCompEdu have given institutions a shared language for describing what that competence involves (Redecker, 2017). The same shift appears in recruitment, where advertisements for teaching posts now name experience with online course design or educational technology alongside the familiar requirements (Basilotta-Gómez-Pablos et al., 2022). Many universities have answered by setting up internal training routes, sometimes presented as a digital academy or similar scheme, that offer short courses and certificates in online teaching, data handling, and related skills (OECD, 2023). Professional and administrative staff face a comparable change that attracts far less comment. As core processes are digitised and reorganised around new systems, these staff must learn unfamiliar software and adopt new ways of working, often while keeping the existing service running. This is rarely described as skill development – although that is what it is – and the lack of structured support for it is a recurring gap in institutional planning. A strategy that develops academics while leaving professional staff to cope alone tends to create bottlenecks that undermine the wider effort.

Roles are also diversifying in ways that strain established career structures. Some academics now divide their time between scholarship and the leadership of digital projects, becoming something close to in-house technologists or data specialists for their departments (Bygstad et al., 2022). These hybrid

posts do not fit the conventional model of an academic career, and they call for more flexible employment and promotion arrangements than most universities currently provide. The risk is that people in such roles fall between categories, valued for work that no existing pathway recognises, which can leave them uncertain about their prospects.

At the senior level, the job of a head of department or dean has grown more complex as these leaders now oversee technology projects and data-informed decisions on top of academic management (Hagerer, 2022). Where governance reforms have widened the scope of these roles without matching investment in preparation, leaders can feel stretched and underqualified for some of the work they are asked to do (Hum et al., 2024). Distributed and collaborative models of leadership, in which duties are shared rather than concentrated in one overburdened person, offer a practical response, and there is some evidence that they reduce the sense of overload (Ladyshewsky & Flavell, 2011).

A fair reading is that the rhetoric of new skills sometimes runs ahead of the support that would make them attainable. Staff are told that digital competence matters, yet the time, training, and recognition needed to acquire it are not always provided. Structural change of the kind that would genuinely lighten the load, such as redesigned roles and shared leadership, is harder to implement than providing another workshop. This may explain why it remains less common than the scale of the problem would warrant.

10.3 Adapting Human Resource Strategies for Digital Talent

Human resource strategy in higher education is adapting to the competence demands created by digital transformation across the whole span of an employee's time at an institution, from hiring through to departure. This adaptation can be understood through three interrelated strands: recruitment and retention, training and continuing professional development, and leadership development. The first strand is recruitment and retention. Universities increasingly look for candidates who are comfortable with technology and open to continual learning, on the reasonable assumption that a workforce at ease with change will perform better in a digital environment (Gandy et al., 2018). Some make this explicit by listing digital skills in their job descriptions (Basilotta-Gómez-Pablos et al., 2022). Hiring such people is only part of the task. Keeping them matters at least as much, and the evidence points to workload and job satisfaction as strong influences on whether capable staff stay (Gandy et al., 2018; Dube & Ndofirepi, 2023). An institution that recruits talented people and then buries them under unmanageable demands or unclear expectations should not be surprised when they leave.

The second strand of human resource strategy is training and continuing professional development. Building the digital skills of existing staff is necessary if an institution is to keep up with changes in how teaching and administration are carried out (Oberländer et al., 2020). Many universities have expanded in-house provision or drawn on outside expertise to develop staff in areas such as online teaching and data literacy. The benefits are real, but so are the obstacles. Limited budgets, heavy administrative loads, and cultural resistance can all slow the spread of new programmes, and these constraints are easy to overlook in optimistic policy documents (Hagerer, 2022). In blended teaching in particular, provision that addresses online pedagogy, time management, and the handling of stress has been recommended as a way to reduce the strain that technology can place on staff (Rai, 2026). Development and well-being are connected here, since staff who feel competent with new tools tend to meet change with less anxiety (Nascimento et al., 2024).

The third – and often the weakest – strand of digital human resource strategy is leadership development. Academics who move into the management of digital projects need skills in change management, communication, and team-building that their scholarly training did not supply. Well-designed leadership programmes can produce genuine transfer of learning, with participants applying what they have learned to their departments rather than setting it aside once a course ends (Ladyshewsky & Flavell, 2011). Coaching and mentoring can help people grow into hybrid academic and managerial roles by building practical confidence (Ladyshewsky & Flavell, 2011). The quality of leadership in turn affects staff well-being, since supportive and well-prepared leaders are associated with lower stress and stronger satisfaction in their teams (Biron et al., 2008).

The limits of this picture deserve honesty. Talent management as a field grew up in the corporate world, and its concepts do not always sit easily in universities, where academic freedom, collegial governance, and long career horizons complicate the tidy language of pipelines and high performers (Smagina & Stich, 2026). The research base for talent development in higher education is still thin and uneven, and many recommendations rest on just a few studies (Smagina & Stich, 2026). The overall trajectory of human resource strategy is sensible, but the effects of particular practices are not yet well established, and institutions would be wise to treat current best practices as provisional rather than proven.

10.4 Aligning Performance Management and Career Pathways

As roles change, the systems used to judge and reward staff have to change with them; otherwise, they become a source of grievance. Traditional measures such as publication counts and teaching hours capture only part

of what academics now do, and they say little about the effort involved in building an online course or learning to work with data (Hum et al., 2024). Support is growing for broadening promotion and tenure criteria so that digital contributions are recognised rather than treated as invisible service (Hum et al., 2024). Without such recognition, staff soon learn that the activities an institution claims to value are not the ones that advance a career, and they adjust their behaviour to match.

Workload is the other half of the problem. A common complaint in public universities is the gap between the duties people are assigned, the standards by which they are assessed, and the time actually available to them (Hum et al., 2024). When new digital tasks are added without any change to workload models, the result is frustration and a sense that career paths have become fragmented and unclear (Hum et al., 2024). Faculty who are pulled in several directions at once and are unsure what counts tend to lose both morale and focus. Calls for more transparent and systematic workload management have grown stronger as teaching and service have become more demanding (Gregory & Lodge, 2015).

Some institutions have turned to dashboards and similar tools to track teaching loads and other duties, hoping to share work more fairly and to give leaders a clearer view of who is carrying what (Hagerer, 2022). Shared data of this kind can make evaluation more transparent by providing a documented record of workload distribution, thereby reducing reliance on informal perceptions, anecdotal judgements, and the selective visibility of particular forms of academic labour. There is also interest in collegial models of assessment, in which departments set goals together and review performance with input from peers, supported where useful by shared records of teaching, research, and service contributions.

These ideas are appealing, yet they carry a risk that deserves attention. Measurement systems tend to grow once they are in place, and a dashboard introduced to protect staff from overload can turn into another instrument of pressure if it is used carelessly. The same caution applies to the automated systems now entering human resource work. The purpose of aligning performance management with digital work is to make the system feel fair and supportive, not to add another layer of monitoring to a job that is already demanding. Career pathways, in particular, need to be sufficiently clear for staff to see how the new kinds of contributions they are asked to make will be recognised over time, rather than acknowledged in one cycle and forgotten in the next.

There is a wider lesson in how reward and workload interact. Recognition without relief is hollow, since praising digital work in a promotion case while continuing to add tasks does little to address the conditions that wear staff down. Relief without recognition is equally unsatisfactory because lightening a workload while ignoring the value of the work signals that the effort

does not count. Performance management in a digital university works best when the two move together, so that what is measured, what is rewarded, and what is realistically possible are brought into some kind of agreement. Achieving that balance is difficult, and few institutions have managed it fully, but naming it as the goal is a useful corrective to the assumption that better measurement alone will solve the problem.

10.5 Well-Being Challenges in the Digital Workplace

The digitisation of academic work brings costs as well as gains, and these show up most clearly in technostress, rising workload, and burnout. Technostress is the strain that comes from adapting to new technology, and it has become a familiar feature of academic life. Staff move between several systems in a single day, cope with frequent updates, and feel pressure to remain reachable well beyond ordinary hours. Research links higher technostress to a reduced willingness to keep teaching online. This reluctance may be intensified by worries about job security, since staff may fear that failing to master a tool will be held against them (Mushtaque et al., 2022). In blended settings, higher technostress has been associated with poorer quality of working life and lower job satisfaction, both of which bear on well-being (Rai, 2026).

Technostress is better understood as a standing condition of the modern academic workplace than as a passing difficulty that fades once people learn the latest system (Nascimento et al., 2024). The distinction matters for how institutions respond, since a problem treated as temporary attracts one-off fixes, while a problem recognised as ongoing calls for steady support such as reliable technical help, attention to mental health, and arrangements for staff to learn from one another. A note of caution is warranted here. Not all contact with technology is harmful. Recent work on what has been called techno-eustress argues that, under the right conditions, technology can be a source of motivation and growth rather than merely a source of strain (Nascimento et al., 2024). The task for management is therefore not to shield staff from technology but to shape the conditions under which they encounter it.

Workload is the second concern. The move to online teaching was sharpest during the pandemic and plainly added to academic workloads as staff built new materials, learned new tools, and supported students through digital channels (Mushtaque et al., 2022). Even outside a crisis, the integration of technology tends to increase workload unless something is done to offset it, such as genuine leadership support and continuing development (Gregory & Lodge, 2015). Overload was a problem in universities long before digital tools arrived, but constant change and the expectation of being always available can exacerbate it (Biron et al., 2008). These pressures

fall unevenly. Early-career staff, women, and those on insecure contracts often feel them most, which is a question of fairness as much as of health (Dube & Ndofirepi, 2023).

Sustained overload, combined with the demands of new systems, feeds burnout – a state of exhaustion and withdrawal that harms both individuals and the institutions that rely on them (Biron et al., 2008). Supportive management appears to help. Leaders who show concern, speak openly about pressure, and protect reasonable boundaries are linked to lower burnout in their teams (Biron et al., 2008). Giving staff a real voice in decisions matters too since strained relations with managers and the feeling of having no say are well-documented stressors in academic work (Biron et al., 2008; Dube & Ndofirepi, 2023).

Individual coping has its place alongside these measures. Skills such as time management and self-care can help, and peer support groups can ease the isolation that remote and technology-heavy work can bring. The danger is that responsibility is shifted entirely onto the individual. Telling staff to be more resilient while leaving an unworkable workload untouched is neither fair nor effective, and resilience is better seen as something built jointly by people and institutions (Rai, 2026; Nascimento et al., 2024). Well-being in a digital university is finally a shared responsibility, and treating it as a private problem for staff to solve on their own is one of the more common mistakes institutions make.

10.6 Towards a People-Centric Digital University

The thread running through this chapter is that managing human capital in a digital university means keeping people at the centre even as new technology arrives. A people-centric approach treats faculty and staff as partners in change rather than as the means by which decisions made elsewhere are carried out (Smagina & Stich, 2026). Institutions that have done this well tend to share a few habits. They use mentoring and peer learning, pairing confident users of technology with colleagues who are less sure, so that people can learn from one another without fear of judgement (Smagina & Stich, 2026). They support communities of practice in which staff trade advice about online teaching and software, which helps useful methods spread and makes the learning feel ordinary rather than remedial.

A second habit is to give well-being and continual learning a genuine place in the culture rather than a token one. In practice, this can mean recognising mentorship and community-building as real contributions, rather than valuing only research output and teaching scores. It also means offering time and space for staff to develop. Study leave or protected time to build digital skills or redesign a course sends a clear signal that learning is expected of everyone and is not squeezed into the margins of an already full

week. When the development of people is treated as an investment rather than a cost to be cut, institutions tend to end up with a workforce that copes better with change (Smagina & Stich, 2026).

It is worth stating plainly that the reverse also holds. Where staff feel ignored or overloaded, even well-chosen technology will fall short of what was promised because the people meant to use it have neither the capacity nor the goodwill to make it work. This is a practical case for a human-centred strategy, quite apart from the moral case. A university that spends heavily on systems while neglecting the people who operate them is unlikely to see the returns it expects.

The arrival of AI in administrative and human resource processes raises the stakes further. Automating routine tasks may relieve some burdens, and there is a genuine opportunity to free staff from repetitive work. The same tools can also erode trust if decisions about workload, evaluation, or hiring are handed to systems whose reasoning staff cannot see or challenge. A people-centric approach asks that such tools stay transparent and open to question, and that fairness is built into their use rather than hoped for after the fact. The argument of this chapter is not that universities should resist digital change. It is that they should meet it with their people rather than at their people's expense, and that the choices made about technology are, in the end, choices about how an institution treats the people who give it life.

None of this requires heroic effort or large new budgets, although resources help. Much of it is a matter of attention and sequence, of asking before a change is made what it will mean for the people who must live with it, and of building in the support that turns a demand into a capability. Universities that adopt this order of priorities – putting people somewhat ahead of platforms in their planning – are not slowing transformation. They are giving it a better chance of holding once the initial enthusiasm has passed.

10.7 Conclusion

This chapter has argued that the digital transformation of universities is, at its heart, a question of people. New tools change what staff are expected to know and do; they reshape academic and professional roles, and they place fresh demands on leaders who are often unprepared for them. Human resource strategy has begun to respond across the whole working life of an employee, from how universities hire to how they develop, assess, reward, and retain their staff, and from how they manage workloads to how they protect well-being. The direction is sensible, but the evidence supporting particular practices remains limited and is drawn from a small and varied set of national and institutional contexts; therefore, confident prescriptions are improper.

Three points deserve emphasis. The first is that support has to match expectations. Asking staff to gain digital skills without giving them time, training, and recognition produces resentment rather than capability. The second is that well-being is not a soft addition but a condition of effective transformation, since overloaded and anxious staff cannot make good use of even the best systems, and technostress is a persistent feature of the work rather than a phase that passes. The third is that fairness must be designed into the systems that judge and reward people – including the automated tools now entering human resource work – because measurement and automation can quietly shift from protecting staff to pressuring them.

A forecast can be offered here, and it is presented as informed judgement rather than established fact. The institutions that fare best in the coming years are likely to be those that treat human capital as seriously as they treat their technology budgets. The pace of change shows little sign of slowing, and the spread of generative artificial intelligence may well widen the gap between what universities have and what they need. Closing that gap will depend less on the tools themselves than on whether universities choose to develop, support, and trust the people who use them. The final claim of this chapter is straightforward. Technology will not transform a university on its own. Its people will, but only if they are properly equipped and treated as partners in the work.

References

Basilotta-Gómez-Pablos, V., Matarranz, M., Casado-Aranda, L.-A., & Otto, A. (2022). Teachers' digital competencies in higher education: A systematic literature review. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 19*, 8. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-021-00312-8

Biron, C., Brun, J.-P., & Ivers, H. (2008). Extent and sources of occupational stress in university staff. *Work*, *30*(4), 511–522. https://doi.org/10.3233/WOR-2008-00678

Bygstad, B., Øvrelid, E., Ludvigsen, S., & Dæhlen, M. (2022). From dual digitalization to digital learning space: Exploring the digital transformation of higher education. *Computers & Education*, *182*, 104463. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2022.104463

Dube, N., & Ndofirepi, T. M. (2023). Academic staff commitment in the face of a role (im)balance between work and personal life: Can job satisfaction help? *European Journal of Management Studies*, *29*(1), 31–50. https://doi.org/10.1108/EJMS-08-2022-0048

Gandy, R., Harrison, P., & Gold, J. (2018). Talent management in higher education: Is turnover relevant? *European Journal of Training and Development, 42*(9), 597–610. https://doi.org/10.1108/EJTD-11-2017-0099

Gregory, M. S.-J., & Lodge, J. M. (2015). Academic workload: The silent barrier to the implementation of technology-enhanced learning strategies in higher

education. *Distance Education*, *36*(2), 210–230. https://doi.org/10.1080/01587919.2015.1055056

Hagerer, I. (2022). It is still about bureaucracy in German faculties. *Tertiary Education and Management*, *28*(4), 335–352. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11233-022-09112-9

Hum, C., Choi, T., Lo, S., Sok, S., & Yu, W. (2024). Aligning academic career management in the evolving landscape of Cambodian public universities. *International Journal of Comparative Education and Development*, *26*(2), 95–113. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCED-06-2023-0049

Ladyshewsky, R. K., & Flavell, H. (2011). Transfer of training in an academic leadership development program for program coordinators. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, *40*(1), 127–147. https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143211420615

Mushtaque, I., Waqas, H., & Awais-E-Yazdan, M. (2022). The effect of technostress on the teachers' willingness to use online teaching modes and the moderating role of job insecurity during COVID-19 pandemic in Pakistan. *International Journal of Educational Management*, *36*(1), 63–80. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-07-2021-0291

Nascimento, L., Correia, M. F., & Califf, C. B. (2024). Towards a bright side of technostress in higher education teachers: Identifying several antecedents and outcomes of techno-eustress. *Technology in Society*, *76*, 102428. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2023.102428

Oberländer, M., Beinicke, A., & Bipp, T. (2020). Digital competencies: A review of the literature and applications in the workplace. *Computers & Education*, *146*, 103752. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2019.103752

OECD. (2023). OECD Digital Education Outlook 2023: Towards an effective digital education ecosystem. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/c74f03de-en

Rai, D., G. (2026). Quality of work life, job satisfaction, technostress and psychological well-being in blended learning: A moderated mediation model. *European Journal of Training and Development*, *50*(1–2), 189–216. https://doi.org/10.1108/EJTD-09-2024-0128

Redecker, C. (2017). European framework for the digital competence of educators: DigCompEdu (Y. Punie, Ed.; EUR 28775 EN). *Publications Office of the European Union*. https://doi.org/10.2760/159770

Smagina, O. & Stich, J.-F. (2026). Talent development in higher education institutions: Systematic literature review and research agenda. *Human Resource Development Review*, 25(3), 231–260. https://doi.org/10.1177/15344843251381389

Vial, G. (2019). Understanding digital transformation: A review and a research agenda. *The Journal of Strategic Information Systems*, *28*(2), 118–144. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsis.2019.01.003

Walker, R., & Voce, J. (2023). Post-pandemic learning technology developments in UK higher education: What does the UCISA evidence tell us? *Sustainability*, *15*(17), 12831. https://doi.org/10.3390/su151712831

11 Digital Marketing and Communication Strategies

11.1 Interconnected Domains of Marketing, Communication, and Identity

Four concepts anchor the analysis that follows: digitalisation as the working baseline of institutional practice; institutional communication as a multi-stakeholder function spanning external relations and internal communications; marketing, communication, and identity as interconnected rather than separate organisational domains; and digital communication as a managerial activity rather than a purely promotional one. Each of these concepts has a distinct theoretical lineage that justifies its retention in a chapter addressed to managers and scholars of higher education.

Digitalisation, in the sense used here, is not the introduction of new digital tools alongside pre-existing practices but the reconfiguration of these practices around continuous digital mediation. Cluley, Green, and Owen (2019) argued that the digitisation of marketing research has reorganised the work of marketing practitioners themselves, producing both new opportunities and new integration challenges. The subsequent decade has confirmed and amplified this observation in the Higher Education Institution context, where systematic reviews now report that digital transformation in higher education is best understood as a multi-layered organisational change rather than a technology adoption project (Sahni et al., 2025; Bond et al., 2018). The unit of analysis for any examination of digital communication in HEIs is therefore the institution and its routines, not the individual tool or campaign.

Institutional communication encompasses two analytically distinct but increasingly interdependent flows. External communication refers to the structured interactions between an HEI and the constituencies on which it depends for its mission, resources, and legitimacy, including prospective students, alumni, employers, public authorities, regulators, industry partners, and local communities. Freeman's (1984) stakeholder approach offers the most widely used analytical vocabulary for these interactions, and

DOI: 10.4324/9781042001422-16
This chapter has been made available under a CC BY-NC-ND license.

Mitchell, Agle, and Wood (1997) refined it by introducing power, legitimacy, and urgency as criteria for assessing stakeholder salience. Jongbloed, Enders, and Salerno (2008) showed that stakeholder analysis can be adapted productively to universities, where each constituency exerts a different form of salience and requires a different communicative treatment. Internal communication, by contrast, refers to the communication conducted within the institution itself, between leadership and faculty, between leadership and students, and across administrative and academic units. Internal stakeholders are not merely additional audiences but co-producers of institutional identity, whose perceptions of the institution shape the credibility of the messages it projects outwards (Nyagadza, Kadembo, & Makasi, 2020).

The third anchor concept is the proposition that marketing, communication, and institutional identity should be treated as interconnected rather than separate domains. In earlier organisational arrangements, marketing was often understood as the promotion of programmes and the recruitment of students, communication as the dissemination of institutional information, and identity as the symbolic construction of the university as a recognisable entity. Each was typically located in a different unit, with limited coordination across them. In the contemporary environment, these distinctions are no longer sustainable. Digital platforms often serve marketing, communication, and identity functions simultaneously. A single institutional message or digital content item may now be read by prospective students, current students, faculty, administrative staff, alumni, partners, policymakers, and external observers, while the same data infrastructure may support both recruitment and broader stakeholder engagement (Stoica et al., 2025; Núñez-Canal et al., 2026). The implication is that what an HEI says about itself in any channel is at once a marketing act, a communicative act, and an identity-defining act, and that the institutional consequences of digital communication can be understood only when these dimensions are analysed together.

Finally, digital communication is treated here as a managerial function rather than as content production. Spalding and Wang (2006), writing about academic libraries, characterised marketing within higher education as a managerial tool used to accomplish strategic goals; the same framing has since been generalised to whole institutions, where coordinated digital communication is now recognised as an instrument of stakeholder engagement, reputation management, and institutional legitimacy (Stoica et al., 2025; Núñez-Canal et al., 2026). When framed in this way, decisions about platforms, content, personalisation, and analytics cease to be the exclusive preserve of marketing departments and become questions of institutional governance, with consequences for budget allocation, role design, data protection, and the alignment of communication with academic mission. Confidence in this conceptual framing is high, given the convergence of

stakeholder-theoretic, managerial, and educational-technology literatures on the same basic claim that digitalisation has become structural rather than incremental in HEIs.

11.2 Digital Tools, Platforms, and Content Strategies

Most HEIs now treat the institutional website, official email infrastructure, and a managed portfolio of social media accounts as the baseline architecture of digital communication. The website remains the most authoritative and stable reference point in this architecture. It carries programme information, admissions requirements, institutional identity, and trust signals, while its accessibility, usability, technical performance, and search visibility shape whether prospective students can find, navigate, and evaluate the institution at the earliest stages of choice (Zarubina et al., 2024; Fakrudeen, 2025). Social media operates differently. Rather than functioning primarily as a repository of verified information, it supports interaction, visibility, affective engagement, and repeated exposure across the recruitment journey. Recent systematic reviews show that social media in higher education marketing is associated not only with student engagement and branding, but also with enrolment decision-making, relationship management, and strategic marketing (Cingillioglu et al., 2024; Pawar et al., 2024).

The managerial issue is therefore not whether HEIs should use digital channels, but how institutional communication is organised as a governed, audience-sensitive system. Evidence from recent work on university social media suggests that content strategy matters: in student acquisition, interaction-quality signals and the emotional or cognitive tone of communication can affect how prospective students interpret institutional value (Tran et al., 2026). Studies of digital promotion in higher education similarly indicate that website performance, search-engine visibility, programme information, and Generation Z's information needs should be treated as connected elements of recruitment communication rather than as separate technical or promotional tasks (Zarubina et al., 2024). In this sense, effective digital communication depends less on the mere existence of websites and social media profiles than on their integration into a coherent institutional communication system with clear ownership, audience logic, and evaluative capacity. Organising digital communication as a coherent institutional system therefore requires HEIs to move from channel accumulation – that is, the reactive addition of new websites, profiles, and platforms – towards platform governance. In such a governance model, each channel has a defined audience, purpose, owner, and evaluation logic. In practice, HEIs often expand their digital presence by adding new platforms in response to student behaviour, reputational pressure, or competitive imitation. Such expansion can increase visibility, but it can also produce duplication,

inconsistent messaging, uneven quality, and unclear responsibility for content. A more strategic approach is to treat digital tools as a managed communication portfolio. In this portfolio, each platform should have a defined audience, communicative purpose, ownership structure, and evaluation logic. The website may function as the authoritative source of validated information; social media may support engagement and visibility; email may remain central for formal communication; and internal platforms may coordinate organisational work. The question is therefore not how many platforms an HEI uses, but whether they collectively support institutional goals, stakeholder needs, and coherent communication.

The functional differentiation of platforms is now sufficiently well documented to inform institutional choice. Visual, mobile, and short-form social media platforms have become particularly relevant to prospective students and undergraduate audiences because social media use is implicated in information search, student engagement, and enrolment-related decision-making in higher education (Shields & Peruta, 2019; Wong et al., 2022; Pawar et al., 2024). Professional platforms such as LinkedIn play a different but equally consequential role by supporting career-oriented networking, employer communication, and the public visibility of graduate trajectories and professional outcomes (Davis et al., 2020; Ashraf et al., 2025; Lee et al., 2025). Social media should not be treated as a single communication environment, but as a differentiated portfolio of platforms with distinct audiences, affordances, and institutional functions. The managerial implication is that platform strategy in HEIs should be conceived as a portfolio decision in which each platform is assigned a primary audience and a primary communicative function, rather than as a defensive obligation to maintain a presence everywhere.

Internal communications platforms operate alongside this external portfolio and have undergone a comparable transformation. Institutional intranets, internal newsletters, and collaboration suites such as Microsoft 365 and Google Workspace have become standard infrastructures for communication with faculty and administrative staff, while learning management systems and integrated student portals increasingly serve as primary channels for communication with students. Recent work documents that digital communication is now central to administrative work in HEIs and that the effectiveness of institutional coordination depends on the design and adoption of these internal platforms (Aldreabi et al., 2024; Leišytė, 2026). Importantly, several of the platforms used externally, including official social media accounts and email distribution systems, are also used to reach internal audiences, with the consequence that internal and external messages are increasingly visible to overlapping populations. The boundary between internal and external communication has therefore become porous

in practice, even where institutional structures continue to treat the two as separate.

A second tier of digital platforms has become increasingly embedded in both external and internal communication flows. These platforms are significant because they operate at the intersection of communication, service delivery, data production, and institutional positioning. MOOCs are not only delivery mechanisms for open online learning but also instruments through which higher education institutions extend visibility, experiment with recruitment-oriented outreach, and generate behavioural data that can be analysed through learning analytics (Aydin, 2017; Zhu et al., 2022; Ruipérez-Valiente et al., 2021). Podcasts, particularly when built around alumni narratives, can operate as digital storytelling devices that strengthen institutional identity, support alumni engagement, and contribute to brand-related community building (Leandro et al., 2025; Stephenson & Yerger, 2014). Meanwhile, EdTech platforms increasingly support administrative and HRM-related functions in higher education, including performance management, professional development, and data-driven coordination, thereby complicating the traditional distinction between internal management systems and outward-facing communication infrastructures (Leišytė, 2026).

Content directed at different stakeholder groups is, in turn, deliberately tailored. Prospective and current students respond to interactive career-relevant material; alumni respond to brand storytelling and networking opportunities; and international partners value localised content, often delivered through international students acting as informal ambassadors (Tavares et al., 2025). Employers and community partners typically require credibility signals more than promotional energy. Internal audiences require content that is informationally substantive and consistent with the lived experience of the institution, since internal stakeholders are particularly sensitive to gaps between communicated narratives and observed realities. In this sense, content strategy also becomes a form of trust management: it must align promotional claims with organisational experience. Storytelling occupies a particular place within this differentiated content economy. Foundational work in consumer psychology has long argued that narrative is a basic communicative mode that supports memory, affect, and motivation (Woodside et al., 2008), and more recent work confirms that narrative formats strengthen connections between organisations and their audiences in online environments (Kemp et al., 2021). In HEI settings, narrative content built around student, alumni, and staff experience has been shown to support recruitment, brand identity, and internal cohesion, particularly when delivered through video formats native to social platforms (Aicha & Bouzaabia, 2023; Mager, 2021).

Cross-platform coherence remains a recurring challenge across both external and internal flows. Cross-platform content models conceptualise communication strategy as bridging narrative and marketing discourses across heterogeneous channels (Mager, 2021), and the practical task for an HEI is to maintain consistency of identity and meaning while communicating through websites, social platforms, video, podcasts, MOOCs, intranets, and learning management systems. Without explicit editorial governance, this consistency is difficult to maintain at scale, and the institutional voice tends to fragment according to the individual platforms or units that produce content. Thus, the strategic value of digital tools depends not only on technological adoption, but also on the institutional capacity to govern content, coordinate audiences, and sustain a coherent voice across increasingly porous communication environments.

11.3 Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Personalised Stakeholder Engagement

Artificial intelligence (AI) has shifted higher education marketing and communication from broad segmentation towards individual-level personalisation. AI-powered recruitment tools, including chatbots, predictive analytics, and personalised content delivery, are increasingly used to tailor communication to prospective students' preferences and support engagement and enrolment intentions (Al-Dmour et al., 2025). However, the strategic value of AI-mediated personalisation depends not only on technical efficiency, but also on students' trust in AI systems, institutional transparency, data protection, and safeguards against algorithmic bias, since privacy concerns and perceived unfairness may weaken applicants' willingness to engage with AI-driven recruitment communication (Al-Dmour et al., 2025; Fu et al., 2024; Miao & Holmes, 2023). Adaptive learning platforms also use deep learning to construct individualised learning pathways with measurable effects on engagement and outcomes (Naseer et al., 2024). Real-time analytics enable continuous adjustment of campaigns, while AI-driven recommendation logic – already familiar to Generation Z through social media and short-form video platforms – is increasingly relevant to how universities design personalised digital outreach and recruitment communication (Peter, 2025; Hu et al., 2025; Pawar et al., 2024).

Predictive analytics, underpinned by AI-enabled customer relationship management (CRM) systems, has emerged as a particularly consequential application. Institutional CRM platforms now consolidate data from across the student lifecycle, including enquiries, applications, enrolment, course engagement, and alumni interaction, combining these data with predictive models that allow recruitment offices to identify, based on behavioural patterns, which enquiries are most likely to convert to applications

and which applicants are most likely to enrol if admitted. The same logic supports the identification of students at risk of withdrawal, which informs retention communication, and of alumni most likely to engage with development activities. The strategic value of these capabilities is significant, but it depends on the quality of underlying data, on the appropriateness of the predictive models for the specific institutional context, and on the willingness of institutional actors to use the resulting predictions in a manner consistent with the educational mission.

The integration of AI with relationship management has also altered how MOOCs function within institutional strategy. Where earlier MOOC research focused primarily on retention as a pedagogical problem, more recent work treats course analytics as a source of intelligence on learner behaviour, communication patterns, and dropout risks that can inform teaching design, engagement interventions, and personalised communication with prospective and current learners (Wang & Lee, 2024; Palanci et al., 2024). The persistent difficulty of low completion rates remains, but it is increasingly framed as a question of engagement design, adaptive intervention, and stakeholder relationship management rather than as a defect of the format itself.

Conversational agents and AI chatbots have likewise moved from the periphery to a central position in admissions and student support. Reviews of chatbot deployment in HEIs document their use for answering routine enquiries, supporting application processes, and providing 24-hour first-line communication, while also highlighting recurring limitations around natural-language understanding, multilingual capability, and integration with institutional data systems (Okonkwo & Ade-Ibijola, 2021). The introduction of generative AI has accelerated this trajectory while raising new concerns. Generative models can produce confident but inaccurate responses to prospective students and can complicate compliance with data protection regulation; they also require institutional rules of use that did not previously exist. The same technologies are now being applied internally to support faculty and staff with routine information requests, scheduling, and documentation, with comparable benefits and comparable risks.

The regulatory environment in which AI-supported communication operates is also tightening. In the European Union, the General Data Protection Regulation continues to govern the processing of personal data in recruitment and student-facing communication, while the AI Act introduces a risk-based regulatory regime that affects how HEIs design and deploy AI systems, particularly where AI is used for assessment or other consequential decisions. Evidence is therefore accumulating that AI-supported communication has a real effect on institutional reputation, but that this effect is conditional on the institutional capacity to integrate AI competently. Stakeholder engagement and strategic innovation in HEIs improve

when AI competency is built deliberately into institutional structures rather than added on top of existing practices (Núñez-Canal et al., 2026). Confidence in the broad finding that AI supports personalised engagement is moderate to high; confidence in claims about the comparative effectiveness of specific AI tools is lower because the underlying technology, the regulatory environment, and the institutional configurations are all changing simultaneously.

11.4 Implementation, Leadership and the Marketing-IT Convergence

The benefits of digitalisation are not automatic. A systematic review of barriers to e-learning in higher education identifies a recurring set of obstacles, including weak infrastructure, uneven institutional support, gaps in digital literacy among staff, and psychological resistance among both faculty and students (Oulamine et al., 2025). A complementary review of digital transformation in higher education classifies these obstacles into technological, organisational, and human-centred categories, and the human dimension is consistently the most difficult to resolve (Sahni et al., 2025; Limanovskaja & Davidavičienė, 2025). Earlier evidence from the German higher education sector pointed to a persistent gap between the formal availability of digital tools and their meaningful pedagogical and communicative use (Bond et al., 2018); this gap has not closed in the intervening years despite substantial investment.

Leadership matters in this context. Digital leadership, understood as the capacity to orient an institution towards shared digital goals while fostering knowledge sharing, has been linked to successful institutional change and behaviours consistent with education for sustainable development (Pu, Dong & Jiang, 2025; Suknunan & Macháčková, 2026). Where leadership is supportive and where staff are given structured opportunities for mastery, digital self-efficacy increases, technostress is moderated, and engagement is maintained (Li & Han, 2026). Crucially, digital leadership in HEIs cannot be reduced to the appointment of a chief digital officer or the creation of a digital strategy unit; it requires distributed leadership capability across academic and administrative units, since the actors who carry digital communication into daily practice are dispersed throughout the institution.

A defining organisational consequence of digitalisation is the convergence of marketing and information technology functions. Digital marketing in HEIs now requires technical competencies such as data analytics, platform management, content optimisation, and CRM administration, all of which were previously the domain of information technology (IT) departments. The work of segmenting audiences, configuring marketing automation,

integrating data sources, and producing platform-native content cannot be undertaken without sustained technical capability, and the digitisation of marketing research has documented this reorganisation of practitioner work in considerable detail (Cluley et al., 2019). Conversely, IT teams that support HEI communications must now understand brand, message, and audience in ways that were once the exclusive province of communications professionals because decisions about data architecture, system integration, and platform configuration carry direct implications for the institutional voice.

This convergence demands new organisational structures. Hybrid teams that combine marketing, communications, IT, and data-analytics expertise are increasingly common in research-intensive institutions, and the conventional separation of communications and IT into distinct reporting lines is no longer sufficient to support coordinated digital strategy. Collaborative working relationships across these functions need to be embedded in routine processes, not improvised on a project-by-project basis. Where this collaboration is institutionalised, the resulting infrastructure can support coordinated reputation management across multiple platforms (Stoica et al., 2025); where it is not, institutions tend to accumulate technical capabilities and communicative ambitions that fail to connect, with predictable losses in coherence and effectiveness.

Digital literacy among communications staff at all levels is therefore a critical and often underestimated condition of success. The evidence is consistent in showing that one-off training events have limited durable effect, and that sustained development programmes combining structured learning, peer mentoring, and protected time for experimentation produce more reliable improvements in capability and confidence (Li et al., 2026; Pu et al., 2025). In communication-specific roles, this implies that recruitment, admissions, alumni relations, and marketing staff require not only technical training in tools but also a working understanding of data analytics, privacy regulation, and the ethical use of personal data, which most HEIs have historically not provided in a systematic manner. The same logic applies in reverse to IT staff that support both communications functions as well as communication-related systems, including websites, CRM platforms, admissions systems, alumni databases, and other stakeholder-facing digital infrastructures. These staff also need sustained exposure to questions of brand, audience, and editorial judgement.

Governance frameworks form a further element. The integration of AI into communication and decision-making cannot proceed without transparent and accountable structures. Recent contributions propose frameworks of differing scope, from broader policy and equity discussions of agentic AI (Vrba et al., 2026) to institution-level governance models such as

INTEGRITY-AI and the CAIR framework, both of which address responsibility, transparency, and academic readiness (Cheng et al., 2026). Emerging empirical evidence from higher education also suggests that stakeholder support for AI-enabled institutional transformation depends on confidence in governance capacity, institutional readiness, and policy implementation, rather than on technological promise alone (Nnaji et al., 2026). Internal alignment is a closely related but less frequently discussed condition. In higher education, institutional brands and communication strategies are not simply projected outwards by marketing units but are co-created through the experiences, interpretations, and practices of internal stakeholders, including staff, students, and middle managers (Dean et al., 2016; Clark et al., 2020; Maunze et al., 2020). Where externally projected messages are perceived as detached from institutional realities, the credibility of the communication function is therefore weakened, and digital communication strategies should be governed as socio-organisational processes rather than as purely promotional or technical systems. Digital transformation in higher education can increase flexibility, widen access, and support more inclusive participation, particularly where digital infrastructures are used to reduce barriers to educational resources and participation (Matsieli & Mutula, 2024). At the same time, digitally mediated higher education is associated with new risks for staff and students, including digital fatigue, social isolation, assessment-related stress, and weakened interpersonal connection (Banda & Czako, 2026; Sanabria-Mazo et al., 2026; Sharma & Alvi, 2022). The governance of digital communication strategies should therefore include attention to well-being, relational quality, and social support, rather than treating these as separate pastoral or psychological concerns.

Table 11.1 below summarises the recurring implementation challenges identified in this section and the categories of organisational and governance instruments associated with them in the recent literature. Confidence in the central importance of governance and of the convergence of marketing and IT is high as several independent strands of literature have reached the same conclusion; in contrast, confidence in the specific effectiveness of any single framework or organisational design is only moderate as empirical evaluations across multiple institutions are still scarce.

11.6 Conclusion

Digital marketing and communication strategies in HEIs are no longer a discrete operational concern at the periphery of institutional management; they have become a structural feature of how universities present themselves, coordinate their internal life, and sustain the trust of their stakeholders. The chapter has argued that marketing, communication, and institutional

Table 11.1 Recurring implementation challenges and associated organisational and governance instruments in digital communication in HEIs

Challenge category	*Typical manifestation*	*Organisational / governance instrument*	*Selected evidence*
Technological	Weak infrastructure, fragmented systems, legacy integration	Coordinated digital infrastructure strategy; investment plans	Sahni, Verma, and Kaurav (2025); Stoica et al. (2025)
Organisational / structural	Siloed marketing and IT functions; ad hoc social-media management; lack of cross-unit coordination	Hybrid marketing-IT teams; cross-functional role design; collaborative working processes	Cluley, Green, and Owen (2019); Nikitina, Lapina, and Kuzmina (2026)
Human / capability	Digital literacy gaps in communications staff; psychological resistance; technostress	Digital leadership; sustained capability-building (analytics, CRM, content optimisation; wellbeing interventions	Oulamine et al. (2025); Li, Wang, and Han (2026); Banda and Czako (2026)
Ethical / regulatory	AI accountability gaps, data protection compliance, equity concerns	Institution-level AI governance frameworks; transparency rules	Cheng et al. (2026); Vrba et al. (2026)

Source: Own elaboration based on the cited sources.

identity should be understood as interconnected domains rather than as separate functions, and that the same digital infrastructures and analytic capabilities now underpin external relations, internal communications, and the symbolic work of identity construction. The advantages of this transformation are real, including wider reach, more responsive communication, and improved administrative coordination; so too are the costs, including the risk of weakened interpersonal ties, the ethical challenges of AI integration, and the persistent inequalities of digital access.

The reviewed evidence points to a more integrated understanding of digital marketing and communication in higher education. Rather than being handled as a set of discrete operational tasks, platform strategy, content strategy, and AI deployment should be governed as an institutional

function aligned with stakeholder differentiation and the educational mission of the HEI. This requires recognising the growing convergence between marketing and IT functions through hybrid organisational structures, sustained investment in digital literacy among communications staff, and reciprocal exposure of IT staff to questions of brand, audience, and institutional meaning. Most importantly, the legitimacy and truth-alignment of institutional narratives should be treated as primary strategic objectives rather than secondary ethical considerations, since the long-run reputational position of an HEI depends less on the volume or technical sophistication of its communication than on its credibility.

Marketing, in this sense, remains a defensible managerial practice within universities (Spalding & Wang, 2006), but only when its narratives are governed for legitimacy as well as for effect (Schadenberg & Folmer, 2022). The most promising path forward involves blending digital efficiency with relational depth, supported by clear governance, capable leadership, and continuing investment in the people who carry digital strategies into daily practice. The research agenda set out in the preceding section indicates that several of the conditions for this path are still imperfectly understood, and that the next phase of scholarship on digital marketing and communication strategies in HEIs will need to bring management, education, and information systems research into closer dialogue than has hitherto been the case.

References

Aicha, B., A., & Bouzaabia, R. (2023). The effects of video storytelling advertising on consumers' online reactions on Facebook: A cross cultural study. *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, *26*(3), 247–268. https://doi.org/10.1108/QMR-06-2022-0101.

Al-Dmour, R., Al-Dmour, H., Al-Dmour, Y., & Al-Dmour, A. (2025). Transforming international student recruitment: The role of AI, personalization, and trust in Jordanian higher education. *Journal of International Students, 15*(8), 25–52. https://doi.org/10.32674/m2fmc286

AlDreabi, H., Al Twahya, F. K. A., Alzboun, N., Anabtawi, M., Abu Ghaboush, R., Alhur, M., & Alshurideh, M. T. (2024). The role of digital communication in developing administrative work in higher education institutions. *International Journal of Data and Network Science, 8*(2), 1261–1274. https://doi.org/10.5267/j.ijdns.2023.11.008

Ashraf, R., Hitam, N. A., Khan, M. M. S., Naithani, P., Khdour, N., Badreddine, S., & Albeshr (2025). Leveraging LinkedIn as a digital platform for employer branding. *Journal of Theoretical and Applied Electronic Commerce Research, 20*(4), 316. https://doi.org/10.3390/jtaer20040316

Aydin, C. H. (2017). Current status of the MOOC movement in the world and reaction of the Turkish higher education institutions. *Open Praxis, 9*(1), 59–78. https://doi.org/10.5944/openpraxis.9.1.463

Banda, P., & Czako, K. (2026). The impact of digital transformation on interpersonal relationships and mental well-being in higher education institutions. In R. El Khoury (Ed.), *Business models of the future* (pp. 941–952). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-85398-2_83

Bond, M., Marín, V. I., Dolch, C., Bedenlier, S., & Zawacki-Richter, O. (2018). Digital transformation in German higher education: Student and teacher perceptions and usage of digital media. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *15*(1), 48. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-018-0130-1

Cheng, Z., Thewissen, J., Bi, M., & Zhu, C. (2026). Readiness and responsible practices: Academics' perspectives on AI integration through the CAIR framework. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2026.2644340

Cingillioglu, I., Gal, U., & Prokhorov, A. (2024). Social media marketing for student recruitment: An algorithmically sequenced literature review. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education, 34*(2), 1101–1123. https://doi.org/10.1080/08841241.2023.2177789

Clark, P., Chapleo, C., & Suomi, K. (2020). Branding higher education: An exploration of the role of internal branding on middle management in a university rebrand. *Tertiary Education and Management, 26*, 131–149. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11233-019-09054-9

Cluley, R., Green, W., & Owen, R. (2019). The changing role of the marketing researcher in the age of digital technology: Practitioner perspectives on the digitization of marketing research. *International Journal of Market Research*, *62*(1), 27–42. https://doi.org/10.1177/1470785319865129.

Davis, J., Wolff, H.-G., Forret, M. L., & Sullivan, S. E. (2020). Networking via LinkedIn: An examination of usage and career benefits. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 118*, 103396. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2020.103396

Dean, D., Arroyo-Gamez, R. E., Punjaisri, K., & Pich, C. (2016). Internal brand co-creation: The experiential brand meaning cycle in higher education. *Journal of Business Research*, *69*(8), 3041–3048. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2016.01.019

Fakrudeen, M. (2025). Evaluation of the accessibility and usability of university websites: A comparative study of the Gulf region. *Universal Access in the Information Society, 24,* 1883–1898. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10209-024-01160-9

Freeman, R. E. (1984) *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach.* Pitman.

Fu, Y., Weng, Z., & Wang, J. (2024). Navigating the ethical terrain of AI in education: A systematic review on framing responsible human-centered AI practices. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence, 7*, 100306. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100306

Hu, S., Liu, J., Li, H., Yin, J., & Liu, X. (2025). Exploring the mechanism of AI-powered personalized product recommendation on Generation Z users' spontaneous buying intention on short-form video platforms: A perceived evaluation perspective. *Journal of Theoretical and Applied Electronic Commerce Research, 20*(4), 290. https://doi.org/10.3390/jtaer20040290

Jongbloed, B., Enders, J., & Salerno, C. (2008). Higher education and its communities: Interconnections, interdependencies and a research agenda. *Higher Education*, *56*(3), 303–324. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-008-9128-2

Kemp, E., Porter, M., III, Anaza, N. A., & Min, D. (2021). The impact of storytelling in creating firm and customer connections in online environments. *Journal of Research in Interactive Marketing, 15*(1), 104–124. https://doi.org/10.1108/JRIM-06-2020-0136

Leandro, A., Morais, J., & Silva, E. (2025). Digital storytelling in higher education: The use of podcasts in building institutional identity and engagement. *Innovative Higher Education, 51*, 905–924. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-025-09839-4

Lee, C. C. M., Ji, Y., Collins, E., Howard, B., & Choate, J. (2025). Biomedical graduate outcomes unlocked: LinkedIn as a powerful tracking tool. *Advances in Physiology Education, 49*(4), 883–889. https://doi.org/10.1152/advan.00136.2025

Leišytė, L. (2026). Digital platforms and their usage in higher education human resource management. In D. A. Thomas & V. Laterza (Eds.), *Critical perspectives on EdTech in higher education: Varieties of platformisation* (pp. 233–251). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-88173-2_10

Li, J., Wang, Y., & Han, J. (2026). A study on the relationship between digital leadership, digital self-efficacy, and work engagement: The moderating role of technostress. *Frontiers in Psychology, 17*, 1751207. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2026.1751207

Limanovskaja, A., & Davidavičienė, V. (2025). Digital transformation in higher education: Challenges and transformation directions. *Economics and Culture, 22*(2), 83–92. https://doi.org/10.2478/jec-2025-0016

Luo, J. (2025). Design and assessment of AI-based learning tools in higher education: A systematic review. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 22*, 54. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-025-00540-2

Mager, A. (2021). *Toward a cross-platform brand storytelling model: Bridging transmedia, narrative, and marketing discourses* [Master's research paper, Ryerson University]. https://rshare.library.torontomu.ca/articles/thesis/Toward_a_cross-platform_brand_storytelling_model_bridging_transmedia_narrative_and_marketing_discourses/14648784

Matsieli, M., & Mutula, S. (2024). COVID-19 and digital transformation in higher education institutions: Towards inclusive and equitable access to quality education. *Education Sciences, 14*(8), 819. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14080819

Maunze, O. R., Abratt, R., & Mingione, M. (2020). Impact of internal branding on student engagement: Insights from a South African university. *Services Marketing Quarterly, 41*(2), 124–144. https://doi.org/10.1080/15332969.2020.1742979

Miao, F., & Holmes, W. (2023). *Guidance for generative AI in education and research*. UNESCO. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000386693

Mitchell, R. K., Agle, B. R., & Wood, D. J. (1997). Toward a theory of stakeholder identification and salience: Defining the principle of who and what really counts.

Academy of Management Review, *22*(4), 853–886. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1997.9711022105

Naseer, F., Khan, M. N., Tahir, M., Addas, A., & Aejaz, S. M. H. (2024). Integrating deep learning techniques for personalized learning pathways in higher education. *Heliyon, 10*(11), e32628. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e32628

Nikitina, T., Lapiņa, I., & Kuzmina, J. (2026). Agile Essence Improvement Model for assessing business education and enhancing employability. *The International Journal of Management Education, 24*(3), 101427. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2026.101427

Nnaji, I. L., Ayanwale, M. A., Ukeje, I. O., Ekwunife, R. A., Igwe, C. M., Okwor, E. O., & Nwuzor, C. I. (2026). Enhancing governance and performance in Nigerian higher education through AI-driven digital transformation: Insights from stakeholder perspectives. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open, 13*, 102348. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2025.102348

Núñez-Canal, M., De Obesso Arias, M. D. L. M., Pérez-Rivero, C. A., & Álvarez-De-Mon, I. (2026). Stakeholder engagement and strategic innovation in higher education through AI competency. *Journal of Innovation and Knowledge*, *13*, 100920. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jik.2025.100920

Nyagadza, B., Kadembo, E. M., & Makasi, A. (2020). Exploring internal stakeholders' emotional attachment & corporate brand perceptions through corporate storytelling for branding. *Cogent Business & Management, 7*(1), 1816254. https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2020.1816254

Okonkwo, C. W., & Ade-Ibijola, A. (2021). Chatbots applications in education: A systematic review. *Computers and Education Artificial Intelligence*, *2*, 100033. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2021.100033

Oulamine, A., Chakra, R., Ziky, R., Bahida, H., El Gareh, F., Oubihi, I., & Massiki, A. (2025). A systematic literature review of barriers affecting e-learning in higher education. *Educational Process: International Journal, 17*, e2025396. https://doi.org/10.22521/edupij.2025.17.396

Palanci, A., Yılmaz, R. M., & Turan, Z. (2024). Learning analytics in distance education: A systematic review study. *Education and Information Technologies, 29*, 27289–27326. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-024-12737-5

Pawar, S. K., Das, A., & Pal, D. (2024). Social media in higher education marketing: A systematic literature review and research agenda. *Cogent Business & Management, 11*(1), 2423059. https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2024.2423059

Peter, R. (2025). Gen AI–Gen Z: Understanding Gen Z's emotional responses and brand experiences with Gen AI-driven, hyper-personalized advertising. *Frontiers in Communication, 10*, 1554551. https://doi.org/10.3389/fcomm.2025.1554551

Pu, R., Dong, R. K., & Jiang, S. (2025). Toward the Education for Sustainable Development (ESD): Digital leadership and knowledge-sharing behavior on the higher education institutional change. *Education and Information Technologies, 30*(8), 10567–10589. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-024-13247-0

Ruipérez-Valiente, J. A., Jaramillo-Morillo, D., Joksimović, S., Kovanović, V., Muñoz-Merino, P. J., & Gašević, D. (2021). Data-driven detection and characterization of communities of accounts collaborating in MOOCs. *Future*

Generation Computer Systems, 125, 590–603. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.future.2021.07.003

Sahni, S., Verma, S., & Kaurav, R. P. S. (2025). Understanding digital transformation challenges for online learning and teaching in higher education institutions: A review and research framework. *Benchmarking: An International Journal, 32*(5), 1487. https://doi.org/10.1108/BIJ-04-2022-0245

Sanabria-Mazo, J. P., Bentil, H., Bonilla, I., Cladellas, R., Dudenaite, D., Tillmanns, T., … Riva, E. (2026). Well-being in post-pandemic digital higher education: A scoping review of students and teaching staff. *Cogent Education, 13*(1), 2652188. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2026.2652188

Schadenberg, D. & Folmer, E. (2022) Getting the story right: How second-hand stores use storytelling to gain legitimacy with multiple audiences. *Social Enterprise Journal*, *18*(3), 503–518. https://doi.org/10.1108/sej-06-2021-0050

Sharma, S., & Alvi, I. (2022). Impact of digital transformation on academicians' well-being. *Digital Education Review, 42*, 78–97. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1388396.pdf

Shields, A. B., & Peruta, A. (2019). Social media and the university decision. Do prospective students really care? *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education, 29*(1), 67–83. https://doi.org/10.1080/08841241.2018.1557778

Spalding, H. H., & Wang, J. (2006). The challenges and opportunities of marketing academic libraries in the USA: Experiences of US academic libraries with global application. *Library Management*, *27*(6-7), 494–504. https://doi.org/10.1108/01435120610702477

Stephenson, A. L., & Yerger, D. B. (2014). Does brand identification transform alumni into university advocates? *International Review on Public and Nonprofit Marketing, 11*(3), 243–262. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12208-014-0119-y

Stoica, D., Patriche, C.-C., David, S., Beldiman, C. M., & Dragomir Bălănică, C. M. (2025). Knowledge-driven reputation management in higher education institutions. *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge, 10*(6), 100811. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jik.2025.100811

Suknunan, S., & Macháčková, P. (2026). Digital leadership-challenges and promises of digital transformation for higher education through a critical review. In P. Ordóñez de Pablos, X. Zhang, M. Anshari, & M. Almunawar (Eds.), *AI and Digital Technologies Transforming Global Industries*, 121–154. IGI Global Scientific Publishing. https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3373-6097-3.ch005

Tavares, O., Aguiar, J., & Sin, C. (2025). Off the beaten track: Portugal's strategies for attracting international students. *Policy Futures in Education, 23*(3), 604–620. https://doi.org/10.1177/14782103241287566

Tran, H.-A., Evanschitzky, H., Ludwig, S., Nguyen, B., Grewal, D., Farrell, A. M., & Ackfeldt, A.-L. (2026). How universities can use social media for student acquisition. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 54*(*2*), 539–556. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-025-01131-3

Vrba, J., Reza, S. A., Ahmad, M., Rajabov, K., & Sapaeva, B. (2026). Policy, equity, and governance: Shaping the future of agentic AI in education. In M. Ahmad (Ed.), *Multidisciplinary perspectives on agentic AI in educational systems* (pp. 25–42). IGI Global Scientific Publishing.

Wang, S., & Lee, S. K. (2024). Exploring the role of learning goal orientation, instructor reputation, parasocial interaction, and tutor intervention in university students' MOOC retention: A TAM-TRA based examination. *PLOS ONE, 19*(9), e0299014. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0299014

Wong, L.-W., Tan, G. W.-H., Hew, J.-J., Ooi, K.-B., & Leong, L.-Y. (2022). Mobile social media marketing: A new marketing channel among digital natives in higher education? *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education, 32*(1), 113–137. https://doi.org/10.1080/08841241.2020.1834486

Woodside, A.G., Sood, S., & Miller, K. (2008). When consumers and brands talk: Storytelling theory and research in psychology and marketing. *Psychology and Marketing*, *25*(2), 97–145. https://doi.org/10.1002/mar.20203

Zarubina, V., Zarubin, M., Yessenkulova, Z., Salimbayeva, R., & Satbaeva, G. (2024). Digital transformation of the promotion of educational services of Kazakhstani universities. *Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship, 13*, 3. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13731-023-00355-3

Zhu, M., Bonk, C. J., & Sari, A. R. (2022). Trends and issues in MOOC learning analytics empirical research: A systematic literature review. *Education and Information Technologies, 27*, 10135–10160. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-022-11031-6

12 Financial Management and Data-Driven Decision-Making

12.1 From Financial Administration to Strategic Financial Governance

Few areas of university management have changed as quickly over the past decade as the management of university finances. Demands for financial sustainability, solvency, and demonstrable accountability to students, governments, regulators, and donors have pressed institutions to treat finance not as a back-office function but as a central concern of strategy and governance (McNaughtan et al., 2022; OECD, 2025a; Office for Students, 2024).

The pressure behind this shift is structural rather than incidental. Public funding in many national higher education systems has failed to keep pace with rising costs, while inflation, staff costs, estates, compliance, demographic volatility, and international-student exposure have made institutional income more fragile. The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development review of higher education financial sustainability identifies precisely this combination of pressures across systems, while UK sector analyses show how cost inflation, tuition-fee constraints, and uneven liquidity have moved financial sustainability from a technical concern to a governing-board concern (OECD, 2025a; Universities UK & PwC, 2024; Office for Students, 2024).

For higher education institutions, financial sustainability is therefore not a generic question of organisational survival. It is tied to the public mission of the university and to a distinctive revenue ecology in which public grants, tuition fees, research funding, student accommodation, commercial activity, philanthropy, endowment income, and international student recruitment often interact uneasily. A change in one stream can quickly destabilise another: a fall in international enrolment may reduce unrestricted income; a decline in research grants may increase pressure on cross-subsidy from teaching; and inflation in estates or energy costs can absorb resources before they reach academic activity. This interdependence

DOI: 10.4324/9781042001422-17
This chapter has been made available under a CC BY-NC-ND license.

explains why contemporary financial management in Higher Education Institutions has become a matter of strategic governance rather than just financial control (OECD, 2025a; Office for Students, 2024; Universities UK & PwC, 2024).

The same point applies to accountability. Universities answer simultaneously to governing boards, regulators, ministries, students, funders, staff, donors, creditors, and local communities. Each constituency asks different financial questions: Is the institution solvent? Has public money been used properly? Do fees produce educational value? Are cross-subsidies legitimate? Are capital projects affordable? Is risk being carried by those least able to influence it? Data-driven finance is valuable because it can bring these questions into a common evidence base, but it also makes the politics of allocation more visible. In a university, financial information is never merely technical; it structures arguments about academic priorities, equity between units, and the future shape of the institution (McNaughtan et al., 2022; Cohen et al., 2018).

This chapter takes this observation a step further. Digitalisation does more than make existing processes faster or cheaper. It alters the economic model of higher education itself. New revenue streams emerge from digital fundraising, platform-mediated payments, and more sophisticated use of institutional data. New cost structures result from the move towards subscription software, cloud infrastructure, and analytics capability that must be bought, maintained, and renewed. New investment imperatives arise because competitive standing now depends on technical capacity that few institutions can build for themselves. New forms of financial risk follow from dependence on vendors, exposure to cyberattacks, and the possibility that financial decisions become overly dependent on narrow indicators. Read this way, data-driven finance is not a tool bolted onto an otherwise unchanged institution. It is a force that rearranges where money comes from, where it goes, and where it can be lost.

This understanding of data-driven finance as a force that reshapes the economic model of the university carries a caution that runs through the whole chapter. The capacity to measure, forecast, and monitor financial activity in something close to real time is genuinely valuable, yet it does not relieve leaders of making judgements. Numbers describe a university. They do not determine what it is for. A dashboard can show that a faculty has falling research income, rising staff costs, or weaker programme margins; it cannot determine whether the right response is investment, restructuring, patient support for a new disciplinary strategy, or closure. That interpretation requires academic, financial, and mission-sensitive judgement.

These themes connect directly to governance, risk, accountability, and cybersecurity. Financial data now sits at the centre of strategic governance conversations, and the protection of financial operations from cyberthreats

has become a responsibility that reaches the governing board rather than stopping at the finance office. The discussion proceeds in four further parts. The first describes the analytics infrastructures that institutions are assembling. The second examines how that infrastructure is changing the economic model of the university, including its revenue, costs, and growing dependence on commercial platforms. The third turns to the risks this creates and the governance responses they require, including the behavioural effects of pervasive measurement and the board-level character of financial cybersecurity. A short conclusion returns to the relationship between data and judgement.

12.2 The Analytics Infrastructure of the Modern University

Much of the recent writing on financial management describes a recognisable cluster of technologies that together restructure planning, budgeting, and control: enterprise resource planning systems, business intelligence platforms, data warehouses, cloud-based financial tools, workflow automation, and, increasingly, predictive analytics.

In the HEI context, these systems should be read as management information systems rather than as generic corporate finance software. They integrate student-number projections, tuition-fee exposure, research-grant pipelines, estate commitments, staffing costs, philanthropic income, and regulatory reporting obligations into a financial picture that senior teams and governing bodies use to make decisions. This integration matters because university finances are not reducible to sales, costs, and margins: they involve cross-subsidies between teaching and research, uneven income cycles, public-interest obligations, and missions that cannot be valued through short-run financial return alone.

The most visible expression of this shift is the dashboard. Business intelligence systems are designed to assemble, visualise, and distribute organisational data so that decision makers can interpret trends with greater timeliness. Recent experimental work on dashboard visualisations shows that information format, currency, and completeness can improve decision quality indirectly by reducing perceived task complexity and increasing satisfaction with the information provided (Hjelle et al., 2024). In higher education, however, dashboards do not simply support decisions; they also shape governance by defining what is visible, comparable, and actionable. Weinberg's analysis of Power BI in Danish higher education is especially useful here because it shows how data visualisation platforms are entangled with funding pressures, managerial reforms, and vulnerability to defunding in specific disciplinary areas (Weinberg, 2025).

Behind the dashboard lies a broader claim that data analytics functions as an infrastructure for financial strategy rather than merely a reporting

mechanism. Studies of big data analytics capability indicate that data-driven insight improves organisational performance only when it is embedded in decision processes, supported by appropriate capabilities, and aligned with organisational goals (Awan et al., 2021). The same lesson applies to university finance. An institution gains little from a dashboard that pulls unreliable data from unreconciled systems. It gains value when data across key functional domains of the university such as finance, student administration, human resources, estates, research, and strategic planning can be connected through agreed definitions and governed processes.

It helps to be concrete about what this infrastructure actually consists of. At its base sits the system of record: finance and enterprise resource planning software in which transactions are captured. Above it sits an integration layer that draws data from finance, student records, human resources, estates, and research management systems into a common store where data are cleaned and reconciled. Above that layer sit dashboards, scenario models, and predictive tools. Each tier depends on the one beneath it, which is why an impressive dashboard built on an unreliable foundation flatters the institution rather than informing it. The visible sophistication of the top layer is frequently mistaken for the health of the whole, but in reality the difficult and unglamorous work lies in the integration beneath it.

The governance significance of this architecture is substantial. Building a single trusted view of institutional finance forces an organisation to agree on definitions that may previously have remained comfortably vague: what counts as the full cost of a programme, how shared overheads are attributed to faculties, how research time is costed, which income is recurrent, and how cross-subsidy is justified. A dashboard built on contested or poorly governed data does not reduce uncertainty so much as relocate it, hiding unresolved disagreement behind a confident visual surface. Whoever controls the definitions embedded in the system exercises a quiet form of power over the decisions the system later appears merely to inform.

Artificial intelligence (AI) extends this trajectory towards prediction and recommendation. In university finance, the most plausible near-term uses are not autonomous strategic decisions but forecasting enrolment-sensitive income, identifying unusual transactions, estimating cash-flow exposure, modelling scenario assumptions, and supporting procurement or estates planning. These applications may improve responsiveness, but they also require model documentation, explainability, human review, and auditability.

The auditing literature makes a related observation from a different direction. Big-data-enabled auditing moves from sampling towards broader testing, anomaly detection, and more continuous monitoring. For universities, this logic is attractive because public accountability, donor trust, research-funder compliance, and internal stewardship all depend on credible

records. Yet, the shift is never only technical. As Williamson (2017) argues of education more generally, the spread of data systems changes what institutions come to see and value. Financial dashboards therefore need to be assessed not only for accuracy and speed, but also for the institutional behaviours they encourage.

12.3 Reshaping the Economic Model of University Finance

The technologies described so far are usually justified by efficiency, but their more profound effect falls on the economic model of the university. Two decades of scholarship on academic capitalism have shown how universities increasingly behave as market actors, pursuing revenue, competing for position, and reorganising internal economies around external income (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). Digital finance accelerates this trend and equips it with new instruments.

The transformation of university finance can be organised around four linked economic effects. First, digital tools create or extend revenue channels through online payments, digital fundraising, and data-enabled services. Second, they alter cost structures by replacing owned systems with continuing subscriptions, cloud contracts, and vendor-managed analytics. Third, they create new investment imperatives because competitiveness increasingly depends on technical capabilities that must be purchased, governed, and renewed. Fourth, they generate financial risks that are inseparable from cyber risk, procurement risk, data-governance risk, and reputational risk. This four-part structure makes this chapter less a discussion of technology adoption than an analysis of how digitalisation changes the financial management problem facing universities.

Financial technology supplies some of the machinery. FinTech should not be understood as a single product but as an ecosystem of payment technologies, platform infrastructures, crowdfunding, analytics, blockchain, and regulatory technology. Peer-reviewed reviews describe FinTech as part of a wider transformation of financial services in which digital platforms, data, and new intermediaries reshape transactions and organisational relationships (Alt et al., 2018; Barroso & Laborda, 2022). For universities, the attraction is convenience and reach. A payment experience that resembles consumer commerce reduces friction for students and families, while digital fundraising extends the donor base beyond traditional alumni channels.

The data dimension of the new revenue picture deserves particular attention because it is the least familiar and the most contested. Universities generate large quantities of data through teaching, research administration, estate management, finance, procurement, library systems, student services, and alumni relations. In principle, these data have value: as an internal

planning asset, as a basis for services, and as material that can improve institutional performance. In practice, much of the value may be captured by the platforms that process the data rather than by the institutions that produce it. Komljenovic (2021) describes this as educational rentiership: universities pay recurring rents for access to proprietary digital infrastructures while platform owners extract value from data, dependency, and control.

The same partnerships reshape the cost side of the ledger. Subscription software and cloud infrastructure convert what were once occasional capital purchases into continuous operating commitments. Capability that used to be owned is now rented. This change can be defensible: subscriptions spread costs, reduce local maintenance burdens, and transfer some obsolescence risk to providers. However, the same move can also surrender ownership, accumulate dependence, and increase switching costs. Over time, a university may discover that its data, processes, staff skills, and reporting cycles have been reorganised around a provider whose prices, technical roadmap, and data policies it cannot control.

A simple illustration shows what is at stake. An institution that once bought a financial system outright might have paid a large one-off sum and then maintained it modestly for a decade, owning the asset throughout. The same capability acquired today may arrive as an annual subscription that never ends, often rising each year and frequently priced according to the volume of data or the number of users, modules, and integrations. At the end of the decade, the institution may own little and may find it difficult to switch providers because its workflows and data architecture have been built around the vendor's system. The point is not that subscriptions are always the worst choice. The point is that the decision is strategic and should be assessed in terms of ownership, dependence, resilience, data rights, and long-term bargaining power.

Blockchain is sometimes proposed as a means of securing records and financial flows. The more rigorous literature supports a cautious position. Expert assessment of blockchain in financial services points to potential benefits for transparency and tamper-resistant records, while stressing regulatory and supervisory challenges (Chang et al., 2020). Scholarship on permissioned blockchain auditing notes that the technology changes the control environment, eliminating some risks while introducing others related to access management, transaction validation, smart-contract governance, cryptographic key management, system interfaces, monitoring, and incident response. It therefore requires a redesign of IT general controls and audit procedures rather than the simple continuation of existing audit assumptions (Sheldon, 2019). A bibliometric review of blockchain in auditing finds the evidence base still developing, which supports treating adoption as a governance project rather than a procurement shortcut (Hakami et al., 2023).

The platformisation of university finance presents two faces at once. One is innovation and convenience, expressed in smoother payments, wider fundraising, more responsive planning, and auditable records. The other is operational dependence and risk. FinTech literature repeatedly links digital convenience with exposure to privacy, financial stability, competition, and cybersecurity risks (Vučinić, 2022; Barroso & Laborda, 2022). In HEIs, these risks are amplified by the sensitivity of student, staff, donor, supplier, payroll, and research-funder data. A finance strategy that treats platform adoption only as efficiency improvement therefore misses the institutional risk created by the very systems that make finance more efficient.

12.4 New Financial Risks and Governance Response

If digitalisation rearranges revenue and cost, it also changes what accountability looks like and what can go wrong. Transparent and ethical financial reporting remains a pillar of institutional sustainability and public trust, but digitalisation alone does not guarantee it. Research on public-sector accounting warns that systems can produce information that does not meet the requirements of accountability (Cohen et al., 2018). The implication for universities is direct: financial systems must be designed around governance needs, not merely around operational reporting.

The deeper risk is harder to see because it operates through success rather than failure. As monitoring becomes continuous and funding is increasingly tied to measured performance, the university begins to resemble a quantified institution. Foucault (1977) described how the possibility of constant observation induces people to govern their own conduct. Power (1999) showed how the audit society reorganises organisations around verification. Espeland and Sauder (2016) documented how rankings provoke reactivity in higher education, encouraging institutions to change behaviour in order to improve the numbers. Williamson (2017) and Weinberg (2025) extend this warning into the datafied university: metrics and dashboards do not merely describe institutional life but help reshape it.

This risk is easiest to grasp through a concrete case. Suppose an institution ties part of each faculty budget to a composite score combining completion rates, graduate earnings, and research income. Within a year, rational behaviour at faculty level may involve admitting students likely to complete, favouring programmes with stronger earnings data, and chasing grants that score well, regardless of whether those choices serve the institution's mission. The measure, having become a target, ceases to measure what it once did. A funding formula that was meant to reward quality instead trains the organisation to "perform the formula". Nothing in the technology causes this by itself. The cause is the decision to let a metric govern without adequate deliberation, appeal, and contextual judgement.

Three behavioural risks follow. The first is bias. Models trained on historical data can reproduce historical inequalities, particularly where past funding, recruitment, completion, and research income reflect structural advantage. The second is risk aversion. When funding is tied tightly to measured outcomes, units learn to avoid work whose benefits are long-term, uncertain, civic, local, interdisciplinary, or difficult to monetise. The third is displacement of judgement: the quiet assumption that a figure on a screen has settled a question that in truth calls for institutional deliberation.

A further risk has moved decisively from the technical domain into the boardroom. As financial operations are digitalised and connected to external platforms, they become targets, and the consequences of compromise are counted in solvency, continuity, and public confidence rather than inconvenience.

Enterprise risk management is especially relevant in HEIs because risks are interdependent: enrolment risk affects income; income risk affects staffing and estates; cyber risk affects payment continuity and trust; reputational risk affects recruitment and philanthropy; regulatory risk affects operating permission. Bamber's case-based work on enterprise-wide risk management in higher education provides sector-specific support for embedding risk management into educational governance, while Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission's enterprise risk management framework links risk explicitly to strategy and performance (Bamber, 2023; COSO, 2017).National Institute of Standards and Technology's Cybersecurity Framework 2.0 strengthens this point by foregrounding the GOVERN function and by treating cybersecurity as part of enterprise risk management rather than as a separate technical checklist (NIST, 2024).

The concrete forms of threat are worth naming. Finance functions are attacked through fraudulent redirection of legitimate payments, impersonation of senior officers to authorise transfers, compromise of supplier details, ransomware that interrupts payroll and accounts payable, and denial-of-service attacks that disrupt digital operations. The UK Cyber Security Breaches Survey 2025/2026 reported that three in ten higher education institutions experienced a breach or attack at least weekly, and that further and higher education institutions reported higher incidences of impersonation, malware, denial-of-service attacks, and unauthorised access than many other education categories (Department for Science, Innovation and Technology, 2026).

For this reason, the board-level discussion should be framed through enterprise risk rather than through information technology alone. The NIST Cybersecurity Framework 2.0 makes governance an explicit function of cybersecurity management, requiring organisations to establish roles, responsibilities, policy, oversight, and risk appetite before technical controls can be meaningful (National Institute of Standards and Technology, 2024).

For higher education institutions, this means that payment security, payroll continuity, procurement controls, cyber insurance, incident reporting, and recovery capability belong within the same assurance conversation as liquidity, reserves, and financial sustainability. The risk is not only that a system may fail, but that a financial governance system may prove unable to explain who was responsible, what level of exposure was acceptable, and how quickly the institution can restore core financial operations.

The governance response is institutional rather than merely technical. Someone must own the definitions on which financial data rests. Models that influence resource allocation should be documented well enough that a competent reviewer can understand their inputs, assumptions, and limitations. Units affected by model-informed allocations should have a route to challenge results. The audit committee, or whatever body performs that role, needs the standing and expertise to scrutinise not only the figures produced by financial systems but also the systems that produce them. Cybersecurity, vendor dependence, continuity planning, and data rights should sit within the same risk conversation as liquidity, borrowing, pension exposure, estate liabilities, and enrolment forecasts.

The principle can be stated simply. An unexplainable financial decision cannot be governed, and a financial decision that cannot be contested is not accountable, regardless of how efficiently it may have been made. This is the boundary between data-driven governance and data-driven managerialism.

12.5 Conclusion

Each of the preceding chapters in this book has, in one way or another, explored a transformation already in progress. This final chapter turns instead to what lies ahead. The reflections offered here are grounded in the evidence, patterns, and analytical commitments developed throughout the earlier chapters, yet they are presented as plausible trajectories rather than firm predictions.

Higher education today is undergoing a digital transformation that the COVID-19 pandemic accelerated rather than initiated, prompting institutions to adopt new technologies and governance arrangements at remarkable speed (Sangwa et al., 2025; Zou et al., 2025). It is tempting to interpret this acceleration as a straightforward march towards a clearly defined technological endpoint. That would be misleading. The future of higher education is better understood as a set of sociotechnical possibilities: outcomes shaped not simply by what technologies can do, but by institutional strategy, leadership, and the quality of ethical governance (Sangwa et al., 2025). The same digital platform may broaden access for some learners while intensifying exclusion for others. Research on the future of digital learning repeatedly points to this tension. Technology can widen

opportunity and deepen inequality at the same time. That is precisely why, in the coming decade, careful governance is likely to matter far more than uncritical enthusiasm for adoption (Gilbert & Baxter, 2025; Sharma, 2025).

The developments examined in this chapter –AI in teaching and research, immersive learning through virtual and augmented reality, networked and platform-based institutional models, and portable digital credentials – should therefore be seen as matters of choice rather than as inevitable developments. Each can be directed towards human-centred purposes, equity, transparency, and accountability, or away from them (Komljenovic, 2022; de Andrade et al., 2023; Selznick & Titareva, 2022). This perspective echoes wider analyses of so-called smart societies, where opportunity and risk are inseparable and where the central question is not technological capability, but governance (Ramesh, 2026).

From this perspective, the chapter pursues three aims. First, it maps the horizon by identifying the shifts most likely to shape the next phase of the academic wave. Secondly, it considers the opportunities, asking how digital transformation, if guided well, might make universities more inclusive, more creative, and more responsive to the societies that sustain them. Finally, it issues a call to action. Leaders, academics, administrators, students, and policymakers must not simply drift with forces they did not choose. They need to take an active role in shaping the future of higher education, deliberately and responsibly.

References

Alt, R., Beck, R., & Smits, M. T. (2018). FinTech and the transformation of the financial industry. *Electronic Markets*, *28*(3), 235–243. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12525-018-0310-9

Awan, U., Shamim, S., Khan, Z., Zia, N. U., Shariq, S. M., & Khan, M. N. (2021). Big data analytics capability and decision-making: The role of data-driven insight on circular economy performance. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 168*, 120766. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2021.120766

Bamber, C. (2023). Exploring enterprise-wide risk management system in higher education. *Management Dynamics in the Knowledge Economy*, *11*(3), 267–285. https://doi.org/10.2478/mdke-2023-0017

Barroso, M., & Laborda, J. (2022). Digital transformation and the emergence of the FinTech sector: Systematic literature review. *Digital Business, 2*(2), 100028. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.digbus.2022.100028

Chang, V., Baudier, P., Zhang, H., Xu, Q., Zhang, J., & Arami, M. (2020). How blockchain can impact financial services: The overview, challenges and recommendations from expert interviewees. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, *158*, 120166. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2020.120166

Cohen, S., Rossi, F., Caperchione, E., & Brusca, I. (2018). Local government administration systems and local government accounting information needs: Is

there a mismatch? *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, *85*(4), 708–725. https://doi.org/10.1177/0020852317748732

Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission. (2017). *Enterprise risk management: Integrating with strategy and performance*. COSO. www.coso.org/guidance-erm

Department for Science, Innovation and Technology. (2026). Cyber Security Breaches Survey 2025/2026: Education institutions findings. *GOV.UK*. www.gov.uk/government/statistics/cyber-security-breaches-survey-20252026/cyber-security-breaches-survey-20252026-education-institutions-findings

Espeland, W. N., & Sauder, M. (2016). *Engines of anxiety: Academic rankings, reputation, and accountability*. Russell Sage Foundation.

Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison* (A. Sheridan, Trans.). Pantheon Books. (Original work published 1975).

Gilbert, A., & Baxter, J. (2025). The futures of digital learning and teaching. In J. Baxter, H. Selby-Fell, & A. Gilbert (Eds.), *Creativity and critique in digital learning and teaching: Insights for learning design in business and law* (pp. 323–338). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-68086-1_14

Hakami, T., Sabri, O., Al-Shargabi, B., Rahmat, M., & Attia, O. (2023). A critical review of auditing at the time of blockchain technology: A bibliometric analysis. *EuroMed Journal of Business*, *19*(4), 1173–1201. https://doi.org/10.1108/EMJB-01-2023-0010

Hjelle, S., Mikalef, P., Altwaijry, N., & Parida, V. (2024). Organizational decision making and analytics: An experimental study on dashboard visualizations. *Information & Management*, *61*(6), 104011. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2024.104011

Komljenovic, J. (2021). The rise of education rentiers: Digital platforms, digital data and rents. *Learning, Media and Technology*, *46*(3), 320–332. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2021.1891422

McNaughtan, J., Garcia, H., & Schiffecker, S. (2022). Editors' note. *New Directions for Higher Education*, *2022*(198), 5–6. https://doi.org/10.1002/he.20456

National Institute of Standards and Technology. (2024). *The NIST Cybersecurity Framework (CSF) 2.0*. NIST Cybersecurity White Paper 29. https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.CSWP.29

OECD. (2025a). *The financial sustainability of higher education*. OECD Publishing. www.oecd.org/content/dam/oecd/en/publications/reports/2025/11/the-financial-sustainability-of-higher-education_d0716f48/f544ccfe-en.pdf

Office for Students. (2024). *Financial sustainability of higher education providers in England: 2024 update*. www.officeforstudents.org.uk/media/ly1buqlj/financial-sustainability-report2024.pdf

Power, M. (1999). *The audit society: Rituals of verification*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198296034.001.0001

Sangwa, S., Butera, A., & Mutabazi, P. (2025). Digital transformation of higher education: A post-COVID review of adoption, quality assurance, and governance challenges. *Current Research Bulletin*, *2*(7), 120–133. https://doi.org/10.55677/CRB/I07-07-CRB2025

Sharma, A. K. (2025). Governance in the age of artificial intelligence: A comparative analysis of policy framework in BRICS nations. *AI Magazine*, *46*(2), e70010. https://doi.org/10.1002/aaai.70010

Sheldon, M. D. (2019). A primer for information technology general control considerations on a private and permissioned blockchain audit. *Current Issues in Auditing*, *13*(1), A15–A29. https://doi.org/10.2308/ciia-52356

Slaughter, S., & Rhoades, G. (2004). *Academic capitalism and the new economy: Markets, state, and higher education*. Johns Hopkins University Press. https://doi.org/10.56021/9780801879494

Universities UK & PwC. (2024). *UK higher education financial sustainability report*. www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/sites/default/files/field/downloads/2024-01/pwc-uk-higher-education-financial-sustainability-report-january-2024.pdf

Vučinić, M. (2022). Fintech, risk-based thinking and cyber risk. *Journal of Central Banking Theory and Practice*, *11*(2), 27–53. https://doi.org/10.2478/jcbtp-2022-0012

Weinberg, L. (2025). Power BI and the datafication of Danish higher education. *Big Data & Society*, *12*(3), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1177/20539517251365230

Williamson, B. (2017). *Big data in education: The digital future of learning, policy and practice*. SAGE Publications. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781529714920



Taylor & Francis
Taylor & Francis Group
http://taylorandfrancis.com

Part V

The New Academic Wave

Challenges and Futures



Taylor & Francis
Taylor & Francis Group
http://taylorandfrancis.com

13 Core Characteristics of the New Academic Wave

13.1 Framing the "New Academic Wave" as a Higher Education Paradigm Shift

The preceding 12 chapters of this volume have collectively traced the contours of a systemic transformation in higher education – one that is simultaneously technological, organisational, cultural, and political. This final synthesis chapter does not merely recapitulate those findings. Its purpose is threefold: to distil the core characteristics of what this book has termed the "new academic wave"; to subject those characteristics to critical scrutiny in the light of the evidence assembled throughout the preceding analysis; and to identify where the framework confirms prior theory, where it necessitates revision, and where genuinely unresolved tensions endure.

The term "paradigm shift" is employed here with deliberate care. Following Kuhn's original formulation (1962) and its subsequent reappropriation in the social sciences, a paradigm shift implies not merely incremental change but a fundamental reorganisation of the assumptions, methods, and goals that structure a field of practice. Contemporary higher education, we argue, satisfies this criterion. The digital transformation currently underway is not reducible to a set of technological adoptions layered onto existing institutional forms. Rather, it represents what Anbarasan et al. (2025) have characterised as a redesign of educational models within an integrated digital ecosystem – a shift in which governance, pedagogy, research, administration, and culture become interdependent in qualitatively new ways.

The conceptual architecture of this volume extends Burton R. Clark's seminal analysis (1998) of the entrepreneurial university. Clark identified five organisational pathways of transformation – namely, a strengthened steering core, an extended developmental periphery, a diversified funding base, a stimulated academic heartland, and an entrepreneurial culture – that together enabled universities to escape the growing imbalance between environmental demands and institutional capacity. The "new academic

DOI: 10.4324/9781042001422-19
This chapter has been made available under a CC BY-NC-ND license.

wave" framework proposed in this book does not supersede Clark's model; it reconfigures it for an era in which digital infrastructures, platform-mediated collaboration, and artificial intelligence (AI)-augmented decision-making reconstitute the very terrain on which Clark's five elements operate. As Marginson (2024) observed in his Burton R. Clark Lecture, the megatrends of the past four decades – massification, neoliberalisation, and globalisation – now intersect with digitalisation in ways that amplify and complicate each other, requiring analytical frameworks adequate to that complexity.

Within this framing, the "new academic wave" is characterised by five interlocking features: (i) unprecedented institutional agility; (ii) deep global interconnectedness; (iii) an institutionalised data-driven culture; (iv) hybrid roles and boundary-blurring organisational structures; and (v) an explicit ethical and social-responsibility mandate. These characteristics are neither independent nor of equal weight across all institutional contexts. They are, rather, mutually reinforcing and differentially expressed depending on institutional type, national regulatory environment, and resource endowment. The sections that follow examine each characteristic in detail, drawing on the evidence presented throughout this volume while integrating critical perspectives from the broader scholarly literature.

13.2 Core Characteristic I – Unprecedented Institutional Agility

The first and perhaps most pervasive characteristic of the new academic wave is institutional agility: the capacity to sense environmental change, make adaptive decisions, and reconfigure resources and processes with speed and coherence. This capacity is not a residual managerial virtue; it has become a structural imperative under conditions of digital transformation. Universities increasingly operate in what Velkoska and Nuredin (2023) characterise as dynamic, complex, and sometimes unpredictable socio-economic conditions, in which stable long-cycle planning becomes progressively less viable. The redesign of educational models within integrated digital ecosystems, as mapped by Anbarasan et al. (2025), implies that instructional delivery, institutional strategy, and research infrastructure are all subject to continuous iteration rather than periodic overhaul.

This shift in planning logic is reflected at the managerial level. Marjanovic and Kovacevic-Opacic (2025) demonstrate how internal digital platforms reshape organisational operations and interact continuously with digital-transformation strategising, requiring adaptive governance, cross-unit coordination, and ongoing managerial adjustment rather than reliance on static, top-down planning. The effect is a compression of the decision cycle: what previously required committee deliberation extending across academic years can, in digitally integrated institutions, be accomplished within weeks through data-mediated consultation. Ndidi et al. (2025)

operationalise this through the concept of continuous improvement cultures which connect leadership, instructional quality monitoring, and professional development within tight feedback loops. Tang et al. (2025), writing in *Frontiers in Psychology*, further observe that digital transformation in higher education creates conditions in which experimental pedagogical models can be tested, evaluated, and either scaled or discontinued far more rapidly than traditional infrastructure would permit – what they term "iterative transformation", as distinct from "periodic reform".

The evidence assembled in this volume nonetheless warrants caution about the uncritical celebration of agility as an institutional ideal. Several countervailing considerations emerge from the case studies presented in earlier chapters. First, agility is unevenly distributed: well-resourced research-intensive universities in high-income countries possess the digital infrastructure, data literacy, and management capacity to operationalise rapid adaptation, while institutions in lower-income contexts frequently lack the most basic preconditions. The systematic literature review by Sangwa et al. (2025) – drawing on United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) and World Bank datasets and comparative case evidence from Rwanda, India, and the United States – demonstrates that emergency digital adoption during the COVID-19 pandemic frequently "masked longer-term issues of strategy, funding, and staff support", producing a veneer of agility without the organisational depth to sustain it.

Second, the discourse of agility may function ideologically, legitimating managerial encroachment on academic autonomy under the rubric of institutional responsiveness. As Morley (2024) argues in her critical analysis, neoliberal managerialism has systematically subordinated academic work to administrative imperatives, with agility discourse serving as a contemporary vehicle for that subordination. The point is not that agility is inherently problematic, but that its governance implications must be scrutinised: agility in whose interest, directed by whom, and accountable to which constituency? The university's commitment to slow, careful scholarship – its epistemic core – is not obviously compatible with the rhythms of iterative platform-mediated management. This tension is insufficiently theorised in the extant literature and remains one of the most significant unresolved challenges within the new academic wave.

13.3 Core Characteristic II – Global Interconnectedness

Global interconnectedness constitutes the second core characteristic of the new academic wave and operates across multiple registers simultaneously. At the structural level, the long-running agenda of higher education internationalisation – encompassing mobility of students, scholars, and programmes, as well as the institutional legitimation effects of global

rankings – has established a baseline of cross-border integration that predates the current digital transformation (de Wit, 2020). What the digital wave adds is a qualitative intensification of that integration: cloud computing and networked platforms enable distributed participation and coordination in research collaborations, curriculum development, and administrative benchmarking at scales previously impracticable (Anbarasan et al., 2025).

The evolution of global interconnectedness also has an institutional competitive dimension. De Wit (2020) observes that internationalisation has shifted in part from cooperative exchange to competitive positioning, with international education increasingly functioning as an industry and revenue stream. This market logic intersects with the digital transformation in complex ways: platform-mediated delivery enables new modes of cross-border educational provision, while global data infrastructures intensify reputational competition through the proliferation of rankings, citation metrics, and employer-satisfaction indices. Kayyali (2025), writing in a volume published by IGI Global, identifies the concept of "sustainable internationalisation" as an emergent counter-narrative, arguing that responsible global engagement requires universities to balance competitive pressures against commitments to equity, cultural diversity, and local relevance.

Cultural complexity is a constitutive feature of global interconnectedness, not an externality. Mariyono, Kamila, and Hidayatullah (2025) examine how globalisation simultaneously produces homogenising pressures – principally through the dominance of English-language knowledge systems and Anglophone institutional models – and cultural enrichment through exchange, multilingualism, and hybrid forms. Universities that treat internationalisation as a revenue optimisation exercise, without attending to the unequal cultural dynamics that structure global academic flows, risk reproducing rather than challenging epistemic hierarchies.

A critical dimension of global interconnectedness that several chapters in this volume have confronted directly is political contestation. The assumption that academic globalisation proceeds within a broadly permissive political environment has been challenged by the resurgence of nationalist and sovereigntist political movements in numerous national contexts. As Muradian and Pascual (2020) observe, political movements oriented against globalism and immigration create friction around cross-border academic openness, affecting everything from visa policy to research collaboration to the institutional rhetoric of diversity and inclusion. The new academic wave cannot, therefore, be understood as straightforwardly cosmopolitan: it unfolds within political environments that are often ambivalent or actively hostile to the values that underpin international academic exchange.

The governance of global interconnectedness thus requires what Kayyali (2025) terms "leadership perspectives on sustainable internationalisation": an

orientation that acknowledges geopolitical constraints, attends to the power asymmetries structuring North–South academic relations, and resists the temptation to treat mobility and digitally mediated collaboration as self-evidently beneficial regardless of their distributional consequences.

13.4 Core Characteristic III – A Data-Driven Academic Culture

The institutionalisation of data-driven culture constitutes the third defining characteristic of the new academic wave, and it is in this domain that the transformation of the university is perhaps most profound and most contested. The enabling conditions are well established: big data infrastructure, cloud computing, and AI combine to make possible the collection, processing, and interpretation of datasets at scales and speeds that fundamentally change the information environment in which institutional decisions are taken (Anbarasan et al., 2025). Cekuls (2025) observes that AI-enabled real-time analysis of large datasets can reveal organisational patterns that would be imperceptible to conventional management information systems, generating what this volume terms "institutional intelligence" – an analytic capacity that extends from student learning outcomes to staffing patterns, financial trajectories, and strategic positioning.

The *Springer Nature* article by Sposato (2025) provides a comprehensive taxonomy of AI applications in educational leadership, identifying ten distinct domains of deployment – from administrative efficiency and personalised learning to risk management and crisis response. The breadth of this taxonomy illustrates the extent to which data-driven practice is no longer confined to specialist analytic units but is increasingly embedded across the full range of institutional functions. The findings of Bergsteedt and Plessis (2025) further demonstrate that strategic thinking and accountable governance in universities are increasingly mediated through data infrastructures, with institutional effectiveness increasingly measured through quantified performance indicators rather than peer-based qualitative judgement.

At the pedagogical level, data-driven culture manifests in the systematic evaluation of instructional approaches. Wu and Zhang (2024) exemplify this orientation through their investigation of flipped-classroom pedagogies, demonstrating how data collection and statistical analysis can be deployed to assess the differential effectiveness of instructional modes across disciplinary contexts, an inherently iterative, adaptive stance towards curriculum design that stands in contrast to the tradition-based curricular conservatism characteristic of many pre-digital academic cultures. Similarly, Fitzgerald et al. (2023) situate the remixing of open educational resources within a broader framework of "sustainable data-driven language learning systems

design", positioning open content and data analytics as co-constitutive elements of an emergent pedagogical paradigm.

The institutionalisation of data-driven culture is not without significant risks and critiques, and the evidence assembled in this volume demands that these be confronted directly rather than relegated to a residual category of "challenges". The systematic literature review on AI for good governance in universities by Chairuddin et al. (2025) identifies AI-based systems as powerful tools for enhancing transparency, accountability, and resource management, but equally notes that their effectiveness is contingent on robust data governance frameworks, ethical oversight mechanisms, and institutional capacity to interpret and act on analytical outputs responsibly. Without such frameworks, datafication can produce what the literature on learning analytics terms "surveillance without understanding": the accumulation of data points that generate compliance behaviour without improving learning or wellbeing.

Privacy and data ethics are acutely salient in this context. Sposato (2025) observes that

> as AI systems in education become more pervasive, educational leaders of the future may need to become adept at managing complex data ecosystems, balancing the benefits of data-driven insights with the imperative to protect student privacy and ensure ethical use of data.

Through analysis of open-data governance in Kazakhstan, Kassen (2017) further demonstrates that platform architecture choices determine whether data infrastructures enable or constrain public value creation: Information and Communication Technology-driven single-platform approaches can facilitate open-data initiatives, but they simultaneously concentrate power and create dependencies that may undermine the institutional autonomy they purport to serve.

The most fundamental critique of data-driven culture within universities, however, concerns its implications for epistemic authority. When institutional decision-making is increasingly governed by quantified metrics, citation counts, student satisfaction scores, revenue per programme, and graduate employment rates, the forms of knowledge that do not lend themselves to quantification are systematically marginalised. As Morley (2024) argues, this represents a form of colonisation of the academic heartland by managerial rationality, in which the slow, uncertain, and frequently uncommercial work of fundamental scholarship is rendered institutionally invisible. The new academic wave must grapple honestly with this tension: data-driven governance is a genuine advance in institutional intelligence, but it is not a substitute for, and may actively undermine, the epistemic culture that universities exist to sustain.

13.5 Core Characteristic IV – Hybrid Roles and Boundary-Blurring Structures

The fourth characteristic of the new academic wave is the progressive dissolution of the boundaries that historically separated academic from administrative work, and both from external innovation ecosystems. This boundary-blurring operates at multiple levels: individual role configurations, organisational structures, and the broader articulation of universities within regional and global knowledge economies. At the individual level, Laufer et al. (2025) show that effective leadership for digital change increasingly takes the form of enabling leadership, in which managers steer and support innovation by creating adaptive spaces, sharing decision-making, empowering staff, and facilitating collaboration rather than relying primarily on hierarchical control. This represents a significant departure from the line-management model that characterised mid-twentieth-century university administration. Academic staff, meanwhile, are increasingly expected to perform roles that would previously have been distributed across distinct professional functions: grant-writing, knowledge transfer, digital content creation, data management, and public engagement alongside research and teaching.

Technology transfer is emblematic of the boundary-blurring logic of the new wave. Chiș and Crișan (2020), through a project-based study of the Graphene4Life initiative, demonstrate that successful technology transfer depends on multifactor configurations that span research competency, policy literacy, commercial awareness, and stakeholder communication – a configuration that no single traditional academic role encompasses. This finding is consistent with the broader literature on university–industry collaboration, which documents the emergence of hybrid institutional actors, knowledge brokers, technology transfer officers, and research commercialisation specialists, all of which occupy the interstices between academic and market logics.

At the organisational level, the new wave is characterised by the proliferation of what Clark (1998) termed "extended developmental peripheries" – namely, boundary-spanning units that connect the academic core to external partners while insulating it from direct market pressure. In the digital era, these peripheries include innovation hubs, digital transformation offices, data analytics centres, and online learning divisions. Their proliferation reflects the deepening integration of universities into what Li (2025) terms "digital innovation networks for the SDGs": transinstitutional partnerships oriented towards addressing global challenges through digitally mediated research and education collaboration.

The hybridisation of academic roles is not a neutral organisational evolution; it is accompanied by significant shifts in power, status, and

employment security. The critical literature on academic capitalism has documented extensively how the blurring of academic–administrative boundaries has frequently operated to the disadvantage of faculty: administrative logics penetrate the academic heartland, eroding the epistemic authority and professional autonomy of academic staff, while the expansion of managerial hierarchies concentrates strategic decision-making power in the hands of professional administrators rather than scholars (Slaughter and Leslie, 1997; Morley, 2024). O'Brady's analysis (2025) of academic capitalism and employment precarity demonstrates that neoliberal institutional restructuring has produced a workforce in which contingent employment now comprises a majority of academic positions in several national systems, with hybrid role expectations demanding that precarious staff perform the functions of tenured scholars, intensifying rather than resolving the contradictions of the academic labour market.

The digital wave does not resolve these contradictions; in several respects it amplifies them. Platform-mediated delivery creates new possibilities for the unbundling of teaching from research, enabling institutions to employ casualised staff for digitally delivered instruction while concentrating research investment in elite units. The emergence of AI-assisted teaching tools may further accelerate this dynamic by reducing the perceived need for highly qualified instructional staff in certain course typologies. The new academic wave must therefore be assessed not only in terms of its organisational innovations but also in terms of its distributional consequences: who benefits from boundary-blurring, and who bears the costs of hybridisation?

13.6 Core Characteristic V – An Ethical and Social-Responsibility Mandate

The fifth characteristic of the new academic wave is the explicit embedding of an ethical and social-responsibility mandate within the institutional identity of the digital university. This is not a novel aspiration: historically, universities have articulated their social mission in terms of knowledge for the public good, civic engagement, and the cultivation of critical citizenship. What distinguishes the current moment is the degree to which this mandate has become operationalised, institutionalised, and contested simultaneously. Velkoska and Nuredin (2023) observe that universities are increasingly expected to be agile, autonomous, transparent, and oriented towards innovation and quality in the service of social and global needs – expectations that establish both the operational and normative dimensions of the new wave. The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), and SDG4 in particular, have provided a framework through which this mandate is globally articulated, with digital innovation positioned as a vehicle for widening access to quality education and reducing educational inequalities (UNESCO, 2024).

The ethical mandate has specific and urgent salience in the domain of access. Mihus (2024) documents how access to high-quality training and education can be impeded by financial constraints, geographic limitations, and cultural resistance to change – impediments that digital transformation may either address or exacerbate depending on the design choices made by institutional leaders and policymakers. The research reviewed by the systematic literature review on digital transformation barriers (Singun, 2025) demonstrates that "many students are left without proper internet access or devices", and that "online learning remains out of reach for those who cannot align with conventional classes". These findings position digital equity not as a peripheral concern but as a central design challenge for the new academic wave.

Mauti and Nyambane (2025) explicitly connect transformative leadership with ethical imperatives in technology-driven higher education, arguing that equity must be treated as a primary organisational goal rather than a secondary consideration. Their analysis resonates with the framework developed by Floridi and Cowls (2019), which identifies beneficence, non-maleficence, autonomy, justice, and explicability as the five foundational principles for ethical AI in society – principles that apply with particular force to AI deployment in educational institutions, where asymmetries of power between institution and student are structurally significant.

The ethical mandate of the new academic wave extends to the domains of knowledge production and institutional accountability. Fitzgerald et al. (2023) situate open educational resources within a sustainability and public-access agenda, arguing that the remixing of open-access content has cultural, policy, and commercial implications. Openness is therefore not only a pedagogical strategy for enabling access and reuse, but also an ethical commitment to more inclusive and publicly accountable forms of knowledge circulation. This is consistent with Kassen's (2017) demonstration that open-data governance architectures in public institutions can either enable or constrain public value creation, depending on whether they are designed to maximise institutional control or democratic participation.

The data-driven university bears particular ethical obligations around transparency and accountable governance. When AI systems mediate student assessment, curriculum recommendation, staff performance evaluation, and financial resource allocation, the opacity of algorithmic decision-making becomes a matter of institutional justice. As Sposato (2025) observes, the potential for AI to exacerbate educational inequities will likely be "a central issue in the coming years", requiring a proactive governance approach that "prioritises equity and inclusion from the outset". On this account, the new academic wave cannot be understood as ethically self-regulating: it requires deliberate institutional design, regulatory oversight, and ongoing critical scrutiny to ensure that its benefits are widely shared and its risks are equitably distributed.

13.7 Integrative Framework: How the Characteristics Cohere

Considered independently, each of the five characteristics described above represents a significant dimension of institutional change. Considered together, they constitute a coupled transformation in which each element reinforces and complicates the others. This section articulates the coherence logic of the new academic wave framework, identifies the principal tensions within it, and proposes a set of diagnostic questions that institutional leaders and scholars can apply to their own contexts.

Agility and data-driven culture are structurally linked: the real-time adaptive management that agility requires is enabled by the analytics infrastructure that data-driven culture provides. But this linkage is not without friction: the acceleration of decision cycles that analytics enables may conflict with the deliberative governance structures, senate committees, academic boards, and peer reviews through which universities have historically maintained their epistemic integrity. The new academic wave intensifies this tension without resolving it.

Global interconnectedness and hybrid roles are similarly intertwined: the boundary-blurring of academic identities is partly a function of the internationalisation of research and teaching, which creates new expectations regarding cross-cultural competence, multilingual communication, and global partnership management. At the same time, hybridisation creates new vulnerabilities for globally mobile academic staff, whose contingent employment status is intensified by the market logics of international higher education competition.

The ethical mandate cuts across all four other characteristics, functioning simultaneously as a normative aspiration and a critical check. An institution that claims to be agile without subjecting its adaptive capacity to ethical scrutiny risks making rapid decisions that compound rather than address injustice. An institution that pursues global interconnectedness without attending to power asymmetries risks reproducing colonial knowledge hierarchies in digital form. An institution that institutionalises data-driven culture without robust privacy governance and algorithmic accountability risks surveilling its students and staff without their meaningful consent. An institution that embraces hybrid roles without addressing the precarity and power dynamics that accompany hybridisation risks deepening the structural disadvantages of the most vulnerable members of its academic community.

The following matrix (Table 13.1) summarises the five characteristics, their principal enabling conditions, their primary tensions, and the critical questions that each raises for institutional leadership and scholarly analysis:

Table 13.1 Core characteristics of the new academic wave – summary matrix

Characteristic I: Unprecedented Agility
Enabling conditions: integrated digital platforms, real-time analytics, continuous improvement cultures.
Principal tensions: conflict between speed and deliberative governance; uneven distribution across institutional resource contexts.
Critical question: agility in whose interest, governed by whom?
Characteristic II: Global Interconnectedness
Enabling conditions: internationalisation infrastructure, cloud-based collaboration, networked research ecosystems.
Principal tensions: competition vs. cooperation logics; cultural homogenisation vs. enrichment; geopolitical contestation.
Critical question: how are power asymmetries in global academic flows governed?
Characteristic III: Data-Driven Academic Culture
Enabling conditions: big data infrastructure, AI and machine learning, learning analytics platforms.
Principal tensions: institutional intelligence vs. surveillance; quantification vs. qualitative epistemic values; transparency vs. algorithmic opacity.
Critical question: whose knowledge counts, and who controls the data?
Characteristic IV: Hybrid Roles and Boundary-Blurring Structures
Enabling conditions: technology transfer imperatives, interdisciplinary coordination demands, platform-mediated work.
Principal tensions: innovation vs. precarity; managerial encroachment vs. academic autonomy; hybridisation benefits vs. distributional costs.
Critical question: who bears the costs and risks of boundary dissolution?
Characteristic V: Ethical and Social-Responsibility Mandate
Enabling conditions: SDG frameworks, open education movement, accountability expectations.
Principal tensions: public mission vs. market competition; equity aspirations vs. digital divide realities; institutional autonomy vs. regulatory oversight.
Critical question: how is the ethical mandate operationalised rather than merely proclaimed?

13.8 Critical Assessment: What the Evidence Confirms, Complicates, and Contests

Having articulated the five characteristics and their interrelations, this section undertakes the critical evaluation that a scholarly synthesis demands. The new academic wave framework is presented not as a completed theoretical edifice but as a working conceptual tool that the evidence assembled throughout this volume both supports and complicates in important ways.

What the evidence confirms: the digitally enabled institutional ecosystem, in which governance, pedagogy, research, and administration are interconnected through shared data infrastructures and platform-mediated

collaboration, is empirically observable across a diverse range of national and institutional contexts, as documented in the case studies presented in earlier chapters and in the comparative literature (Sangwa et al., 2025; Anbarasan et al., 2025). The five characteristics identified in this chapter are grounded in the evidence rather than imposed upon it; they emerge consistently from the data, even if their expression varies significantly by institutional type and national context.

What the evidence complicates: the framework's initial formulation tended towards a relatively optimistic account of digital transformation as institutional improvement. The critical literature on academic capitalism, neoliberal managerialism, employment precarity, digital equity, and algorithmic governance that was reviewed in preparing this synthesis complicates that optimism substantially. The new academic wave is not simply a beneficial reconfiguration of Clark's entrepreneurial university for the digital era; it is also a vehicle for the intensification of market logics, the erosion of academic autonomy, and the widening of structural inequalities within and between institutions. A theoretically adequate account must hold both dimensions in view simultaneously.

What the evidence contests: the framework's assumption that digital transformation necessarily strengthens institutional coherence and strategic capacity is directly challenged by findings on governance fragmentation, capacity gaps, and the masking effects of emergency adoption. Sangwa, Butera, and Mutabazi (2025) demonstrate that post-COVID digital adoption in resource-constrained contexts frequently produces shallow transformation without the governance depth to sustain it. These findings suggest that the new academic wave is a tendency, not a trajectory – a direction of institutional change that some universities navigate successfully and others fail to navigate at all.

13.9 How the Wave Manifests Across Institutional Settings

One of the most significant analytical demands placed on any framework for higher education transformation is that it accounts for institutional diversity rather than projecting a single developmental pathway. The new academic wave manifests very differently depending on institutional mission, resource endowment, national regulatory environment, and historical legacy. Research-intensive universities in high-income national systems have been the primary locus of the transformation traced in this volume, and the five characteristics of the new academic wave framework – digitalisation, marketisation, global interconnectedness, hybridisation, and ethical contestation – are most fully instantiated in these institutions. However, the majority of the world's universities do not belong to this category, and a framework that claims global relevance must account for its limits as well as its applicability.

In resource-constrained environments, including many institutions across sub-Saharan Africa, South Asia, and parts of Latin America, the digital infrastructure that enables agility, data-driven culture, and platform-mediated interconnectedness is frequently absent or unreliable. The comparative case evidence in Sangwa, Butera, and Mutabazi (2025) demonstrates that progress in digitally constrained contexts is most rapid when transformation is embedded in coherent institutional strategy supported by clear governance structures, including "clear decision rights, portfolio management, and monitoring indicators". This finding suggests that the governance dimension of the new academic wave – more specifically, the quality of institutional leadership and strategic intent – matters more than the sophistication of the technology deployed.

Teaching-focused and professionally oriented universities face different challenges from research-intensive institutions. For these institutions, the boundary-blurring characteristic is primarily expressed through closer integration with employment markets and community partners rather than through research commercialisation. The agility characteristic is operationalised through curriculum responsiveness to labour market signals rather than through research portfolio management. The data-driven characteristic manifests in graduate employment tracking and employer satisfaction monitoring rather than in research analytics. The framework must be flexible enough to accommodate these variations without losing its analytical coherence.

13.10 Leadership Implications: Navigating the New Academic Wave

The final analytical task of this synthesis chapter is to distil from the preceding analysis a set of leadership implications: not prescriptions, but analytically grounded orientations that can inform the practice of institutional leaders navigating the conditions described throughout this volume.

Institutional leaders must develop what Foss, Schmidt, and Teece (2023) term "dynamic capabilities" for guiding innovation networks with the capacity to sense environmental change, seize emerging opportunities, and reconfigure institutional assets in response. In the context of the new academic wave, this implies not only technological competence but also strategic intelligence: the ability to read the implications of digital transformation for governance, culture, and power, and to make deliberate choices about the institutional values that will govern its implementation.

Leaders must attend simultaneously to efficiency and equity. The data-driven institutional intelligence that the new wave enables can be deployed to optimise resource allocation in ways that systematically disadvantage already marginalised students and staff, or it can be deliberately oriented towards identifying and addressing structural barriers to participation. Mauti

and Nyambane (2025) argue that ethical leadership in the digital university requires treating equity as a design constraint rather than an aspiration, building it into the architecture of data systems, curriculum decisions, and governance processes from the outset.

Leaders must maintain the epistemic integrity of the academic heartland against the encroachment of managerial rationality. Clark's (1998) concept of the "stimulated academic heartland" – the maintenance of a vital, engaged scholarly culture at the core of the entrepreneurial university – remains essential in the digital era, but it requires active protection rather than passive assumption. The risk of the new academic wave is not that universities become too academic, but that they cease to be academic at all in any meaningful sense – that the pursuit of agility, data, and global market position hollows out the epistemic culture that justifies the university's existence.

Leaders must cultivate what Beeson (2025) terms "network-oriented leadership mindsets": the capacity to function effectively within and across the distributed platform-mediated collaborations that characterise the new academic wave without surrendering institutional identity or accountability to network logic. The digitally integrated institutional ecosystem is a genuinely new organisational form, and the leadership capacities it requires are not fully captured by existing frameworks derived from either traditional academic collegialism or corporate management theory. Developing those capacities through experiential learning, peer exchange, and ongoing critical reflection is one of the most urgent priorities for the new generation of academic leaders.

13.11 Conclusion

The new academic wave is neither a destination nor a problem to be solved. It is an ongoing transformation – dynamic, contradictory, and unevenly distributed – in which the five characteristics identified in this chapter simultaneously create new possibilities and generate new risks. Unprecedented agility, global interconnectedness, data-driven culture, hybrid roles, and an ethical mandate are not simply descriptors of a novel institutional form; they are contested terrains on which the future of the university as a social institution will be determined.

The framework proposed in this volume builds on and extends Clark's foundational analysis of the entrepreneurial university, reconfiguring its key elements – mission, governance, culture, funding, and organisational structure – for an era in which shared data infrastructures, platform-mediated collaboration, and AI-augmented decision-making reconstitute the relations among them. It illuminates mechanism-based changes in decision processes and academic work that narrower frameworks – whether ed-tech narratives

focused on technology adoption or online learning discourse focused on instructional modality – do not capture.

But the framework also requires ongoing critical scrutiny of the kind undertaken in this chapter. The new academic wave is not a tide that carries all institutions forward equally. It is a differentiated process in which some universities are transformed and others are left stranded, in which some academic communities flourish and others are precarised, in which some students gain access to genuinely enriched educational experiences and others find new digital barriers replacing old physical ones. Attending to these differentiations with the analytical honesty that the evidence demands and the ethical seriousness that the stakes require is the scholarly and institutional obligation that the final chapters of this volume take up.

References

Anbarasan, P., Rathna, B. R., Gupta, P. S., Rout, S. P., Fatma, N., Varshney, D., Samiuddin, & Kumar, P. (2025). Digital transformation in higher education: A blend of social science, management, and policy perspectives. *Lex Localis – Journal of Local Self-Government, 23*(S5), 2156–2175. https://doi.org/10.52152/801549

Beeson, J. (2025). *Network leadership: Promoting a healthier world through the power of networks.* Cambridge University Press.

Bergsteedt, B., & du Plessis, A. (2025). Reimagining transformation through strategic thinking and accountable governance in the South African public university system. *Higher Education*, *91*(6), 2199–2217. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-025-01517-w

Cekuls, A. (2025). The evolution of competitive intelligence in a complex business environment. *Journal of Intelligence Studies in Business*, *14*(2), 4–5. https://doi.org/10.37380/jisib.v14.i2.2546

Chairuddin, A., Jayadi, K., Wahira, & Suarlin. (2025). Artificial intelligence for good governance in universities: Science mapping of present and future trends. *Multidisciplinary Reviews*, *9*(5), 2026230. https://doi.org/10.31893/multirev.2026230

Chiș, D.-M., & Crișan, E. L. (2020). A framework for technology transfer success factors: Validation for the Graphene4Life project. *Journal of Science and Technology Policy Management, 11*(2), 217–245. https://doi.org/10.1108/JSTPM-06-2019-0066

Clark, B. R. (1998). *Creating entrepreneurial universities: Organizational pathways of transformation*. Pergamon Press.

de Wit, H. (2020). Internationalization of higher education: The need for a more ethical and qualitative approach. *Journal of International Students, 10*(1), i–iv. https://doi.org/10.32674/jis.v10i1.1893

Fitzgerald, A., Wu, S., König, J. L., Shaw, S., & Witten, I. H. (2023). Reflections on remixing open access content into open educational resources: A new paradigm

for sustainable data-driven language learning systems design in higher education. In J. Olivier & A. Rambow (Eds.), *Open educational resources in higher education* (pp. 99–128). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-8590-4_6

Floridi, L., & Cowls, J. (2019). A unified framework of five principles for AI in society. *Harvard Data Science Review, 1*(1). https://doi.org/10.1162/99608f92.8cd550d1

Foss, N. J., Schmidt, J., & Teece, D. J. (2023). Ecosystem leadership as a dynamic capability. *Long Range Planning, 56*(1), 102270. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2022.102270

Kassen, M. (2017). Open data in Kazakhstan: Incentives, implementation and challenges. *Information Technology & People, 30*(2), 301–323. https://doi.org/10.1108/ITP-10-2015-0243

Kayyali, M. (2025). Leadership perspectives on sustainable internationalization in higher education. In B. Wu Berberich & R. M. Berberich (Eds.), *Higher education institution strategies for internationalization* (pp. 97–124). IGI Global. https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3373-1092-3.ch004

Kuhn, T. S. (1962). *The structure of scientific revolutions.* University of Chicago Press.

Laufer, M., Deacon, B., Mende, M. A., & Schäfer, L. O. (2025). Leading with trust: How university leaders can foster innovation with educational technology through organizational trust. *Innovative Higher Education, 50*, 303–327. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-024-09733-5

Li, W. (2025). Digital innovation networks for the SDGs: A research agenda for higher education transformation. *European Journal of Education, 60*(4), e70292. https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.70292

Marginson, S. (2024). *The three dilemmas of higher education: The 2024 Burton R. Clark Lecture* (Working Paper No. 110). ESRC/RE Centre for Global Higher Education. www.researchcghe.org/wp-content/uploads/migrate/wp110-1.pdf

Mariyono, D., Kamila, A., & Hidayatullah, A. N. A. (2025). Unity in diversity: Navigating global connections through cultural exchange. *Quality Education for All, 2*(1), 116–139. https://doi.org/10.1108/QEA-10-2024-0122

Marjanovic, O., & Kovacevic-Opacic, L. (2025). The 'how' of digital transformation: Understanding the micro-processes of digital transformation strategising and internal platformisation coevolution. *Information Systems Frontiers*, *27*, 2651–2676. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10796-025-10635-w

Mauti, J. M., & Nyambane, A. K. (2025). Ethical dimensions of transformative leadership: Advancing equity in technology-driven higher education. *Editon Consortium Journal of Educational Management and Leadership, 6*(1), 32–46. https://doi.org/10.51317/ecjeml.v6i1.642

Mihus, I. (2024). Innovating education for financial specialists: The digitalization imperative. In M. Denysenko, L. Khudoliy, & S. Laptiev (Eds.), *Digital skills in a digital society: Requirements and challenges* (pp. 58–86). Scientific Center of Innovative Research. https://doi.org/10.36690/DSDS-58-86

Morley, C. (2024). The systemic neoliberal colonisation of higher education: A critical analysis of the obliteration of academic practice. *The Australian Educational Researcher, 51*, 571–586. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13384-023-00613-z

Muradian, R., & Pascual, U. (2020). Ecological economics in the age of fear. *Ecological Economics, 169*, 106498. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2019.106498

Ndidi, O. M., Chika, O. E., Chinyere, N. M., & Oko-Jaja, C. C. (Eds.). (2025). *Educational management, leadership and supervision: Contemporary perspectives.* Deep Science Publishing. https://doi.org/10.70593/978-93-7185-247-0

O'Brady, S., Bamber, G. J., & Cooper, B. (2025). Academic capitalism and precarity in the neoliberal university: Job insecurity and stress in two liberal market economies. *Industrial Relations Journal*, *56*(4), 291–300. https://doi.org/10.1111/irj.12466

Obizue, M. N., Obizue, E. C., Nwachukwu, M. C., & Oko-Jaja, C. C. (Eds.). (2025). *Educational management, leadership and supervision: Contemporary perspectives.* Deep Science Publishing. https://doi.org/10.70593/978-93-7185-247-0

Sangwa, S., Butera, A., & Mutabazi, P. (2025). Digital transformation of higher education: A post-COVID review of adoption, quality assurance, and governance challenges. *Contemporary Research in Business, 2*(7), 120–133. https://doi.org/10.55677/CRB/I07-07-CRB2025

Singun, A. (2025). Unveiling the barriers to digital transformation in higher education institutions: A systematic literature review. *Discover Education*, 4, Article 37. https://doi.org/10.1007/s44217-025-00430-9

Slaughter, S., & Leslie, L. L. (1997). *Academic capitalism: Politics, policies, and the entrepreneurial university.* Johns Hopkins University Press.

Sposato, M. (2025). Artificial intelligence in educational leadership: A comprehensive taxonomy and future directions. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 22*, 20. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-025-00517-1

Tang, J., Huang, P., & Yan, S. (2025). Digital transformation in higher education: Logical framework, practical dilemmas, and implementation approaches. *Frontiers in Psychology, 16*, 1565591. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1565591

UNESCO. (2024). *Six pillars for the digital transformation of education: A common framework.* UNESCO. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000391299

Velkoska, C., & Nuredin, M. (2023). Quality assurance in the higher education in North Macedonia: Challenges and key trends. *Vision International Refereed Scientific Journal, 8*(1), 59–74. https://doi.org/10.55843/ivisum2381059v

Wu, Z., & Zhang, X. (2024). Comparative study on marketing teaching mode under the background of Chinese modernization. *Education, Learning and Development in Nations, 2*(2), 96–100. https://doi.org/10.26480/eldn.02.2024.96.100

14 Contradictions and Challenges in the New Era

14.1 Introduction: The New Academic Wave as a Field of Productive Tension

The previous chapter outlined the defining features of the new academic wave – unprecedented agility, global interconnectedness, a data-driven culture, hybrid organisational roles, and an explicit ethical mandate – and subjected that framework to critical scrutiny in light of the evidence gathered across this volume. This chapter takes up a related but distinct task. It offers a deliberate reality check: an honest examination of the tensions, trade-offs, and unresolved challenges generated by the new academic wave, approached not as signs of failed implementation, but as structurally inherent features of any serious institutional transformation. The analytical lens adopted here is that of *dilemmatic space*: contexts in which institutional actors must continually navigate competing imperatives without any prospect of final resolution. In the setting of the digital university, this perspective recasts contradiction as something more than an obstacle. Rather than treating it as a regrettable side effect of change, it allows us to see institutional tension as analytically productive – indeed, it is one of the very conditions through which transformation is governed, contested, and ultimately shaped. The tensions explored in this chapter are therefore not problems to be solved once and for all. They are enduring sites of governance, leadership, and scholarly practice through which the character of the new academic wave will be formed.

What follows traces five interrelated fields of tension. It begins with the ethical dilemmas produced by AI deployment, datafication, and digital surveillance. These are dilemmas that cannot be settled through technical design alone but demand ongoing normative judgement and institutional oversight. It then turns to the structural inequalities that digital transformation may reproduce, deepen, or redistribute across lines of income, geography, disability, and cultural capital. From there, the discussion moves to a more internal institutional fault line: the uneasy relationship between the

DOI: 10.4324/9781042001422-20
This chapter has been made available under a CC BY-NC-ND license.

innovation imperatives associated with the new wave and the long-standing traditions of scholarly autonomy, collegiality, and deliberative academic culture. The chapter also considers the resistance that digital transformation reliably provokes, whether individual, collective, or organisational, arguing that such resistance deserves analytical attention rather than simple managerial suppression. Finally, it examines the growing pressures placed on institutional autonomy by digital governance architectures, external political intervention, and the concentration of platform power. Across these sections, the aim is not to offer prescriptive solutions, but to develop analytically grounded orientations for institutional leadership, rooted in the scholarly evidence assembled throughout the volume.

14.2 Ethical Dilemmas: When Digital Capabilities Outpace Normative Governance

The most immediate category of tension in the digital university concerns the systematic gap between the pace at which new digital capabilities are deployed and the pace at which the normative governance frameworks required to deploy those capabilities can be responsibly developed. This gap is structural rather than accidental. Institutions face competitive pressures to adopt artificial intelligence (AI)-powered teaching tools, predictive analytics platforms, digital proctoring systems, and automated administrative services even though the ethical, legal, and pedagogical implications of these tools have not been adequately examined. The result is an institutional landscape in which powerful capabilities routinely precede the governance structures required to ensure their responsible use.

Marin et al. (2025) document this pattern across multiple domains. In assessment, AI-driven grading tools are deployed in contexts where their algorithmic logic is opaque to both students and faculty, raising fundamental questions of transparency, contestability, and fairness. In student support, predictive analytics systems identify students "at risk" of disengagement or failure based on behavioural data collected without students' full understanding of how that data is being used, creating what scholars describe as a regime of "pedagogical surveillance" that may deter rather than support engagement.

Several overlapping ethical domains can be identified in AI deployment in higher education, including privacy and data protection, bias and fairness, transparency and accountability, autonomy and oversight, governance gaps, and integrity and plagiarism (Chinoracky & Stalmasekova, 2025). This perspective is useful because it connects ethical risks with the concrete professional activities of university educators rather than treating AI ethics solely as an abstract normative framework. It also suggests that ethical awareness

at the individual level is insufficient unless universities develop institutional mechanisms for guidance, accountability, and governance.

No ethical issue raised by the new academic wave has attracted more immediate institutional attention or posed more serious analytical difficulty than the implications of generative AI (GenAI) for academic integrity. The ability of large language models to produce fluent, contextually convincing academic text at scale has made traditional approaches to assessment authenticity increasingly difficult to sustain. This is not a problem that can be resolved simply through detection technologies or policy prohibition. As Coates, Croucher, and Calderon (2025) argue, regulatory and institutional responses to GenAI-related threats to academic integrity are constrained by the slow pace of reform, the weak fit between governance mechanisms and everyday academic practice, and the global character of the challenge.

The ethical complexity of GenAI in higher education is intensified further by the uneven way in which its benefits are distributed across student populations. Emerging research on the "GenAI divide" suggests that students' digital and AI literacies are not simply ancillary skills but important conditions shaping whether access to GenAI can be turned into educational advantage. Beckman et al. (2025), for instance, identify distinct student profiles of novice, cautious, and more confident users, and show that those with stronger AI literacy are better placed to use GenAI productively. Students with lower levels of literacy, by contrast, may approach these tools with greater caution, uncertainty, or limited strategic benefit. In this respect, GenAI appears to reproduce a familiar pattern in educational technology: access on its own does not guarantee equitable participation.

This issue goes beyond individual competence. It is embedded in wider digital inequalities linked to infrastructure, prior educational opportunity, institutional support, training, and the availability of trusted guidance. UK survey evidence likewise suggests that student engagement with AI is socially patterned rather than evenly distributed, with higher reported levels of use among men, students in STEM-related fields, and more socioeconomically advantaged groups (Freeman, 2025). Students with limited digital resources, weak institutional support, or a less secure command of academic English may therefore be less able to turn GenAI into a meaningful academic resource. These disparities are especially significant given that large language models – and the cultures through which they are evaluated – have been shaped disproportionately by English-language data, dominant institutional settings, and high-resource linguistic environments. This raises wider concerns about cultural and linguistic exclusion (Bender et al., 2021; Miao & Holmes, 2023).

The United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO)'s guidance on GenAI in education and research frames these issues explicitly in terms of equity, inclusion, linguistic diversity, and

human-centred governance, warning that poorly regulated or weakly supported adoption may reinforce existing forms of marginalisation rather than reduce them (Miao & Holmes, 2023). The implication for higher education is clear. Universities cannot treat GenAI equity solely as a matter of tool availability. They also need to ensure that students are supported through equitable access to infrastructure, critical AI literacy, pedagogical guidance, transparent policy, and forms of academic support that enable diverse learners to use these systems safely, critically, and in educationally meaningful ways.

Institutional responses to the academic integrity challenge vary considerably in their sophistication and their fidelity to educational values. Redesign-focused approaches that structure assessments around forms of intellectual work that AI cannot readily replicate – such as oral examination, portfolio-based evidence, iterative design processes, and collaborative problem-solving – are pedagogically more promising but require significant faculty development investment and curriculum redesign capacity that many institutions currently lack. A principled resolution to the academic integrity dilemma requires institutional commitment to reforming assessment practices, made practicable by support from governance structures and resources.

Beneath the specific ethical challenges of algorithmic bias, data privacy, and academic integrity lies a more fundamental concern: the possibility that the progressive mediation of educational relationships through digital platforms and AI systems may erode the relational and personal character of teaching and learning in ways that are difficult to quantify but educationally consequential. This concern is not reducible to technological nostalgia or resistance to innovation. Rather, it reflects a long-standing educational insight: teaching is not simply the delivery of content, feedback, or assessment, but a relational, interpretive, and ethically situated practice.

Recent research on GenAI in higher education captures this ambivalence. Lee et al. (2024), in their study of educators' perspectives, show that AI is often associated with efficiency, administrative support, and new possibilities for teaching, but also with uncertainty regarding its appropriate pedagogical role. Similarly, Marín et al. (2025) report that although students and faculty recognise the potential benefits of AI for educational improvement and administrative streamlining, concerns remain about excessive technological dependence and the possible dehumanisation of education. These concerns are especially important because the educational value of teaching depends not only on the sophistication of instructional tools, but also on the quality of the human judgement, presence, responsiveness, and pedagogical care that make meaningful learning encounters possible.

There is strong evidence that relational quality matters for learning. In administrative operations, AI systems can improve efficiency and support

decision-making, but in educational contexts they cannot substitute for the relational dimensions of teaching and learning. In digitally mediated contexts, the Community of Inquiry (CoI) framework similarly emphasises that meaningful online learning requires not only cognitive engagement, but also teaching presence and social presence (Garrison et al., 2000). These findings suggest that educational relationships are not peripheral to learning outcomes; they are part of the conditions through which such outcomes become possible.

For this reason, AI governance in higher education should not be framed solely around efficiency, risk management, or measurable performance indicators. If institutions evaluate AI primarily in terms of its capacity to automate feedback, personalise content, reduce workload, or optimise administrative processes, they may overlook more subtle losses: diminished teacher presence, weakened peer interaction, reduced opportunities for dialogic learning, and a narrowing of education to what can be tracked, predicted, and quantified. From this perspective, the ethical challenge is not whether AI should be excluded from higher education, but how it can be governed so that it supports, rather than substitutes for, the relational and human purposes of teaching. Human-centred AI governance should therefore include explicit safeguards for pedagogical judgement, student belonging, academic care, dialogic interaction, and the professional agency of teachers.

14.3 Structural Inequalities: The New Wave and the Reproduction of Disadvantage

The second major category of tension concerns the relationship between the democratising aspirations of digital transformation and its documented capacity to reproduce, or in certain configurations intensify, existing structural inequalities. The proposition that digital transformation widens access to high-quality education is empirically well-supported in contexts where the enabling conditions are in place: reliable infrastructure, adequate devices, pedagogically competent digital instruction, and institutional support for non-traditional learners. The difficulty is that these enabling conditions are unevenly distributed in precisely the ways that produce educational inequality in the first place.

The equity implications of AI in higher education are inseparable from the broader structural conditions of digital transformation. Although AI is often presented as a means of widening access, personalising learning, and improving institutional efficiency, its benefits depend on pre-existing capacities that are themselves unevenly distributed. Singun's (2025) systematic literature review shows that digital transformation in higher education is constrained by a complex set of institutional barriers, including

digital strategy, leadership, organisational readiness, resources, digital competence, stakeholder management, academic culture, and digital ethics. Within this broader landscape, three barriers are particularly consequential for equity: inadequate digital infrastructure, uneven digital competencies among staff and students, and socioeconomic disparities in access to devices, connectivity, and support. These barriers tend to be most acute in precisely those contexts where the potential benefits of digital transformation are greatest: lower-income countries, underfunded regional institutions, and rural or otherwise marginalised communities.

This is why AI implementation cannot be evaluated only in terms of technological capability. Varsik and Vosberg (2024) argue that AI may advance educational equity only when its implementation is attentive to access, bias, teacher training, privacy, cultural responsiveness, accountability, techno-ableism, and the risks of commercial influence. The implication is that AI does not automatically democratise education. When technologies are deployed without sufficient alignment with local infrastructures, institutional capacities, pedagogical cultures, and learner needs, they may not reduce inequality; rather, they may reorganise it in digital form.

Drljić et al. (2025) further strengthen this point by showing that digital equity and institutional sustainability in higher education are structurally interconnected. Their study identifies digital equity as a multidimensional condition involving not only access to technology, but also access to supportive teachers, digital resources, culturally relevant software and applications, opportunities for meaningful use, and open-access resources. This shifts the equity question from a narrow concern with hardware provision to a broader concern with educational design. A university may be formally "digital" while remaining practically exclusionary if students cannot access reliable connectivity, appropriate platforms, pedagogical support, accessible materials, or culturally and linguistically relevant digital environments. Equity, therefore, should not be treated as a remedial adjustment after digital systems have been introduced. It must operate as a design constraint from the outset of any digital transformation initiative.

The structural inequality problem also has a global dimension. AI capacity, high-quality digital infrastructure, platform governance, and the production of dominant educational technologies remain concentrated in a relatively small number of high-income regions and corporate ecosystems. This concentration risks reproducing older epistemic hierarchies in new technological form. León et al.'s (2026) systematic review examines AI-driven higher education between 2018 and 2025 and is useful here because it explicitly frames digital equity as a central dimension of AI's educational impact and notes the limits of cross-contextual transfer when evidence, design assumptions, and research agendas are concentrated in particular regions. This concern is consistent with broader critiques of digital

transformation: if educational AI systems are designed, benchmarked, and governed primarily from the perspective of well-resourced institutions, they may universalise the needs, languages, pedagogical assumptions, and infrastructures of the Global North while positioning other contexts as sites of implementation rather than knowledge production.

For higher education governance, the conclusion is clear. Digital transformation should not be understood as a linear movement from analogue inefficiency to technological modernisation. It is a sociotechnical process in which institutional capacity, digital competence, infrastructure, accessibility, culture, and power relations determine who benefits and who is left behind. AI can support inclusion, but only if equity is embedded in procurement, infrastructure-planning, staff development, curriculum design, accessibility standards, data governance, and local participatory decision-making. Otherwise, the digital university may become more technologically advanced while remaining socially stratified.

The governance implications are significant. Universities in the Global South that adopt AI-powered educational platforms, developed primarily in and for high-income contexts, may import pedagogical assumptions, cultural norms, linguistic hierarchies, data practices, and assessment logics that do not necessarily align with their institutional missions or student populations. This concern is consistent with recent work on Gen AI and digital neocolonialism in global education, which warns that AI systems may reproduce global inequalities when low- and middle-income contexts are positioned mainly as sites of adoption, data extraction, or market expansion rather than as equal participants in design, governance, and knowledge production (Nyaaba et al., 2026). This does not mean that such technologies should be rejected. Rather, it means that their adoption should be treated as a matter of educational sovereignty, contextual adaptation, and epistemic justice. Sustainable digital equity in global higher education therefore requires more than redistributing access to existing platforms. It also requires investment in locally appropriate digital pedagogies, participatory data governance frameworks, culturally and linguistically responsive AI tools, and institutional capacities that position universities in the Global South as knowledge producers rather than merely as technology consumers within the global digital economy.

Structural inequality in the digital university is not only a student-facing phenomenon. It also affects academic labour. Evidence on academic precarity shows that insecurely employed academics experience intensified vulnerability within marketised university systems, including job insecurity, stress, and reduced institutional protection (O'Brady et al., 2025). These conditions matter for digital transformation because pedagogical innovation, online teaching, AI literacy development, and student support all require time, training, security, and professional recognition. When

universities require staff to adapt rapidly to new platforms and AI-mediated teaching practices without redistributing workload or providing meaningful professional support, the burdens of innovation are likely to fall unevenly on those with the least institutional power.

Gender and racialised inequalities further complicate this picture. A substantial body of research shows that women academics often carry disproportionate service, care, mentoring, and student-support responsibilities. Guarino and Borden (2017) and Docka-Filipek and Stone (2023) document that women faculty disproportionately carry service, care, and student-support burdens, reinforcing gendered expectations of academic care. These dynamics are directly relevant to AI governance. Digital instructional reform often increases demand for student guidance, reassurance, troubleshooting, pastoral support, and policy interpretation. If such work is not formally recognised, resourced, or equitably distributed, AI-enabled transformation may intensify existing inequalities within the academic workforce.

These within-institution inequalities are frequently obscured by digital transformation strategies that assume an "average" faculty member: equally secure, equally resourced, equally trained, and equally able to absorb new technological responsibilities. Governance frameworks that take equity seriously should therefore require disaggregated impact assessment. Such assessment should examine how AI and digital transformation affect staff differently according to employment status, career stage, gender, race, disability, discipline, contract type, and institutional location. This is not an administrative add-on. It is a necessary condition for responsible AI governance in higher education. Without it, universities may claim to promote digital equity for students while reproducing inequity among the very staff expected to deliver, interpret, and sustain that transformation.

14.4 Resistance and Pushback: Understanding Opposition as Information

The third category of tension is, in some respects, the most theoretically consequential. It concerns the internal contradiction between the innovation imperatives foregrounded by the new academic wave and the traditions of scholarly autonomy, deliberative knowledge production, and civic purpose that have historically defined the university as a distinctive social institution. This tension was already visible in Burton R. Clark's (1998) analysis of the entrepreneurial university, where the challenge was to strengthen the "academic heartland" while extending the university's developmental periphery. In the digital era, however, the contradiction becomes more acute because innovation is increasingly mediated through platforms, metrics, performance dashboards, AI systems, and externally defined indicators of

institutional responsiveness. A central risk in this context is technocentrism. Tang et al. (2025) identify the "pitfall of technocentrism" as a recurrent distortion in digital transformation discourse: the tendency to pursue digital transformation for its own sake, allowing technological adoption to overshadow the value-driven goals of student development. This distortion is not merely rhetorical. It has concrete institutional consequences. When innovation is treated as an end in itself rather than as a means to educational and scholarly purposes, indicators such as platform adoption, digital competency scores, learning analytics dashboards, AI uptake, and usage statistics may begin to substitute for the educational outcomes they were originally intended to support. The university then risks mistaking technological activity for educational progress.

The entrepreneurialisation of the curriculum provides a specific illustration of this contradiction. The increasing alignment of degree programmes with labour-market demands, national innovation agendas, and employer-defined competency frameworks can enhance employability and strengthen the social relevance of higher education. Yet it may also narrow educational purpose if immediate workforce utility becomes the dominant criterion for curriculum design. The danger is not entrepreneurship education as such, but the reduction of university education to short-cycle responsiveness, measurable competencies, and market-aligned skill production. A sustainable approach to entrepreneurial education requires balance: students need opportunities to develop initiative, creativity, and practical agency, but these should be embedded within broader intellectual formation.

The agility imperative enters into structural tension with the temporal rhythms of serious scholarly work. Research that genuinely advances knowledge often requires sustained attention, tolerance for uncertainty, slow engagement with complex literatures, productive failure, and forms of intellectual conversation that cannot always be compressed into short innovation cycles or digital communication formats without epistemic loss. The compression of funding cycles, the multiplication of short-term projects, and the expectation of rapid, visible, and measurable outputs are not neutral organisational preferences. They tend to privilege forms of knowledge production that are applied, partnership-oriented, fundable, interdisciplinary, and rapidly publishable. In doing so, they disadvantage scholarship whose value is less immediately visible or less easily captured by short-term metrics, including slower-maturing, foundational, critical, theoretical, or curiosity-driven work. The evidence on academic burnout situates this contradiction in its human consequences. In a systematic review of burnout, Cadena-Povea et al. (2025) identify workload and insufficient institutional support as especially robust psychosocial risk factors. The consequences are not confined to employees themselves. Research on teacher burnout indicates that burnout is associated with poorer student outcomes, including lower

academic achievement and lower quality motivation. The pursuit of institutional agility at the cost of faculty wellbeing is therefore not only ethically problematic; it is institutionally self-defeating.

The related phenomenon of change fatigue deserves analytical recognition as a structural feature of the digital transformation landscape, rather than as an individual psychological deficit to be addressed primarily through resilience training. Change fatigue emerges when members of an organisation are repeatedly exposed to high-volume, fast-paced, poorly coordinated, or insufficiently supported reform demands. In higher education, ambitious digital transformation strategies can produce precisely these conditions when they require continuous adaptation to new platforms, assessment systems, AI policies, data infrastructures, and teaching expectations without corresponding time, training, workload recognition, or participatory governance.

This has important leadership implications. Change fatigue is not simply a function of the quantity of change but of the quality of its implementation. Well-designed, participatory, adequately resourced reform can strengthen institutional capacity and professional agency. Poorly designed, top-down, under-resourced reform, by contrast, generates cynicism, disengagement, and institutional disillusionment, even among staff who may initially support the broad goals of innovation. The governance challenge is therefore not to choose between innovation and tradition, but to ensure that innovation remains answerable to the deeper purposes of the university: knowledge, judgement, intellectual freedom, civic responsibility, and the cultivation of human capacities that cannot be reduced to technological optimisation.

14.5 Risks to Institutional Autonomy: Platform Power, Political Pressure, and the Governance of Digital Dependency

The fifth, and perhaps still insufficiently theorised, category of tension in the digital university concerns the risks to institutional autonomy generated by the infrastructures through which digital transformation is enacted. Contemporary universities increasingly depend on cloud services, learning management systems, AI tools, student information systems, proctoring technologies, learning analytics platforms, and administrative data infrastructures that are often developed, owned, and governed by a relatively small number of commercial technology providers. This dependency is not merely operational. It has financial, legal, pedagogical, epistemic, and political implications that are rarely foregrounded in institutional digital strategies.

Platform dependency creates structural risks across at least three dimensions: financial (escalating subscription costs and high switching

costs), data-related (opaque contractual terms and vendor-controlled governance of institutional data), and epistemic. This third dimension is the least visible but potentially the most consequential: when AI-supported systems shape curriculum recommendations, learning pathways, assessment support, academic advising, or student risk profiling, the pedagogical assumptions embedded in these systems may reflect vendor priorities and platform logics rather than the educational mission of the institution.

This concern is consistent with recent scholarship on platform governance in education. Nichols and Dixon-Román (2024) argue that platform technologies do not simply support education policy; they increasingly mediate relations among commercial, technical, and educational actors, thereby becoming a form of governance in their own right. Similarly, research on the datafication of teaching in higher education shows that data systems and AI-enabled infrastructures can reshape teaching through new forms of measurement, prediction, comparison, and institutional surveillance. The governance challenge is therefore not only whether universities use platforms, but how far platform infrastructures come to define the conditions under which teaching, learning, assessment, administration, and institutional accountability are organised.

The issue of data sovereignty is central to this problem. In higher education, data sovereignty should be understood not merely as the physical location of data storage, but also as the capacity of institutions to exercise meaningful legal, technical, and ethical control over how educational, research, and administrative data are collected, processed, shared, monetised, retained, and deleted. Institutional AI governance frameworks increasingly recognise privacy, accountability, transparency, and risk management as core issues, but these commitments remain fragile when universities lack contractual leverage, technical expertise, procurement capacity, or independent infrastructure. In such circumstances, data governance may exist formally as policy while remaining practically dependent on vendor architectures.

For this reason, the governance of platform dependency should be treated as an institutional autonomy issue. Universities that lack meaningful control over their data infrastructures may find it difficult to protect academic freedom, ensure research confidentiality, safeguard student rights, or preserve pedagogical independence. This does not require universities to reject commercial technologies altogether. Rather, it requires procurement and governance models that prioritise interoperability, data portability, auditability, algorithmic transparency, jurisdictional clarity, exit rights, and meaningful institutional control over educational data.

Beyond the commercial dimension, institutional autonomy in the digital era also faces pressure from political actors who perceive universities' independence – particularly their capacity to produce knowledge and public

discourse that challenge prevailing political narratives – as institutionally threatening. The Academic Freedom Index 2025 documents significant global pressure on academic freedom, identifying 34 countries and territories where academic freedom declined substantially and statistically significantly between 2014 and 2024. The AFI framework is especially relevant because it treats institutional autonomy as one of the core dimensions of academic freedom, alongside freedom to research and teach, freedom of academic exchange and dissemination, campus integrity, and freedom of academic and cultural expression.

Digital infrastructure creates specific new mechanisms through which political pressure may operate. Centralised student, staff, and research data systems create potential targets for surveillance, compelled disclosure, cyberattack, and politically motivated data access. AI-monitored educational environments – such as digital proctoring systems, learning analytics dashboards, automated moderation tools, and integrated student-risk systems – generate digital traces that may be legally or politically accessible in ways that traditional university records were not. These risks are not uniform across jurisdictions, but they are sufficiently serious to require institutional planning. Responsible governance therefore requires technical safeguards, including data minimisation, encryption, access controls, retention limits, and jurisdictional risk assessment, as well as legal and policy safeguards governing institutional responses to state requests for data.

European policy debates on academic freedom reinforce this point. The European Parliament's Academic Freedom Monitor 2024 identifies institutional autonomy as a core condition for the protection of academic freedom in the European Union, while the European University Association's Autonomy Scorecard provides a comparative framework for assessing university autonomy across organisational, financial, staffing, and academic dimensions. These frameworks show that institutional autonomy is not an abstract privilege of universities. It is a governance condition for the wider public goods universities are expected to produce: independent research, evidence-informed policy, critical public discourse, and the education of citizens capable of democratic judgement.

The concentration of digital platform power raises systemic governance questions that exceed the capacity of any single university. When a small number of technology providers control the infrastructures through which universities deliver instruction, manage learning data, administer student records, and increasingly deploy AI-mediated services, the governance of these infrastructures becomes a matter of public policy. Universities therefore have a collective interest in advocating for regulatory frameworks that ensure interoperability, data portability, algorithmic accountability, transparency in educational AI systems, robust privacy protections, and enforceable limits on secondary uses of educational data.

This advocacy role may sit uneasily alongside the commercial partnerships through which many universities fund and implement digital transformation, but this tension cannot be avoided by treating platform decisions as merely technical procurement choices. Universities must distinguish between their short-term organisational interests in efficiency, scale, and cost containment, and their long-term institutional interest in preserving agency over teaching, research, data, and public mission. The long-term interest of the university lies in digital infrastructures that are open, accountable, interoperable, governable, and aligned with academic values. Without such governance, digital transformation may increase institutional efficiency while diminishing the very autonomy that makes the university socially valuable.

14.6 Towards Principled Governance of Contradictions: An Integrated Framework

The five categories of tension examined in this chapter – ethical dilemmas, structural inequalities, the pull between innovation and academic tradition, resistance and institutional pushback, and threats to institutional autonomy – should not be read as evidence that digital transformation is either impossible or undesirable. In fact, they are the predictable contradictions of any serious transformation of the university as a social institution. Naming these contradictions is therefore not an exercise in institutional pessimism. It is a condition of responsible governance. The central implication of the chapter is that the new academic wave cannot be governed through managerial optimism, technological enthusiasm, or reactive compliance alone. It requires a principled governance framework capable of holding together innovation and restraint, efficiency and care, experimentation and accountability, institutional responsiveness and academic freedom. Drawing on the preceding analysis, six principles are especially important.

First, ethics must precede deployment, not follow it. Digital and AI-enabled systems should not be introduced into teaching, assessment, administration, or student support before adequate ethical governance arrangements are in place. Ethical governance should not be reduced to abstract principle statements. It requires institutional mechanisms with authority, resources, and the capacity to suspend, revise, or reject technologies that conflict with educational values.

Second, equity is a design requirement, not a later accommodation. Digital transformation should be designed from the outset for the full diversity of institutional life: disabled students, multilingual learners, students with uneven access to devices and connectivity, non-traditional learners, precariously employed staff, early-career academics, and those whose forms of participation do not match the assumptions embedded in dominant platforms. Equity-oriented transformation therefore requires inclusive

procurement, participatory design, accessible infrastructure, staff development, and careful attention to the local conditions under which technologies are actually used.

Third, wellbeing is a condition of sustainable transformation. Workload regulation, protected time, professional development, recovery, and participatory governance should not be treated as optional wellbeing initiatives added after reform has been designed. They are part of the infrastructure of transformation itself. Sustainable transformation therefore requires institutions to evaluate not only what new technologies make possible, but also what forms of labour, stress, acceleration, and hidden work they generate.

Fourth, resistance deserves interpretation, not suppression. Faculty, student, and staff resistance to digital transformation often carries information about pedagogical concerns, workload pressures, equity risks, professional identity, academic freedom, and governance deficits. Treating resistance merely as a communication problem to be managed can produce compliance without commitment. By contrast, responsible leadership treats resistance as diagnostic. It asks what forms of knowledge, care, autonomy, or institutional trust are being defended, and whether the proposed transformation has been designed with sufficient participation, evidence, support, and legitimacy.

Fifth, educational purpose must govern technological choice. The question that should precede every significant digital transformation decision is not simply what a technology can do, but what the university's educational and scholarly mission requires. Technologies adopted without this question tend to optimise for efficiency, scalability, prediction, and visibility, while weakening the relational, reflective, critical, and civic dimensions of university education. Educationally responsible governance therefore requires a reversal of means and ends: rather than redefining those purposes according to what is technically measurable or commercially available, AI and digital platforms should serve teaching, learning, research, judgement, and public purpose.

Sixth, institutional autonomy must be actively protected. Platform dependency, political pressure, commercial concentration, and data extraction should not be understood as rare or exceptional threats to university autonomy; rather, they constitute structural risks embedded in the architecture of the digital university. The autonomy at stake is not institutional self-interest narrowly understood. It is the condition that enables universities to protect academic freedom, research integrity, pedagogical independence, and their wider civic role.

Together, these principles suggest that the governance of digital transformation should be neither technocratic nor defensive. It should be reflexive, participatory, evidence-informed, and institutionally courageous.

The aim is not to eliminate contradiction because contradiction is inherent in any university that seeks simultaneously to innovate, preserve academic values, widen access, protect autonomy, and serve democratic society. The aim is to govern contradiction well: to ensure that digital transformation strengthens rather than diminishes the educational, scholarly, and civic purposes of the university.

14.7 Conclusion

The contradictions examined in this chapter are not signs of failure. They are the necessary accompaniment to any transformation serious enough to engage with the institutional, cultural, pedagogical, ethical, and social complexity of the contemporary university. A digital transformation agenda that produces no ethical dilemmas, no concerns about inequality, no cultural friction, no resistance, and no risks to institutional autonomy is unlikely to reflect change of any real institutional depth. More often, it suggests a process confined to technical adoption, managerial rhetoric, or surface-level modernisation. The central argument of this chapter has been that the quality of digital transformation in higher education should be judged not by the absence of tension, but by the quality of governance brought to bear on it. Universities that engage honestly with ethical contradictions are better placed to realise the genuine possibilities of the new academic wave if they embed equity as a design principle, protect academic culture from the erosions of continuous innovation pressure, interpret resistance rather than simply suppress it, and defend institutional autonomy against commercial and political encroachment. In this sense, contradiction is not an obstacle to transformation. It is the terrain on which responsible transformation must be governed. The digital university will ultimately be shaped not only by the technologies it adopts, but also by the values it chooses to defend, the forms of equity it is willing to institutionalise, the autonomy it succeeds in protecting, and the quality of leadership it develops to navigate the genuinely difficult terrain of the new academic era.

References

Beckman, K., Apps, T., Howard, S. K., Rogerson, C., Rogerson, A., & Tondeur, J. (2025). The GenAI divide among university students: A call for action. *The Internet and Higher Education, 67*, 101036. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2025.101036

Bender, E. M., Gebru, T., McMillan-Major, A., & Shmitchell, S. (2021). On the dangers of stochastic parrots: Can language models be too big? In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency* (pp. 610–623). Association for Computing Machinery. https://doi.org/10.1145/3442188.3445922

Cadena-Povea, H., Goyes-Baca, C., & Samaniego-López, A. (2025). What pushes university professors to burnout? A systematic review of sociodemographic and psychosocial determinants. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 22*(8), 1214. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph22081214

Chinoracky, R., & Stalmasekova, N. (2025). Ethical problems in the use of artificial intelligence by university educators. *Education Sciences, 15*(10), 1322. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15101322

Clark, B. R. (1998). *Creating entrepreneurial universities: Organizational pathways of transformation*. Pergamon.

Coates, H., Croucher, G., & Calderon, A. (2025). Governing academic integrity: Ensuring the authenticity of higher thinking in the era of generative artificial intelligence. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, *23*(4), 2015–2028. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-025-09639-7

Docka-Filipek, D., & Stone, L. B. (2023). "Professor moms" & "hidden service" in pandemic times: Students report women faculty more supportive & accommodating amid U.S. COVID crisis onset. *Innovative Higher Education, 48*, 619–633. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-023-09652-x

Drljić, K., Čotar Konrad, S., Rutar, S., & Štemberger, T. (2025). Digital equity and sustainability in higher education. *Sustainability, 17*(5), 2011. https://doi.org/10.3390/su17052011

Freeman, J. (2025). *Student generative AI survey 2025 (Policy Note 61)*. Higher Education Policy Institute. www.hepi.ac.uk/reports/student-generative-ai-survey-2025/

Garrison, D. R., Anderson, T., & Archer, W. (2000). Critical inquiry in a text-based environment: Computer conferencing in higher education. *The Internet and Higher Education, 2*(2–3), 87–105. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1096-7516(00)00016-6

Guarino, C. M., & Borden, V. M. H. (2017). Faculty service loads and gender: Are women taking care of the academic family? *Research in Higher Education, 58*, 672–694. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-017-9454-2

Lee, D., Arnold, M., Srivastava, A., Plastow, K., Strelan, P., Ploeckl, F., Lekkas, D., & Palmer, E. (2024). The impact of generative AI on higher education learning and teaching: A study of educators' perspectives. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence, 6*, 100221. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100221

León, P. M. S., Farroñán, E. V. R., Chilicaus, G. C. F., Salinas, L. E. C., Aguinaga, D. A. L., & Cumpa, R. O. (2026). AI-driven higher education: A systematic review of impacts on educational quality and digital equity (2018–2025). In H. Kannan, R. Villamarin Rodriguez, M. Rege, V. Piuri, A. AdeIbijola, M. López González de León, & I. Ben Dhaou (Eds.), *Artificial intelligence and knowledge processing: 5th International Conference, AIKP 2025, proceedings* (Communications in Computer and Information Science, Vol. 2804, pp. 183–198). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-032-14706-6_15

Marín, Y. R., Caro, O. C., Rituay, A. M. C., Llanos, K. A. G., Perez, D. T., Bardales, E. S., Tuesta, J. N. A., & Santos, R. C. (2025). Ethical challenges associated with the use of artificial intelligence in university education. *Journal of Academic Ethics, 23*, 2443–2467. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-025-09660-w

Marin, Y. R., Caro, O. C., Rubio, Y. C. M., Tuesta, J. N. A., Bardales, E. S., Rituay, A. M. C., & Santos, R. Ch. (2025). Artificial intelligence as a teaching tool in university education. *Frontiers in Education, 10*, 1578451. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1578451

Miao, F., & Holmes, W. (2023). *Guidance for generative AI in education and research*. UNESCO. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000386693

Nichols, T. P., & Dixon-Román, E. (2024). Platform governance and education policy: Power and politics in emerging edtech ecologies. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 46*(2), 309–330. https://doi.org/10.3102/01623737231202469

Nyaaba, M., Wright, A., & Choi, G. L. (2026). Generative AI and digital neocolonialism in global education: Towards an equitable framework. *Journal of Digital Educational Technology 6*(1), ep2608.www.jdet.net/article/generative-ai-and-digital-neocolonialism-in-global-education-towards-an-equitable-framework-17862

O'Brady, S., Bamber, G. J., & Cooper, B. (2025). Academic capitalism and precarity in the neoliberal university: Job insecurity and stress in two liberal market economies. *Industrial Relations Journal, 56*(4), 291–300. https://doi.org/10.1111/irj.12466

Singun, A. (2025). Unveiling the barriers to digital transformation in higher education institutions: A systematic literature review. *Discover Education*, *4*, Article 37. https://doi.org/10.1007/s44217-025-00430-9

Tang, J., Huang, P., & Yan, S. (2025). Digital transformation in higher education: Logical framework, practical dilemmas, and implementation approaches. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *16*, 1565591. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1565591

Varsik, S., & Vosberg, L. (2024). *The potential impact of artificial intelligence on equity and inclusion in education* (OECD Artificial Intelligence Papers No. 23). OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/15df715b-en

15 Horizons and Emerging Possibilities for the New Academic Wave

15.1 Looking Forward: A Contested Horizon

Higher education today is undergoing a digital transformation that the COVID-19 pandemic accelerated rather than initiated, prompting institutions to adopt new technologies and governance arrangements at remarkable speed (Sangwa et al., 2025; Zou et al., 2025). It is tempting to interpret this acceleration as a straightforward march towards a clearly defined technological endpoint. That would be misleading. The future of higher education is better understood as a set of sociotechnical possibilities: outcomes shaped not simply by what technologies can do, but by institutional strategy, leadership, and the quality of ethical governance (Sangwa et al., 2025). The same digital platform may broaden access for some learners while intensifying exclusion for others. Research on the future of digital learning repeatedly points to this tension. Technology can widen opportunity and deepen inequality at the same time. That is precisely why, in the coming decade, careful governance is likely to matter far more than uncritical enthusiasm for adoption (Gilbert & Baxter, 2025; Sharma, 2025).

The developments examined in this chapter – artificial intelligence (AI) in teaching and research, immersive learning through virtual and augmented reality, networked and platform-based institutional models, and portable digital credentials – should therefore be seen as matters of choice rather than inevitability. Each can be directed towards human-centred purposes – equity, transparency, and accountability – or away from them (Komljenovic, 2022; de Andrade et al., 2023; Selznick & Titareva, 2022). This perspective echoes wider analyses of so-called smart societies, where opportunity and risk are inseparable and the central question is not technological capability, but governance (Ramesh, 2026). From this perspective, the chapter pursues three aims. First, it maps the horizon by identifying the shifts most likely to shape the next phase of the academic wave. Secondly, it considers the opportunities, asking how digital transformation, if guided well, might make universities more inclusive, more creative, and more responsive to

DOI: 10.4324/9781042001422-21
This chapter has been made available under a CC BY-NC-ND license.

the societies that sustain them. Finally, it issues a call to action. Leaders, academics, administrators, students, and policymakers must not simply drift with forces they did not choose. They need to take an active role in deliberately and responsibly shaping the future of higher education.

15.2 Artificial Intelligence: From Augmentation to Value Reconstruction

Of all the technologies on the horizon, AI is the one most likely to reorganise the daily work of universities. Its most visible application is in teaching: adaptive systems that tailor instruction, pacing, and feedback to the individual learner (Wang, 2025). Much of the current literature anticipates an expanding role for such personalisation, linking it both to improved student experience and to professional development for academic staff (Zou et al., 2025; Henshaw, 2025). International policy guidance points in the same direction. The United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) frames AI as a potential accelerator of progress towards inclusive, equitable education, while warning that the benefit is conditional on deliberate policy rather than being automatic (UNESCO, 2021a). The cautionary note in the scholarship is consistent: personalisation delivers little unless it sits inside a coherent pedagogical framework backed by evidence-driven, equity-oriented governance (Nassou, 2025; Atef, 2026).

At the institutional level, the conversation is shifting from efficiency to something more demanding. Wan et al. (2025) describe a move from instrumental rationality towards what they call value reconstruction: the idea that an AI system should be judged not only by whether it works, but also by what it does to equity, inclusion, and the longer-term purposes of the institution. The distinction matters. An adaptive platform that raises completion rates while quietly widening the gap between well-resourced and under-resourced students has not succeeded in any sense the university should care about.

AI is not confined to the classroom. It is increasingly embedded in strategy, planning, and administration through tools for decision support, performance analytics, and automation (Oktyabrski, 2025; Sposato, 2025). Sposato's (2025) taxonomy of AI in educational leadership maps just how far the technology now reaches into institutional functions, from admissions and resource allocation to personalised student support, and related work on e-governance extends the same logic to infrastructure management and policy formation (Rathod, 2025; Kaponda, 2025). The promise here is real: better-targeted resources, faster service, sharper foresight. But the more decisions an institution delegates to algorithmic systems, the

heavier its obligations of transparency and accountability become because these systems redistribute power and shape who gets which opportunities (Selznick & Titareva, 2022; Rodrigues et al., 2025). The trajectory of AI in governance is, in the end, a governance problem – one that calls for ethical leadership and design disciplined by institutional values (Oktyabrski, 2025; Bergsteedt & du Plessis, 2025).

The ethical stakes are no longer abstract, and the regulatory environment has begun to catch up. The European Union's Artificial Intelligence Act, in force since August 2024, classifies many educational uses of AI – admissions decisions, evaluation of learning outcomes, and monitoring of students during assessment – as high-risk, subjecting them to obligations around data governance, documentation, human oversight, and transparency (European Parliament & Council of the European Union, 2024). A university that builds its own grading model becomes, in the language of the Act, a high-risk provider; one that licenses a compliant tool becomes a deployer with lighter but still real duties. UNESCO's Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence (2021b), adopted by all its member states, supplies the values beneath such rules: human dignity, transparency, fairness, and the non-negotiable importance of human oversight. The academic literature traces the same concerns from the ground up, cataloguing bias, responsible-use failures, and the persistent gap between fast-moving technology and slow-moving policy (Chinoracký & Stalmašeková, 2025; Atef, 2026). Empirical work on educators' own use of AI confirms how widespread the tools have become and how varied the ethical dilemmas they raise, which is precisely why ad hoc responses are insufficient (Chinoracký & Stalmašeková, 2025; Bilgin, 2025). Policy analysts accordingly recommend concrete institutional mechanisms – honour codes, evaluation guidelines, and self-regulation aligned with external standards – to hold equity in view (Wang, 2025; Bilgin, 2025).

Critical scholarship sharpens the point. Writing within Latin American higher education, Velázquez Avila et al. (2025) argue that AI does not merely assist existing practice but reshapes pedagogy and institutional ethics, altering the relations of power inside the university itself. Governance frameworks that name transparency, accountability, and fairness as first principles are therefore not bureaucratic overhead; they are the conditions under which AI can be integrated legitimately at all (Selznick & Titareva, 2022; Atef, 2026). The conclusion that runs through this literature is sober and useful. AI can genuinely expand what universities are able to do. Whether it should be trusted to do so depends on each institution's capacity to deploy it in transparent, equity-aware ways that serve education's humanistic aims rather than erode them (Selznick & Titareva, 2022; Wan et al., 2025).

15.3 Immersive Education: Engagement Beyond the Physical Classroom

Virtual and augmented reality occupy a different but related frontier. Where AI personalises, immersive technology relocates: it places learners inside environments that a conventional classroom cannot reproduce. The digital transformation literature consistently lists AR and VR among the technologies reshaping educational settings, situating immersion within a wider ecosystem alongside AI and distributed ledger systems (Kazanskaia, 2025; Zou et al., 2025). Reviews of the field expect VR to become a standard component of next-generation learning environments rather than a novelty reserved for showcase projects (Zou et al., 2025; Henshaw, 2025).

The pedagogical case rests on experience. Immersive design enables forms of experiential and interactive learning that lectures and textbooks struggle to deliver: rehearsing a clinical procedure, walking through a reconstructed historical site, or managing a simulated crisis without real-world consequences. In teacher education, for instance, AI-driven immersive tools generate scenario-rich settings in which trainees practise adaptive responses and build skills under realistic but safe conditions (Velmurugan et al., 2026). The recurring claim is that immersion engages learners in ways that traditional frameworks rarely do.

However, the educational benefits claimed for immersive learning depend on demanding preconditions. Realising these benefits, such as more interactive, experiential, and simulation-based learning, requires access to appropriate devices, sufficient bandwidth, reliable connectivity, and technical support. Where these resources are scarce, immersive education risks becoming a privilege of the already advantaged (Gilbert & Baxter, 2025; Sharma, 2025). There is a security dimension too: extending digital infrastructure to broaden inclusion also enlarges the surface for cyber risk, so investment in access must be matched by investment in protection (Ohanu et al., 2025; Ramesh, 2026). Set against these constraints, the realistic future of immersive learning is not a frictionless leap into the metaverse. It is a managed transition that ties hardware and connectivity to teaching capacity and equitable distribution so that the benefits do not accrue only to well-resourced campuses (Drljić et al., 2025; Zou et al., 2025).

A final consideration is human rather than technical. The value of an immersive experience depends far more on its design than on its hardware, which shifts the demand placed on educators. Teaching well in these environments means moving from delivering content to designing experiences; this is a craft that draws on narrative, interaction design, and an awareness of cognitive load – expertise that not every instructor arrives equipped with. Content choices carry weight as well: who is represented in a simulation,

and how, shapes whether learners feel included or estranged. Realising the potential of VR and AR therefore depends less on the next generation of headsets than on deliberate investment in faculty capacity and the careful curation of immersive content (Velmurugan et al., 2026; Drljić et al., 2025).

15.4 The Networked University: Platforms, Micro-Campuses, and Collaboration

The institutional shape of the university is itself in motion. A growing body of work points towards open, networked organisational forms in which collaboration across institutions becomes a permanent structural feature rather than a temporary expedient (Nguyen et al., 2022; de Andrade et al., 2023; Hou, 2023). The pandemic offered an unplanned demonstration: studies of open universities during COVID-19 found that they sustained learning continuity at scale, which lends credibility to the idea that durable, digitally enabled collaboration structures are workable rather than merely aspirational (Hou, 2023).

One way to describe the change is unbundling and rebundling. The functions a university once performed as an integrated whole – curriculum, instruction, assessment, credentialling, student support – can be separated and then recombined through networks. A plausible near-term expression of this is the global micro-campus: partnerships through which students assemble modular learning experiences from several institutions, online or at satellite centres, and consortia that issue joint credentials (this scenario is illustrative and forward-looking rather than an established norm; early examples exist, but the model is far from settled). The appeal is greater choice and genuine international exposure. The difficulties are equally clear. A campus in one country delivering another institution's curriculum must navigate accreditation, cultural differences, and the practicalities of supporting a remote cohort. Cross-border quality assurance, credit transfer – potentially underwritten by verifiable digital credentials – and the translation of each institution's core values across very different settings are the conditions on which any networked model depends (Kayyali, 2026).

Internationalisation along these lines raises questions of ethics and sustainability that the older, transactional model of recruitment and revenue tended to ignore. Recent work argues for a deliberate move away from that transactional posture towards more inclusive and reciprocal partnerships (Kayyali, 2026), and complementary research positions digital innovation networks as vehicles through which universities can act on the Sustainable Development Goals, provided international collaborations are evaluated by their contribution to societal challenges, not merely by their volume (Li, 2025; Rodrigues Marcelino & Melo, 2025).

The deeper idea behind these arrangements is the university as a platform: a public institution evolving into an open educational ecosystem while retaining its civic and scholarly responsibilities (Komljenovic, 2022; Nguyen et al., 2022; de Andrade et al., 2023). Realising such an ecosystem requires both a plurality of instructional models and the infrastructure to support modular participation across institutions (Zou et al., 2025; Henshaw, 2025). Governance scholars warn against treating the platform metaphor too lightly and call for interdisciplinary approaches that take the political and ethical dimensions of these structures seriously (Rodrigues et al., 2025; Bergsteedt & du Plessis, 2025). Participatory governance therefore becomes foundational rather than optional. Decisions about digital and networked educational architectures must involve the stakeholders affected by them and be guided by long-term public, pedagogical, and institutional value (Bergsteedt & du Plessis, 2025; Dabie & Asare, 2025) because questions of equity, access, and participation cannot be resolved by technology alone. A networked architecture built without attention to these issues will tend to reproduce existing hierarchies rather than dissolve them (Motala et al., 2023; Gilbert & Baxter, 2025).

An additional implication follows from the platformisation literature: a networked university is not merely an interoperability project. It also changes the political economy of higher education by creating new dependencies on platform providers, data infrastructures, and contractual governance. For that reason, rather than treating platforms as neutral delivery channels, platform strategy should include public-interest criteria on data ownership, interoperability, procurement, and academic autonomy (Komljenovic, 2022; de Andrade et al., 2023).

The model should therefore be assessed in terms of both its democratising potential and its risks. In principle, pooling the resources of many institutions could democratise access to specialised knowledge, enabling, for example, a student in a lower-income setting to combine local context with globally sourced expertise at modest cost. Pilot efforts in shared and collaborative provision have already suggested that cross-institutional resource pooling can broaden access to specialised knowledge. In practice, language, time zones, uneven funding, intellectual property and revenue-sharing disputes, and outright geopolitical friction all complicate collaboration. There is also a subtler risk. In networks dominated by prestigious institutions, smaller or less visible partners may be overshadowed, with the effect that an arrangement that is meant to democratise instead entrenches a new stratification. The success of networked higher education will hinge less on connectivity than on the fairness of the partnership structures and the distribution of power within them (Motala et al., 2023; Li, 2025).

15.5 Micro-Credentials and Digital Credentialling: Portability, Trust, and New Pathways

If the networked university changes where learning happens, micro-credentials change how it is recognised. Within the literature, micro-credentials are presented as instruments for improving transparency, recognition, and inclusion within qualification frameworks by addressing long-standing problems of data exchange and portability (Trepulė et al., 2021; Hou et al., 2026; Pawilen et al., 2024). This is no longer only an academic proposition. In 2022, the Council of the European Union adopted the *Recommendation on a European Approach to Micro-Credentials for Lifelong Learning and Employability*, intended to support the development, quality assurance, and cross-border recognition of micro-credentials. The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) has pursued a parallel implementation programme to strengthen the evidence base and guide national policy (Council of the European Union, 2022; OECD, 2023). Beyond Europe, recent Asian comparative evidence shows that legitimacy, regulatory alignment, and quality assurance remain decisive for micro-credentials, while Philippines-focused work proposes quality criteria covering standards, design, achievements, and learners' data; this aligns with the Philippine Qualifications Framework's role as a quality-assured national system for recognising qualifications and supporting mobility (Hou et al., 2026; Pawilen et al., 2024; Philippine Qualifications Framework, n.d.). Reviews of inclusive education, in turn, situate verifiable digital credentialling as one promising route to widening recognition (Zou et al., 2025).

Institutions are also revisiting how they recognise prior and informal learning. Efforts to credit such learning illustrate how new technologies might extend legitimacy to previously unrecognised achievement, even as they meet resistance rooted in quality-assurance and regulatory concerns (Nuswantara et al., 2025; Trepulė et al., 2021). The lesson that recurs throughout this chapter is that novel credential formats are only as trustworthy as the governance frameworks that surround them (Nuswantara et al., 2025).

At precisely this point, blockchain and related distributed ledger technologies enter as a proposed solution to the problem of trust. Their appeal lies in producing portable, tamper-evident records that resist credential fraud through decentralisation and cryptographic integrity (Jain, 2025; Awang Abu Bakar et al., 2025). Policy-oriented studies argue that such systems can strengthen accountability in academic credentialling, provided ethical governance is built in from the start (Sheela, 2025; Awang Abu Bakar et al., 2025) and context-specific work from settings as varied as Libya

and South Africa points to gains in efficiency and credibility (Abdelhafed, 2025; Twabu, 2025). This enthusiasm is tempered by familiar obstacles. Feasibility, cost, and the absence of shared standards remain serious barriers to adoption. Privacy regulation adds a further constraint as blockchain-based academic certification must be designed around specific legal and technical requirements for data protection. The GDPR-Compliant Blockchain-Based Architecture for Universal Learning, Education and Training Information Management GAVIN project illustrates this point by examining the conditions under which blockchain-based academic credentials can be made compatible with General Data Protection Regulation GDPR requirements (Gómez Vieites et al., 2025; Awang Abu Bakar et al., 2025). The balanced view, and the right one, treats blockchain credentialling as promising but unproven at scale. Its value will depend on governance, privacy safeguards, and alignment with established qualification frameworks far more than on the elegance of the underlying cryptography (Gómez Vieites et al., 2025; Trepulė et al., 2021; Hou et al., 2026).

15.6 The Humanistic Core: What Must Not Be Automated Away

Running beneath every possibility discussed so far is a question the technology cannot answer for itself: what, in the university, must remain human? As AI is woven deeper into academic life, the leadership literature presses for an ethical conversation centred on mission, transparency, and equity – the conditions for preserving a student-centred ethic of care (Selznick & Titareva, 2022; Atef, 2026). The serious institutional adoption of AI is a redefinition of the academic's role. Institutions that adopt AI seriously will find their educators moving away from the transmission of information and towards the design of learning, the exercise of ethical judgement, and the verification of machine output (De et al., 2025; Wang, 2025). This is not a diminished role; it is arguably a more demanding one, and it presumes continued human oversight rather than gradual replacement (Avila et al., 2025).

The emphasis on relationship and inquiry that animates this book is consonant with values-based accounts of academic leadership, which tie the legitimacy of innovation to its promotion of equity and sustainability (Mauti & Nyambane, 2025; Drljić et al., 2025). Far from making teachers redundant, advanced learning environments raise the premium on skilled educators who can make good use of the tools – a point the evidence on faculty capacity makes clear (Drljić et al., 2025; Henshaw, 2025).

There is also a structural risk that no amount of good intention can dissolve. Bias and digital inequality are recurring features of AI in education, and they are compounded by a governance lag – namely, institutional policy that trails technological change by years rather than months

(Sharma, 2025; Chinoracký & Stalmašeková, 2025). Reviews of generative AI in higher education capture this tension clearly. Generative AI offers substantial opportunities but also creates substantial hazards. Realising these opportunities depends on ethical integration that respects rather than replaces the educator (Ravichandran & Sasikala, 2025; Chinoracký & Stalmašeková, 2025). System-level analyses of smart societies reinforce this warning, naming data privacy and inequality as the risks most likely to undermine legitimacy (Ramesh, 2026; Sharma, 2025). The equity scholarship offers a necessary corrective to techno-optimism: disparities in higher education persist even where institutions are formally committed to justice, which means every innovation should be tested against entrenched inequity rather than presumed to reduce it (Motala et al., 2023; Gilbert & Baxter, 2025). The question worth carrying forward, then, is not whether AI, immersive media, or digital credentials can be implemented. It is whether they can be designed and governed so that they advance educational justice instead of hardening stratification (Atef, 2026; Drljić et al., 2025; Motala et al., 2023).

15.7 Steering the Next Decade: Leadership and Governance as the Decisive Variables

If there is a single argument the preceding sections converge upon, it is that the outcome of the new academic wave will be decided by governance rather than by gadgetry. Current research in educational governance makes the case directly, holding that governance must weave ethical and political judgement together with technical frameworks, which is to say that emerging possibilities have to be actively steered, not passively absorbed (Rodrigues et al., 2025; Sangwa et al., 2025). Studies of South African universities, for example, link successful transformation to stakeholder engagement, ethical leadership, and a capacity for futures literacy – namely, the ability to think rigorously about alternative futures rather than extrapolating blindly from the present (Bergsteedt & du Plessis, 2025; Dabie & Asare, 2025). Conceptual reviews also point towards participatory models that fuse ethical leadership with genuine collaboration (Dabie & Asare, 2025; Mauti & Nyambane, 2025).

Steering of this kind is impossible without capacity. Models of digital leadership for academic staff emphasise sustained professional development and real involvement in shaping digital policy, on the understanding that the future of higher education calls for broad institutional competence rather than isolated pockets of technical expertise (Worapongpat et al., 2024; Zou et al., 2025). Post-pandemic analyses underline the same need, connecting technology adoption to quality-assurance structures and showing that ambitious futures amount to little unless they are operationalised through

deliberate capacity-building (Zamir & Mahmood, 2025; Henshaw, 2025). Sector bodies have begun to formalise this work; the European University Association, for instance, has framed the adoption of AI around the values and needs of universities themselves, identifying ethics, strategy, training, regulation, and sustainability as the areas where leadership attention is most required (European University Association, 2025). The thread connecting these literatures is that leadership and institutional wisdom – not procurement budgets – are the variables on which the next decade turns.

15.8 Conclusion

Taken together, the trajectories surveyed here support a guarded optimism. Higher education can plausibly become more open, more flexible, and more globally connected – but only where innovation is built on ethical, inclusive, and human-centred foundations (Gilbert & Baxter, 2025; Li, 2025; Bergsteedt & du Plessis, 2025). Read against the arc of this book, the pattern is unmistakable. The missions explored in Part I, the governance and leadership questions of Parts II and III, and the management functions of Part IV all converge on the same conclusion that Part V has been building towards: technology sets the menu of possibilities, but institutions choose from it, and these choices are governed by values.

Several practical commitments follow, and they can be stated plainly. AI should be adopted as a project of value reconstruction rather than cost reduction, with equity, transparency, and human oversight treated as design requirements rather than afterthoughts (Wan et al., 2025; Atef, 2026; Selznick & Titareva, 2022). Immersive and networked models should be pursued only alongside explicit plans for access, faculty capacity, and security, so that their benefits do not pool among the already advantaged (Drljić et al., 2025; Zou et al., 2025). Digital credentials, including blockchain-based systems, should be advanced through robust governance, privacy protection, and alignment with recognised qualification frameworks, since portability and verification become socially meaningful only when they are trusted (Gómez Vieites et al., 2025; Council of the European Union, 2022; Hou et al., 2026; Pawilen et al., 2024). Across all of this, institutions should keep asking questions that no algorithm can settle on their behalf: how does this serve the educational mission? Whose needs does it prioritise? What principles guide the change?

The path of the new academic wave will not be set by the raw advance of technology. It will be set by the governance decisions of academic communities – above all by their ability to align new tools with scholarly rigour, equity, and the pursuit of truth through accountable, participatory, and futures-oriented leadership (Bergsteedt & du Plessis, 2025; Dabie & Asare, 2025; Motala et al., 2023). The most useful way to regard the possibilities

in this chapter is therefore as prompts for ethical institutional redesign, ensuring that technology deepens learning, relationships, and inquiry rather than hollowing out the humanistic core of the academy (Selznick & Titareva, 2022; Atef, 2026; Rodrigues Marcelino & Melo, 2025). The coming decade will bring surprises that no chapter can anticipate. With proactive stewardship, universities can still ensure that the wave carries higher education towards greater public value – and that, in riding it, they remain faithful to the enduring purposes the technology was only ever meant to serve.

References

Abdelhafed, Y. (2025). Unleashing the power of blockchain in Libyan higher education: A catalyst for efficiency and trust. *International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research, 7*(4), 1–7. https://doi.org/10.36948/ijfmr.2025.v07i04.54196

Atef, R. (2026). Integrating artificial intelligence in education with a strategic framework for ethical and inclusive innovation. In C. R. G. Popescu (Ed.), *AI and green innovation for achieving sustainable development goals* (pp. 173–204). IGI Global Scientific Publishing. https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3373-7584-7.ch007

Avila, R. C. J., Chinde Ponce, L. E., Chininin Parrilla, L. K., Kipkoech, R. J., & Maldonado Velez, M. Z. (2025, March 28). *Sailing through the challenges of artificial intelligence in institutional research.* Association for Institutional Research. Retrived from: www.airweb.org/article/2025/03/28/sailing-through-the-challenges-of-ai-in-ir

Awang Abu Bakar, N. S., Yahya, N., Idris, N. B., Mohd Nordin, M. A., & Zakaria, Z. (2025). Enhancing academic credential integrity through blockchain-based verification systems. In H. Fujita, A. Hernandez-Matamoros, & Y. Watanobe (Eds.), *New trends in intelligent software methodologies, tools and techniques: Proceedings of the 24th International Conference on New Trends in Intelligent Software Methodologies, Tools and Techniques (SoMeT_25)* (pp. 55–67). IOS Press. https://doi.org/10.3233/FAIA250509

Bergsteedt, B., & du Plessis, A. (2025). Reimagining transformation through strategic thinking and accountable governance in the South African public university system. *Higher Education*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-025-01517-w

Bilgin, H. (2025). A framework for responsible AI in higher education. *Higher Education Governance and Policy, 6*(2), 155–174. https://doi.org/10.55993/hegp.1788343

Chinoracký, R., & Stalmašeková, N. (2025). Ethical problems in the use of artificial intelligence by university educators. *Education Sciences, 15*(10), 1322. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15101322

Council of the European Union. (2022). Council Recommendation of 16 June 2022 on a European approach to micro-credentials for lifelong learning and employability (2022/C 243/02). *Official Journal of the European Union, C 243*, 10–25. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=oj:JOC_2022_243_R_0002

Dabie, P., & Asare, J. (2025). Revisiting transformational leadership in U.S. higher education: A critical conceptual review. *International Journal of Applied Research in Social Sciences, 7*(9), 673–684. https://doi.org/10.51594/ijarss.v7i9.2039

De, M., Berrones, M., Solis-Segovia, G., & Salazar, R. (2025). Transformación docente con IA: Agenda institucional para universidades de México y la región. *Iberociencias, 4*(3), 3694–3724. https://doi.org/10.63371/ic.v4.n3.a307

de Andrade, L. H. A., Thomas, D. A., & Laterza, V. (2023). The rise of EdTech platforms in higher education: Mapping themes from emerging critical literature. In R. Pinheiro, C. E. Tømte, L. Barman, L. Degn, & L. Geschwind (Eds.), *Digital transformations in Nordic higher education* (pp. 27–51). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-27758-0_2

Drljić, K., Konrad, S., Rutar, S., & Štemberger, T. (2025). Digital equity and sustainability in higher education. *Sustainability, 17*(5), 2011. https://doi.org/10.3390/su17052011

European Parliament & Council of the European Union. (2024). Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 June 2024 laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act). *Official Journal of the European Union*. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2024/1689/oj

European University Association. (2025). *Adopting AI that serves the needs and values of universities*. EUA. www.eua.eu/publications/reports/adopting-ai-that-serves-the-needs-and-values-of-universities.html

Gilbert, A., & Baxter, J. (2025). The futures of digital learning and teaching. In Baxter, J., Selby-Fell, H., Gilbert, A. (Eds.), *Creativity and critique in digital learning and teaching*. Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-68086-1_14

Gómez Vieites, A., Delgado-von-Eitzen, C., & Estévez Garcia, D. (2025). GDPR-compliant academic certification via blockchain: Legal and technical validation of the GAVIN project. *Applied Sciences, 15*(16), 9191. https://doi.org/10.3390/app15169191

Henshaw, C. (2025). Multimedia learning and UDL in UK higher education. *Journal of Advanced Research in Education, 4*(2), 27–33. https://doi.org/10.56397/jare.2025.03.03

Hou, A. Y. C., Tao, C. H., Su, E. H. C., Zhou, K. Z.-W., Chen, Y., Lin, A. F. Y., & Hill, C. (2026). Does quality assurance matter for micro-credentials in higher education? Legitimacy, regulatory framework, and challenges in four Asian contexts. *Studies in Higher Education, 51*(3), 592–608. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2025.2482833

Hou, S. (2023). Impact of COVID-19 on open universities worldwide: Case studies from Asia, Africa, and Europe. *Asian Association of Open Universities Journal, 18*(1), 92–102. https://doi.org/10.1108/aaouj-08-2022-0114

Jain, S. (2025). Blockchain for transparent university credential verification. *Scientific Journal of Artificial Intelligence and Blockchain Technologies, 2*(2), 42-50. https://doi.org/10.63345/sjaibt.v2.i2.105

Kaponda, T. (2025). From new public management to digital public administration: Examining the role of technology in shaping super smart societies. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science, 9*(5), 3306–3320. https://doi.org/10.47772/ijriss.2025.905000257

Kayyali, M. (2026). Leadership perspectives on sustainable internationalization in higher education. In M. Kayyali (Ed.), *Higher education institution strategies for internationalization* (pp. 97–124). IGI Global Scientific Publishing. https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3373-1092-3.ch004

Komljenovic, J. (2022). The future of value in digitalised higher education: Why data privacy should not be our biggest concern. *Higher Education, 83*(1), 119–135. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-020-00639-7

Li, W. (2025). Digital innovation networks for the SDGs: A research agenda for higher education transformation. *European Journal of Education, 60*(4) e70292. https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.70292

Mauti, J., & Nyambane, A. (2025). Ethical dimensions of transformative leadership: Advancing equity in technology-driven higher education. *Journal of Education Management and Leadership, 6*(1), 32–46. https://doi.org/10.51317/ecjeml.v6i1.642

Motala, S., Oketch, M., Ouma, G., & Masutha, M. (2023). Higher education funding, justice, and equity: Critical perspectives. *South African Journal of Higher Education, 37*(6), 1–7. https://doi.org/10.20853/37-6-6199

Nassou, Y. (2025). Beyond traditional teaching: Designing analytical models for pedagogy and classroom management in AI-era universities. *Scientia. Technology, Science and Society, 2*(10), 31–41. https://doi.org/10.59324/stss.2025.2(10).03

Nguyen, L. T. (2022). Digital learning ecosystem at educational institutions. *Cogent Education, 9*(1), 2111033. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2022.2111033

Nuswantara, D., Hadi, H., Hariyanto, S., Wijaya, A., Meyer, J., & Run, P. (2025). Recognition of prior learning (RPL) from a posthumanist perspective: A higher education reconceptualization. *Journal of Posthumanism, 5*(3), 263–273. https://doi.org/10.63332/joph.v5i3.731

OECD. (2023). *Micro-credentials for lifelong learning and employability: Uses and possibilities* (OECD Education Working Paper No. 66). OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/9c4b7b68-en

Ohanu, I., Shetima, A., Ude, E., & Chekwube, E. (2025). Broadband for all, but at what cost? Tackling cybersecurity risks in the race for digital inclusion. *Journal of Communication Research.* Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.53555/jcr.v6:i3.13298

Oktyabrski, H. (2025). Artificial intelligence-driven transformation: Rethinking the strategic trajectories of higher education institutions. *Global Spectrum of Research and Humanities, 2*(5), 350–360. https://doi.org/10.69760/gsrh.0250205039

Pawilen, G. T., Tomida, E., & Eugenio, D. O. (2024). Quality assurance framework for micro-credentials in Japan and in the Philippines. *International Journal of Curriculum and Instruction*, *16*(2), 401–421. https://ijci.globets.org/index.php/IJCI/article/view/1456

Philippine Qualifications Framework. (n.d.). *What is PQF?* https://pqf.gov.ph/

Ramesh, M. R. (2026). Technology-driven smart society: The social impact of next-generation smart cyber technologies. In E. Babulak (Ed.), *The social impact of next-generation smart cyber technology* (pp. 1–54). IGI Global Scientific Publishing. https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3373-5656-3.ch001

Rathod, R. (2025). The use of artificial intelligence in the e-governance of higher education institutions. *Shodh Sari: An International Multidisciplinary Journal, 4*(3), 202–208. https://doi.org/10.59231/sari7847

Ravichandran, R., & Sasikala, P. (2025). Harnessing generative AI in higher education: Opportunities, challenges, and ethical imperatives. *Journal of Digital Learning and Education, 5*(1), 28–40. https://doi.org/10.52562/jdle.v5i1.1455

Rodrigues, C., Neto-Mendes, A., Santos, M., & Gouveia, A. (2025). Mapping problems and approaches in educational governance: A systematic literature review. *Education Sciences, 15*(8), 1048. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15081048

Rodrigues Marcelino, L. & Melo, P. (2025). University without walls: Dialogue of knowledges as a principle of institutional transformation. *Revista E-Tech: Tecnologias para Competitividade Industrial, 18*(1). https://doi.org/10.18624/e-tech.v18i1.1436

Sangwa, S., Butera, A., & Mutabazi, P. (2025). Digital transformation of higher education: A post-COVID review of adoption, quality assurance, and governance challenges. *Current Research Bulletin, 2*(7), 120–133. https://doi.org/10.55677/crb/i07-07-crb2025

Selznick, B. S., & Titareva, T. N. (2022). Postsecondary administrative leadership and educational AI: An ethical shared approach. In F. Almaraz-Menéndez, A. Maz-Machado, C. López-Esteban, & C. Almaraz-López (Eds.), *Strategy, policy, practice, and governance for AI in higher education institutions* (pp. 73–100). IGI Global. https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-7998-9247-2.ch004

Sharma, D. (2025). The digital dilemma in education: Global challenges and ethical opportunities in the 5IR transition. *IJSSLL, 5*(9), 5–13. https://doi.org/10.55640/ijssll-05-09-02

Sheela, D. (2025). Enhancing academic trust and accountability: A scalable blockchain system for credential verification for education. *International Journal of Applied Mathematics, 38*(7s), 803–819. https://doi.org/10.12732/ijam.v38i7s.516

Sposato, M. (2025). Artificial intelligence in educational leadership: A comprehensive taxonomy and future directions. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 22*(1), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-025-00517-1

Kazanskaia, A. N. (2025). The future of digital transformation: Emerging technologies, leadership, and sustainability. *NEYA Global Journal of Non-Profit, 1–6. Studies*. https://doi.org/10.64357/neya-gjnps-gdtdgttrfm-11

Trepulė, E., Volungevičienė, A., Teresevičienė, M., Daukšienė, E., Greenspon, R., Tamoliūnė, G., Šadauskas, M., & Vaitonytė, G. (2021). *Guidelines for open and online learning assessment and recognition with reference to the National and European qualification framework: Micro-credentials as a proposal for tuning and transparency*. Vytautas Magnus University. https://doi.org/10.7220/9786094674792

Twabu, K. (2025). Blockchain smart contract efficiency as a use case for higher learning institutions. *Multidisciplinary Reviews, 9*(3), 2026135. https://doi.org/10.31893/multirev.2026135

UNESCO. (2021a). *AI and education: Guidance for policy-makers.* UNESCO. www.unesco.org/en/articles/ai-and-education-guidance-policy-makers

UNESCO. (2021b). *Recommendation on the ethics of artificial intelligence*. UNESCO. www.unesco.org/en/articles/recommendation-ethics-artificial-intelligence

Velázquez Avila, R. M., De la Peña Consuegra, G., Linzan Saltos, M. F., Vega Intriago, J. O., Murillo Mora, M. K., Vásquez Giler, Y. A., & Guerrero Aray, K. G. (2025). From the digital ecosystem to critical artificial intelligence. *Seminars in Medical Writing and Education, 4*, 737. https://doi.org/10.56294/mw2025737

Velmurugan, R., Bhuvaneswari, R., Kalimuthu, M., & Abey, J. (2026). The role of AI in immersive learning in teacher education: Simulated environments, tools, and practices. In *Immersive learning in teacher education: Simulated environments, tools, and practices* (pp. 31–58). IGI Global Scientific Publishing. https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-9861-6.ch002

Wan, Z., Xie, B., & Hou, Y. (2025). The triple realm of AI-enabled education: From instrumental rationality to value reconstruction. *JEVE, 5*(4), 36–52. https://doi.org/10.63650/jeve.v5i4.70

Wang, S. (2025). The application and challenges of artificial intelligence in personalized learning for higher education. *Lecture Notes in Education Psychology and Public Media, 106*(1), 164–170. https://doi.org/10.54254/2753-7048/2025.cb25753

Worapongpat, N., Cai, Q., & Wongsawad, T. (2024). Creating and validating a digital leadership model for university teachers, Liaoning Province. *JELR, 1*(3), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.60027/jelr.2024.740

Zamir, S., & Mahmood, M. (2025). Evaluating ICT practices in higher education: A quantitative study using the SABER ICT policy framework in Pakistan. *Voyage Journal of Educational Studies, 5*(1), 152–170. https://doi.org/10.58622/vjes.v5i1.223

Zou, Y., Kuek, F., Feng, W., & Cheng, X. (2025). Digital learning in the 21st century: Trends, challenges, and innovations in technology integration. *Frontiers in Education, 10*, 1562391. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1562391

16 Empirical Case Studies of Digital-Era Transformation in Higher Education Management

16.1 Purpose, Scope, and Methodological Design of the Case Studies

The case studies presented in this chapter serve an interpretive and illustrative function within the overall analytical architecture of the book. They are designed to make visible how digital transformation in higher education management is enacted within concrete institutional settings under the new academic wave. In line with the book's broader methodological orientation, the cases function as analytically selected configurations that foreground specific strategic mechanisms, governance arrangements, and institutional logics through which digital transformation is interpreted, structured, and governed across different organisational contexts.

Importantly, the case studies do not aim to establish causal claims regarding effectiveness, performance, or impact. Instead, they provide empirically grounded illustrations of how universities operationalise continuous mission-aligned and foresight-oriented approaches to digital transformation under differing organisational, cultural, and system-level conditions. This approach is consistent with interpretive and theory-building traditions in higher education research, where case studies are mobilised to explore strategic variability, institutional sense-making, and governance dynamics rather than to generate generalisable performance metrics or best-practice prescriptions.

Methodologically, the chapter is based primarily on qualitative desk-based research, complemented where available by primary empirical material collected during the broader research programme underpinning this monograph. The core empirical sources comprise systematic analysis of institutional strategy documents, digital transformation programmes, governance guidelines, official policy statements, and publicly available materials disseminated through university websites and formal communications. This documentary analysis is supplemented with semi-structured in-depth interviews (IDI) with academic leaders and professional staff, as well as

DOI: 10.4324/9781042001422-22
This chapter has been made available under a CC BY-NC-ND license.

with elements of participant observation conducted during study visits, and engagement with higher education institutions undergoing digital transformation.

The cases included in this chapter encompass universities from multiple national contexts and higher education systems. In Finland, they include the University of Turku, the University of Helsinki, and Laurea University of Applied Sciences; in Spain, Mondragon University; and in Taiwan, Tamkang University. While the depth, composition, and temporal coverage of empirical material vary across cases, all are examined through a shared interpretive lens focused on strategic intent, governance architectures, institutional capabilities, and the embedding of digital initiatives within broader academic and managerial priorities.

This design reflects the analytical purpose of the chapter. The cases are not constructed as comprehensive institutional ethnographies but as strategically focused case studies illustrating distinct configurations of digital-era transformation across different organisational domains, including governance, learning environments, emerging technologies, and institutional capability development. The analysis attends in particular to how digital initiatives are aligned with academic missions, how coordination and steering mechanisms are organised, and how universities navigate tensions between experimentation, continuity, and institutional coherence.

Accordingly, the comparative observations developed across the case studies should be read as theoretically informed illustrations of analytically distinct configurations of digital transformation in higher education management rather than as empirical claims regarding effectiveness, impact, or measured outcomes. Together, they provide an empirical grounding for understanding how the new academic wave discussed in earlier parts of the book is translated into practice across diverse institutional settings.

While the methodological design outlined in this section applies to all case studies presented in the chapter, each individual case is analytically anchored in a distinct conceptual strand developed across the book. This design allows the case studies to demonstrate how multiple dimensions of the new academic wave are enacted across diverse institutional contexts.

16.2 Case 1: Absorbing the Digital Wave without Losing the Mission

Strategic Platforms and Institution-Wide Coordination at the Universities of Helsinki and Turku

This section presents a brief comparative case of two Finnish universities whose digital-era strategies reveal contrasting but complementary configurations of the pillars discussed in Chapter 7. The analysis is based

on institutional documents, publicly available strategy and policy materials, and interviews conducted for this study with actors familiar with digital transformation processes in Finnish higher education. The case does not aim to provide a comprehensive institutional history of either university. Rather, it examines how strategic platforms, digitalisation programmes, and governance mechanisms translate digital transformation into coordinated institutional action.

The University of Helsinki and the University of Turku are treated here as analytically paired cases because both illustrate mature forms of digital-era coordination, although they do so through different institutional arrangements. Helsinki foregrounds a focused, mission-driven platform combined with institution-wide coordination of emerging technologies. Turku, by contrast, offers an explicit university-wide digitalisation programme that connects learning, research, partnerships, and internal capability development. Read together, the two institutions show how digital transformation can be embedded within academic strategy without being reduced to a separate IT workstream.

The University of Helsinki combines a focused, mission-driven sub-institutional platform with institution-wide coordination of emerging technologies. The Helsinki Centre for Digital Humanities (HELDIG), described as "a major Finnish strategic effort, 2016–2020", was established to refocus and coordinate intellectual resources across the humanities, social sciences, and computer science. Its stated mission is to advance computational methods, open data science, and the societal deployment of research results (University of Helsinki, 2020). Organised around four focal areas – research, education, infrastructures, and society – the strategy is explicitly value-anchored. It prioritises societal benefit and multidisciplinary scholarship over technology acquisition, which is consistent with scholarship cautioning against technology-centric approaches to digital transformation (Morrill, 2010; Pavlova, 2020). HELDIG's design as a collaboration platform spanning seven faculties, and involving partnerships with Aalto University and external memory and public organisations, reflects established governance literature on cross-functional steering and participatory planning (Libo-on et al., 2025). In this respect, HELDIG illustrates how a focused, mission-oriented sub-institutional structure can operationalise a "living strategy" within a large research university.

The University's institutional approach to artificial intelligence (AI) complements this configuration and demonstrates how an emerging technology can be embedded within – rather than developed alongside – the overall strategic framework. Instead of issuing a standalone AI strategy, the University has operationalised AI through an AI Roadmap, a set of institutional guidelines, and a coordinating committee bringing together IT services, library leadership, administrative functions, and academic staff.

This body oversees the piloting and phased scaling of AI applications across teaching, research, and administration. The institutional stance is proactive rather than prohibitionist (Kushwaha, 2025; Hubbart, 2025) and aligns with multivocal review findings that digitally mature institutions embed transformation initiatives within overarching strategies rather than treating them as parallel workstreams (Fernández et al., 2023; Szalma, 2018).

The University issued its first guidelines on AI in teaching in 2023, followed by updated Guidelines confirmed by the Academic Affairs Council on 30 May 2024 (University of Helsinki, 2024). Two institutionally supported generative AI services are currently available: CurreChat, developed internally for teaching purposes, and Microsoft Copilot with commercial data protection. CurreChat is positioned as the more pedagogically appropriate option, with its continued development explicitly oriented towards educational use (University of Helsinki, 2024; University of Helsinki IT Helpdesk, 2025). A complementary set of *Guidelines for the Responsible Use of AI in Research* places particular emphasis on transparency, privacy, and AI ethics (University of Helsinki, 2024b).

Three structural features are analytically salient. First, the decision to host University-developed AI services on controlled institutional infrastructure reflects an explicit data-sovereignty orientation (Pavlova, 2020; De Ramos & Esponilla, 2022). Second, the framing of AI literacy as relevant both to academic study and graduate employability positions digital literacy as a strategic, institution-wide capability (Murray et al., 2022). Third, the explicit recognition that AI raises epistemic challenges beyond instrumental tool use situates institutional AI policy within a broader value-anchored strategic framing (Morrill, 2010; Valdés et al., 2021; Adachi, 2024).

The University of Turku's Digitalisation Programme functions as an explicit, institution-wide roadmap for implementing the University's Strategy 2030. Its stated objective is to "engage the whole University community to co-create a digital learning and research environment with societal impact" (University of Turku, n.d.). The programme is structured around four goal areas: learning experiences and outcomes, the research environment, partnerships and societal engagement, and the internal expert community. It commits to user-oriented learning environments, digital pedagogy support, learning analytics, research data-management services, a partnership-management system, and the systematic development of staff and student digital competences (University of Turku, 2024). In doing so, it treats online and hybrid education (Pillar 1), analytics and information infrastructures (Pillar 2), and governance and human-capability development (Pillar 3) as interdependent elements rather than as siloed domains.

Here, three features are again analytically meaningful. The programme exemplifies close integration between digital strategy and institutional strategy. Rather than functioning as a parallel IT plan, it operates as the

implementation arm of Strategy 2030, consistent with findings that the most advanced digital transformation initiatives are embedded within core institutional strategies (Fernández et al., 2023; Szalma, 2018). It embeds a participatory and continuous-learning logic by foregrounding co-creation with the "whole University community" and aligning with the national Digivision 2030 collaboration (Libo-on et al., 2025; Zou et al., 2025). It also foregrounds foresight, committing to the sustainable development of the operational environment "with foresight and by taking into account the different needs of the users" (University of Turku, 2024).

These cases illustrate complementary enactments of the digital-era academic strategy framework developed in this chapter. The University of Helsinki combines a focused, mission-aligned collaboration platform at the sub-institutional level (HELDIG) with institution-wide coordination of an emerging-technology domain (AI), embedded within overall strategy through a cross-functional committee, an explicit roadmap, and a pilot-before-scale implementation approach. This configuration demonstrates how a specific technological wave can be institutionally absorbed without displacing overarching strategic purpose (Kushwaha, 2025; Du et al., 2025; Fernández et al., 2023). By contrast, the Turku Digitalisation Programme operationalises a university-wide, multi-pillar roadmap that integrates learning, research, partnerships, and community capability within a single governance architecture. This approach is consistent with scholarship arguing that digital transformation must be embedded in institutional strategy rather than treated as a discrete IT workstream (Fernández et al., 2023; Szalma, 2018; Bravo-Jaico et al., 2025).

The two cases suggest that a mature digital-era academic strategy does not take the form of a single fixed template. Rather, it emerges as a coordinated ensemble of strategic arrangements, domain-specific platforms that prototype new capabilities, institution-wide governance frameworks that orchestrate cross-cutting pillars, and thematic governance mechanisms that integrate strategically emerging technologies within overall institutional direction. These configurations remain aligned with a shared strategic logic while being shaped by institutional history, mission, and context, consistent with scenario-planning scholarship emphasising the parallel pursuit of multiple strategic options rather than reliance on single forecast commitments (Bromley et al., 2023; Peñaranda, 2025; Nestorenko, 2025).

16.3 Case 2: Laurea University of Applied Science

Digital Transformation Through a Pedagogical Operating Model

This section presents the case of Laurea University of Applied Sciences, a Finnish practice-oriented higher education institution whose digital

transformation is embedded in pedagogy, learning design, teacher support, and the quality management of education. The case is analytically significant because of the way Laurea absorbs digitalisation into an established pedagogical model and into the everyday organisation of teaching and learning, so that it forms part of the academic core of the institution. The case shows how a university of applied sciences can translate digital transformation into a pedagogical operating model.

The analysis draws on Laurea's institutional documents and public communication, on interviews with academic teachers and a digital-pedagogy expert, and on observation carried out during a study visit. The empirical material covered face-to-face, online, and hybrid learning settings, together with the institutional arrangements supporting digital pedagogy. This combination of sources made it possible to examine how Laurea describes its pedagogical model in formal documents and how that model is enacted in the design of learning environments, the organisation of student work, and the support provided to teachers.

Laurea operates in the Helsinki metropolitan region and the wider Uusimaa area. As a university of applied sciences, it is oriented towards working life, regional development, applied research, and competence formation, while its strategic and pedagogical materials emphasise openness, effectiveness, responsibility, partnership, and interaction with external stakeholders (Laurea University of Applied Sciences, n.d.-a). These commitments shape how digital tools are interpreted and used, so that digitalisation gains institutional meaning when it supports cooperation, flexible learning, competence development, and authentic development work.

The central pedagogical reference point is Laurea's Learning by Developing model, usually abbreviated as LbD. Laurea's institutional materials present LbD as a development-based model in which students learn through authentic workplace-related development tasks, inquiry, reflection, and cooperation with teachers, peers, and working-life partners (Laurea University of Applied Sciences, n.d.-a). The model links education, research and development, and regional engagement within a single pedagogical architecture, and it works as a broader institutional grammar for organising learning, partnership, and competence formation.

The study visit confirmed that LbD operates as more than just a formal pedagogical declaration. The observed learning environments were organised around student activity, collaborative tasks, feedback, and the progressive development of work. Digital tools supported communication, documentation, access to materials, group coordination, and teacher feedback, and their value depended on how far they supported the pedagogical process already structured by LbD. This is a defining feature of the case: technology operates as an enabling condition for development-based learning, and the pedagogical process holds priority over the tools that serve it.

The interviews reinforced this reading. Digitalisation was described as a continuing process of pedagogical redesign, and teachers' accounts pointed to course structure, student engagement, formative feedback, teamwork, and competence development. The digital-pedagogy expert added that internal work on digital pedagogy had begun before the pandemic, through specialised support for online learning design, pedagogical scenarios, and digital learning materials. Laurea's digital transformation therefore predates COVID-19: the pandemic accelerated change, but the institution's pedagogical orientation was already in place.

The documentary analysis of Laurea's pedagogical programme clarifies this point. The programme defines the institution's approach to learning, teaching, guidance, competence development, partnership, and community, and the *Pedagogical Programme 2026–2028* sets out student-centredness, learning-centredness, competence-based education, working-life orientation, guidance, and flexibility as central principles (Laurea University of Applied Sciences, 2026b). It connects digital learning environments with learning that can take place independently of time and place, and it underlines personalised guidance and feedback for study progress and competence development (Laurea University of Applied Sciences, 2026b). The programme itself was co-created through a year-long open process involving teaching staff, management, support services, and students (Ojasalo & Nurkka, 2023), and Laurea has presented the renewed programme as a response to changing demands in higher education learning (Laurea University of Applied Sciences, 2023). It works as a governance mechanism that translates broad institutional values into operational expectations for the design and quality of digital-era learning.

This governance function keeps digital flexibility from collapsing into access or convenience. In the empirical material, flexibility concerns the design of learning paths that let students work in different rhythms, combine synchronous and asynchronous participation, and receive guidance while they take responsibility for their own learning. Observation during the study visit showed digital learning environments used as spaces of guided activity. Students could continue work beyond the classroom while the learning process stayed structured through tasks, teacher feedback, peer interaction, and competence goals.

Laurea's adoption of new digital learning environments shows how this pedagogical logic has shaped technological change. The institution had decided to adopt Canva before the pandemic, and the sudden move to online teaching created a double challenge because the introduction of a new learning management system coincided with the redesign of teaching for online and hybrid delivery. Laurea's own account of its pandemic response describes this transition as both digital and pedagogical (Valsta et al., 2021). The empirical material collected for this study

supports that reading: the platform called for learning design, teacher development, peer support, and alignment with the pedagogical model of the institution.

The observed and reported use of Canva and other digital tools is best understood through the relationship between tools and pedagogical affordances. Digital environments earned their value when they supported motivation, engagement, collaboration, task visibility, feedback, and flexible access, and their significance followed from their capacity to strengthen the learning process. This reading aligns with the TPACK conception of teacher knowledge, in which meaningful technology integration depends on the interaction of technological, pedagogical, and content knowledge (Mishra & Koehler, 2006; Koehler & Mishra, 2009). The framework supplies an analytical language for what the material shows: at Laurea, digital competence is enacted as the capacity to design learning.

Teacher support sits at the centre of Laurea's configuration. The interviews and documentary materials show digital transformation sustained through distributed support structures that bring together digital-pedagogy expertise, IT services, programme-level responsibilities, peer learning, and teacher communities. Laurea's account of its support model identifies the dCELL unit, digi-lecturers, workshops, clinics, and Teams-based channels as central elements of the pandemic-period architecture (Valsta et al., 2021). The value of these arrangements lies in more than their technical function: they created conditions in which teachers could experiment, redesign courses, ask practical questions, and build confidence, so that digitalisation did not fall on individuals as an isolated burden.

This collegial and developmental orientation is one of the strongest features of this case study. Digital transformation at Laurea moved through examples, peer exchange, training, shared materials, and the gradual normalisation of digitally supported pedagogical design, alongside formal institutional decisions. Teachers' willingness to use digital tools grew when they could see how these tools supported concrete learning activities and when support was available close to teaching practice. Digital change thereby became part of professional learning and part of the ordinary development of academic work.

The organisation of student learning follows the same logic. Students act as active contributors to development tasks, and that agency is given structure through pedagogical design. Digital tools help organise teamwork, clarify responsibilities, document progress, and enable continuous feedback. In the observed learning situations, the teacher monitored task development, commented on work in progress, and helped students connect activities to competence goals. Student agency at Laurea is constructed through pedagogical design, teacher guidance, peer interaction, and shared responsibility within learning groups.

Quality management is embedded within this learning process. It reaches beyond institutional reporting, formal evaluation, and platform reliability into the design of learning paths, the articulation of competences, the systematic use of feedback, and the monitoring of task development. The interviews showed that evaluation was understood as part of the learning process itself, especially in project-based and development-based work. Digital tools support this quality logic by making work visible, recording comments, enabling iterative revision, and maintaining continuity between learning events, so that the digital environment becomes part of the institution's quality infrastructure.

The analysis of Laurea's pedagogical documents shows competence-based education and teacher digital competence at the centre of this quality infrastructure. The European DigCompEdu framework provides a useful reference point as it defines educators' digital competence in broad pedagogical, communicative, evaluative, and professional terms (Redecker, 2017). This understanding corresponds to the Laurea case, where digital competence involves the capacity to design learning activities, support student collaboration, guide students in digital environments, use feedback productively, and align digital tools with learning outcomes.

The partnership dimension of LbD gives Laurea's digital transformation a further institutional specificity. Development-based learning depends on authentic tasks and cooperation with working-life partners, and digital environments can extend this cooperation by supporting documentation, remote participation, communication across organisational boundaries, and iterative project work. During the study visit, digital tools were visible as part of the infrastructure of collaborative work. Their pedagogical value held only while they stayed connected to the developmental purpose of the task, with a shared digital workspace mattering only when it supported inquiry, feedback, reflection, and competence formation.

This case study provides little evidence for the view that digital technologies simply replace existing practices. Online and hybrid arrangements extend the spaces in which development-based learning can occur. They allow some forms of collaboration to continue across distance, make parts of the learning process more visible, and support flexible access to materials and feedback, while the relational and dialogic dimensions of learning stay central. The task for the institution is to design digital and hybrid arrangements that preserve the developmental logic of LbD.

The empirical material also brought tensions into view. Digital flexibility can widen access, support participation, and enable more personalised learning paths, and it can create risks of fragmentation, superficial engagement, weakened social contact, and added pressure on students. The interviews treated these as pedagogical and organisational challenges. The concern with student wellbeing carried particular weight as digital

development calls for attention to how students experience responsibility, workload, social connection, and support in digitally mediated learning environments, alongside technical adaptation and pedagogical redesign.

This critical orientation is analytically important. Laurea's digital maturity shows in the institution's capacity to ask what digitalisation does to learning, interaction, feedback, student agency, and educational quality, and to keep flexibility, student agency, and digital access bound to guidance, support, and the quality of learning. Digital transformation becomes sustainable through continuous evaluation of its pedagogical effects.

The analysis points to a model of digital transformation as pedagogical institutionalisation. Laurea's digital transformation is structured by the relationship between LbD, learning design, teacher support, student guidance, competence-based education, partnership, and quality management. Digital tools matter within this architecture, and they acquire meaning through their integration into it. The resulting configuration is a pedagogical operating model in which digitalisation becomes part of the ordinary work of teaching, learning, feedback, and development.

This configuration carries relevance for practice-oriented higher education institutions. It shows digital transformation becoming coherent when it is attached to authentic projects, working-life partnerships, competence-based learning, continuous feedback, and applied research and development. It also shows quality management in digital education reaching beyond compliance and technical reliability into the pedagogical depth of digital learning, the accessibility of study paths, the development of teacher competences, and the capacity of students to act as reflective, responsible, and collaborative professionals.

Laurea's case suggests that digital maturity need not be expressed through the most elaborate technology strategy or the most advanced infrastructure. It can appear in the capacity to connect digital tools with the core educational model of the institution, mediated at Laurea through LbD, pedagogical programme work, learning design, peer support, competence-based education, and quality management. Digital transformation becomes meaningful because it is absorbed into the everyday architecture of learning, and it becomes durable because it is pedagogically purposeful, organisationally supported, and continuously examined through the quality of the learning it produces.

16.4 Case 3: Mondragon University

Embedding Digital Transformation in Cooperative Values and a Technopedagogical Framework

This case presents Mondragon Unibertsitatea (the University of Mondragon) as a Basque cooperative university in which digital transformation is shaped

primarily by pedagogy, institutional values, and cooperative identity. Technology is not treated as an autonomous agenda or as a sign of innovation in itself. It becomes relevant when it supports learning, strengthens collaboration, and contributes to the wider educational and social purpose of the institution. The case therefore shows a form of digital transformation in which digital tools are integrated into teaching, research, and knowledge transfer without displacing the university's mission.

Mondragon Unibertsitatea is part of the wider MONDRAGON cooperative ecosystem, which brings together cooperatives, technology centres, research units, entrepreneurship structures, and the university. This location is important because the University does not approach digitalisation as a detached technological programme, but as part of a broader cooperative tradition in which learning, work, innovation, and social responsibility are closely connected. Across its faculties and centres, digital transformation is interpreted through the values of cooperation, collective responsibility, practice orientation, and service to society.

The most consistent idea across the interviews was the technopedagogical perspective. Respondents used this term to describe an approach in which digital tools are chosen according to the pedagogical objective they serve. A tool is useful only if it adds value to the learning process. One teacher explained that it is not enough to know how a tool works; what matters is knowing how it works in a pedagogical environment. A technopedagogical advisor framed the same point by saying that technology should provide something additional to what is being taught while remaining aligned with learning objectives. Another respondent stressed that, since tools change constantly, the important question is not which application is new or popular, but whether the chosen technology fits the intended learning outcomes.

This understanding is close to the TPACK approach, where meaningful technology integration depends on the relationship between technological, pedagogical, and content knowledge. In Mondragon, however, this is not simply an abstract framework. It takes the form of a practical way of speaking about teaching. Digital competence is understood as the ability to design learning situations in which technology has a clear educational function. The teacher's role therefore becomes more demanding, not less important. Teachers are expected to create environments in which students work actively, collaborate, solve problems, and become more responsible for their own learning, while still receiving guidance and support.

Respondents repeatedly connected digitalisation with student-centred learning. Digital tools were described as useful when they help develop autonomy, collaboration, critical thinking, problem-solving, and lifelong learning. This was especially visible in project-based and challenge-based teaching, including online and hybrid modules. Teachers described using

digital environments to organise active learning, support group work, provide feedback, and help students monitor their progress. At the same time, they were careful not to present technology as a substitute for pedagogy. The quality of learning depended on how the teacher structured the experience, how communication was maintained, and how students were supported.

This approach also involved scepticism towards tool-centred definitions of innovation. Several respondents warned against assuming that the use of a screen, platform, or fashionable application automatically means that teaching becomes innovative. They argued that the pedagogical problem should come first, and the technological solution should follow. One respondent, with an engineering background, extended this argument towards technological literacy. In his view, students and teachers should understand not only how to operate digital tools, but also the mechanisms behind them. Digital competence therefore involves comprehension, judgement, and the ability to recognise the limits of technology.

The shared use of Moodle illustrates this distinction. Respondents referred to Moodle as a common technical base, but what mattered was the pedagogical structure built around it: materials, activities, feedback, communication, and student work. The platform was only one layer of a broader teaching design. The same reasoning appeared in respondents' criticism of the "digital native" assumption. Students may use digital media constantly in everyday life, but this does not mean that they can use them critically, academically, or professionally. For this reason, students' digital competence cannot be assumed. It has to be developed as part of higher education.

Teacher digital competence at Mondragon is also linked to recognised frameworks. Respondents referred to DigCompEdu (the European Framework for the Digital Competence of Educators) as an important reference for defining the competences teachers need in digitally supported learning environments. They also mentioned the Catalan COMDID framework, which they valued because it gives more explicit attention to ethical, legal, and security issues. This ethical dimension matters because it connects competence development with the University's values-based approach. Digitalisation is not presented as a neutral technical process. It raises questions of responsibility, data, legality, security, critical thinking, and the social effects of technology.

At the same time, respondents acknowledged that knowledge of these frameworks is unevenly distributed. They are familiar to staff whose work is closely connected with digitalisation, but they are less known across the wider institution. Part of the current work therefore consists in developing a shared language of competence and gradually spreading it among teachers. This suggests that Mondragon has a clear pedagogical and ethical

orientation towards digitalisation, but that this orientation still needs to be translated into more even institutional practice.

Support for digital transformation is organised in a distributed way. One important role is that of the technopedagogical advisor, who works close to teachers and helps them connect digital tools with pedagogical objectives. The advisor supports Moodle use, runs training sessions, helps teachers choose suitable tools, and follows changes in the technological environment. This role is not limited to technical instruction. It also involves reducing anxiety and building confidence, especially among teachers who fear making mistakes or feel uncertain about their digital skills.

Faculties also organise training plans, often based on needs identified through questionnaires at the beginning of the academic year. Peer learning is equally important. Staff with stronger digital expertise support colleagues through teaching teams, research groups, and informal exchange. This form of capability development fits the cooperative character of the institution. Digital transformation is not only built through formal programmes or top-down decisions; it also develops through everyday collaboration, shared problem-solving, and the circulation of experience among colleagues.

Mondragon offers face-to-face, hybrid, and fully online education. Respondents distinguished these formats carefully and emphasised that each requires a different pedagogical design. Fully online provision was illustrated by programmes such as a master's programme for cooking teachers at the Basque Culinary Center and by teaching international students across an academic year. In these settings, respondents placed particular emphasis on communication, social presence, and continuous evaluation.

Teachers stressed that online learning requires a personal connection. They used recorded video messages, individual meetings, regular feedback, and repeated signals of availability to keep students engaged. One respondent observed that students often choose online study because they need flexibility, but they still want a personal learning relationship. Online teaching therefore cannot be reduced to uploading materials. It requires deliberate work to sustain motivation, trust, and a sense of presence. Interviewees described hybrid learning as a particularly valuable form because it combines physical contact with the development of student autonomy. The decisive question was not whether learning is online, hybrid, or face-to-face, but how each format serves the educational purpose.

The cooperative identity of the University strongly shapes how digital transformation is governed. Respondents contrasted Mondragon's culture of teamwork and collective responsibility with more individualised and competitive models of academic work. This contrast appeared especially when they discussed publication pressure and competition at other institutions. They described Mondragon as a place where research, teaching, and

knowledge transfer are organised more collectively, and where professional development is closely connected with teamwork. Several respondents said they valued this cooperative environment because it allowed them to work with others rather than compete against them.

This cooperative logic affects digitalisation in practical ways. It supports peer assistance, co-creation, the sharing of materials, and the collective interpretation of new technological challenges. It also links the University's internal practice with the broader innovation model of the MONDRAGON Corporation. Respondents noted that digitalisation has grown as a field of work within the University, including the expansion of research groups and an increasing volume of knowledge-transfer activity. The University also supports schools in digitalising their curricula in a gradual and pedagogically grounded way. Digital transformation is therefore not limited to internal university processes. It becomes part of the University's contribution to the wider educational environment.

The same collaborative orientation can be seen in the way the institution reflects on its digital future. Respondents described a faculty-level exercise in which staff worked together to identify the topics the faculty would need to address in order to be a well-prepared digitalised institution by 2030. They also referred to work on defining what digitalisation means as a transversal element of the curriculum. This helped clarify how digitalisation should be understood across different degrees, rather than assuming that one model applies everywhere. Mondragon is therefore not only reacting to technological change. It is building a shared language and anticipating future needs through collective reflection.

AI was discussed in this same spirit. At the time of the interviews, the University did not yet have a formal institution-wide AI policy, but respondents described the issue as under active and collaborative development. Their stance was not prohibitionist. They treated generative AI as a reality that students and teachers need to understand critically. Rather than banning it, they emphasised the need to teach students how to use it responsibly, verify its outputs, and recognise its limitations. AI was described as useful but fallible, and therefore as something that requires judgement rather than blind trust.

The ethical dimension of digitalisation was especially visible in discussions of fear, agency, and technological sovereignty. Several respondents identified fear as one of the main obstacles to digital transformation. This fear concerned losing control, making mistakes, and facing technologies whose operation is not fully transparent. AI intensified these concerns because it often appears opaque to users. Respondents did not suggest avoiding such technologies. They argued instead for informed engagement. One respondent connected this to a broader idea of social and technological

agency. If people refuse to understand technology, they become dependent on decisions made by large global technology firms. If they develop critical digital competence, they are better able to shape their own technological future.

The case also reveals tensions. The most important concern is teacher preparation. Respondents agreed that digital transformation cannot advance without teachers who are adequately prepared for digitally mediated pedagogy. However, they also acknowledged that not all teachers receive systematic preparation. In some cases, the institution recruits staff who already have relevant profiles, while others develop their competence through personal initiative, peer support, or practical necessity. This produces uneven levels of confidence and capability.

Another tension concerns the difference between everyday digital use and educational digital competence. Respondents observed that trainee teachers and students may use digital media constantly in personal life but still struggle to integrate them into professional teaching practice. Students may also rely on a narrow range of tools or use them superficially. Respondents raised further concerns about workload, wellbeing, isolation, and the quality of social connection in digitally mediated study. These problems were not treated as solely technical matters. They were understood as pedagogical and organisational challenges that require continuing attention.

Mondragon's digital maturity is therefore not expressed in the absence of difficulties. It is visible in the way the institution is able to name these difficulties and treat them as shared matters for reflection and action. The University's approach is not based on a single strategic platform or a highly formalised digital operating model. It rests on pedagogical coherence, ethical awareness, distributed support, cooperative governance, and collective thinking about the future. Digitalisation becomes part of the ordinary work of the University because it is connected to its educational mission and cooperative identity.

This case offers a distinctive model of digital transformation. In some universities, digital change is organised mainly through strategic platforms, central coordination, or formal quality systems. At Mondragon, coherence comes from institutional values and a shared understanding of pedagogy. Technology is accepted, but it does not define the purpose of education. The fundamental questions remain pedagogical and ethical: what kind of learning is being supported, how teacher and student agency are developed, how cooperation is preserved, and how the institution can retain control over its technological future. The case suggests that mission-driven universities can build digital coherence by anchoring digitalisation in educational identity, collegial support, and collective responsibility.

16.5 Case 4: Tamkang University

Anchoring Digital Transformation in a Culture of Futures and an Institutional Generative AI Layer

This case presents Tamkang University (TKU), Taiwan's oldest private institution of higher education, as a university in which digital transformation is interpreted through a long-standing institutional culture of futures thinking. The case is analytically significant because Tamkang does not treat digitalisation as a reaction to a recent technological shock, but as a continuation of a foresight-oriented mission that predates the present wave of generative AI by several decades. The Tamkang case illustrates how an institution can absorb emerging technologies within an explicit orientation towards plural and preferred futures (Bromley et al., 2023; Peñaranda, 2025; Nestorenko, 2025).

This case examines how Tamkang frames digital transformation, how it organises the governance and capability structures that support it, and how it situates emerging technologies within its declared mission.

Tamkang's strategic identity is organised around what the University terms its triple objectives of education: globalisation, information-oriented education, and future-oriented education (Tamkang University, n.d.). These objectives were articulated by the University's founder, Clement C. P. Chang, who introduced futures studies into higher education and established information-oriented education (Tamkang University, n.d.; Leong, 2024). The University subsequently built one of the largest futures-education programmes in the world, with a required undergraduate futures course and a Graduate Institute of Futures Studies, thus becoming a regional reference point for the field in Asia (Leong, 2024). The analytically important point is that information-orientation and future-orientation are not recent additions but founding commitments; therefore, digital transformation at Tamkang University is framed as the contemporary expression of a durable institutional logic rather than as a departure from it.

This futures orientation gives this case study its distinctive character. Futures education at the University is explicitly concerned with distinguishing plural and alternative futures from singular and predictive ones, and with cultivating the capacity to pursue preferred futures rather than to forecast a single one (Leong, 2024). Read through this lens, the University's digital strategy resembles less a fixed implementation plan than a continuing exercise in institutional anticipation, consistent with scenario-planning scholarship that emphasises the parallel pursuit of multiple strategic options over reliance on single forecast commitments (Bromley et al., 2023; Peñaranda, 2025; Nestorenko, 2025). The founder's frequently cited conviction that the best future is a created future expresses, in institutional

terms, an active and constructivist stance towards technological change that aligns with literature on strategic leadership in colleges and universities (Morrill, 2010; Kushwaha, 2025).

The University's principal vehicle for digital transformation is its all-cloud smart campus programme, developed through successive phases in partnership with industry. Tamkang University established what it describes as Taiwan's first all-cloud smart campus in 2020 through a strategic alliance with Microsoft, extended it to a second phase in 2022 in collaboration with the telecommunications operator Far EasTone, and then launched a third phase called Y2025 All-cloud Smart Campus 3.0 in March 2025 (Tamkang University, 2024; Tamkang University, 2025). The programme is organised around the institutional vision expressed in the formulations AI + SDGs = ∞ and ESG + AI = ∞, which couple digital transformation with sustainability and net-zero objectives (Tamkang University, 2024). This coupling is analytically meaningful because it embeds the technological agenda within a broader mission frame rather than treating it as a standalone information-technology programme, consistent with findings that mature digital transformation is integrated into institutional strategy rather than pursued in parallel with it (Szalma, 2018).

The most distinctive element of Tamkang's recent digital strategy is its institutional generative AI service, branded the 5C Tamsui Tiger. Following the public release of large language models at the end of 2022, the University moved early to build a dedicated assistant on the foundation of its existing cloud infrastructure, presenting it as a security- and privacy-oriented service that is available to staff, faculty, and students (Tamkang University, 2024). Rather than training a foundation model from scratch, the University developed an institutionally hosted layer over generative AI capabilities, designed to lower the threshold for use by removing the need for elaborate prompt engineering and by integrating functions such as speech-to-text transcription, summarisation, meeting minutes, translation assistance, and proofreading into teaching, research, and administration (Tamkang University, 2024). The 5C designation links the service to five capabilities the University seeks to cultivate – communication, collaboration, complex problem-solving, critical thinking, and creativity – positioning the tool as an instrument of capability formation rather than of mere efficiency.

Two structural features of this configuration are analytically salient and connect the Tamkang case to others in this chapter. First, the decision to host the service on the University's own cloud environment, with explicit emphasis on security and privacy, reflects a data-sovereignty orientation comparable to the institutionally controlled generative AI services observed at the University of Helsinki, and consistent with scholarship on cybersecurity and organisational culture during university digital transformation (Pavlova, 2020; De Ramos & Esponilla, 2022). Second, the framing of the assistant

around transferable twenty-first-century competences positions digital and AI literacy as a strategic, institution-wide capability relevant to both study and graduate employability rather than as a narrow technical skill (Murray et al., 2022). The University further articulates this stance through the language of human–machine collaboration, distinguishing human intelligence from artificial intelligence and presenting their combination as an educational culture to be cultivated (Tamkang University, 2024).

Alongside the AI assistant, Tamkang has built institutional structures intended to develop AI capability across the organisation. The University established a college dedicated to AI and, within it, what it describes as the first AI department of its kind among non-specialised universities in Taiwan, with curricula spanning data engineering, machine learning, natural language processing, and image recognition (Tamkang University, 2024). Capability development extends beyond specialist degrees through a Microsoft Center for Digital Empowerment, which trains staff and students as citizen developers in cloud and productivity platforms under the principles of full participation, wholehearted design, and full-effort service, and the Cloud Student Ambassadors programme, which develops student digital expertise across departments and year groups while also supporting the Center's training and consultation activities (Tamkang University, 2024). This distributed and participatory model of capability formation is consistent with governance scholarship emphasising cross-functional steering and stakeholder engagement in institutional transformation (Liboon et al., 2025).

The governance of Tamkang's digital transformation is characterised by close integration with external partners and by the embedding of digital initiatives within the University's overarching development vision. The successive phases of the smart-campus programme were realised through formal strategic alliances with major technology and telecommunications firms, and the University presents these partnerships as instruments for simultaneously advancing teaching, research, administration, and sustainability (Tamkang University, 2024; Tamkang University, 2025). This configuration illustrates a proactive rather than prohibitionist institutional stance towards emerging technologies, in which the University positions itself as an early adopter while also sharing good practice with peer institutions (Kushwaha, 2025; Du et al., 2025). At the same time, the reliance on commercial platforms introduces a tension between the University's data-sovereignty rhetoric and its dependence on external providers, a tension that the available material does not fully resolve.

The case brings several additional tensions into view beyond the already noted dependence on external commercial platforms. The institutionalisation of foresight has historically had to contend with hierarchical academic traditions, and observers of futures education at Tamkang have noted

the challenge of sustaining institutional support for the field beyond the commitment of its founding champions (Leong, 2024). The promotional character of much institutional communication makes it difficult to assess how evenly the digital initiatives are adopted across faculties, how deeply the generative AI assistant is integrated into everyday teaching and learning, and how far the stated emphasis on critical, human-centred engagement is realised in practice. As in the other case studies, questions of workload, equity of access, and the substantive rather than symbolic use of digital tools remain pertinent, and the framing of digital literacy as a critical competence implies a continuing obligation to examine the effects of these technologies rather than assume their benefits (Murray et al., 2022; Valdés et al., 2021).

Tamkang University's digital maturity is therefore expressed less in any single platform or operating model than in the alignment of digital transformation with a durable, foresight-oriented institutional identity. The University's pursuit of becoming a digital university is articulated as the contemporary realisation of founding commitments to information-orientation and future-orientation, organised through an industry-partnered cloud programme, an institutionally controlled generative AI service, and distributed structures of capability formation, bound together by a vision that couples AI with sustainability. Read alongside the Finnish and Spanish case studies, Tamkang illustrates a further configuration of digital-era transformation: one in which coherence derives neither from a central strategic platform alone, nor from a pedagogical or cooperative frame, but from an institutionalised culture of anticipation that treats the digital future as something to be deliberately created rather than passively received (Bromley et al., 2023; Peñaranda, 2025; Nestorenko, 2025; Morrill, 2010). This case study suggests that, for futures-oriented universities, the strategic value of foresight lies in its capacity to integrate successive technological waves within a stable sense of mission while preserving the institution's agency over its own technological trajectory.

References

Adachi, C. (2024). "Discovery towards strategy" – Co-creating an institutional innovation strategy for digital and medical education. *International Medical Education*, *3*(4), 374–387. https://doi.org/10.3390/ime3040028

Bravo-Jaico, J., Maquen-Niño, G. L. E., Germán, N., Valdivia, C., Alarcón, R., Aquino, J., & Serquén, O. (2025). Assessing digital transformation maturity in higher education institutions: A correlational analysis by actors and dimensions. *Frontiers in Computer Science, 7*, 1549262. https://doi.org/10.3389/fcomp.2025.1549262

Bromley, P., Furuta, J., Kijima, R., Overbey, L., Choi, M., & Santos, H. (2023). Global determinants of education reform, 1960 to 2017. *Sociology of Education*, *96*(2), 149–167. www.jstor.org/stable/48746135

De Ramos, N., & Esponilla, F. (2022). Cybersecurity program for Philippine higher education institutions: A multiple-case study. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, *11*(3), 1198–1206. https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v11i3.22863

Du, B., Zhang, Y., Wu, Z., Li, R., Gan, X., & Cao, L. (2025). Leadership strategies for digital transformation in higher education: A qualitative study of Heilongjiang universities. *Malaysian Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, *10*(8), e003557. https://doi.org/10.47405/mjssh.v10i8.3557

Fernández, A., Gómez, B., Binjaku, K., & Kajo Meçe, E. (2023). Digital transformation initiatives in higher education institutions: A multivocal literature review. *Education and Information Technologies*, *28*(10), 12351–12382. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-022-11544-0

Hubbart, J. A. (2025). Lean and agile strategic planning: Reframing organizational strategy for competitive advantage. (2025). *International Journal of Innovation Management and Technology*, *16*(4), 65–71. https://doi.org/10.18178/ijimt.2025.16.4.979

Kushwaha, H. (2025). Adaptive strategy in the age of disruption: Rethinking strategic management for 2025 and beyond. *Tuijin Jishu/Journal of Propulsion Technology*, *46*(4), 41–52. https://doi.org/10.52783/tjjpt.v46.i04.9942 https://propulsiontechjournal.com/index.php/journal/article/view/9942

Laurea University of Applied Sciences. (n.d.-a). *Laurea as an organisation*. https://www.laurea.fi/en/about-us/laurea-as-an-organisation

Leong, L. (2024). A created future: Futures and foresight at Tamkang University in a postpandemic era. *Journal of Futures Studies*, *29*(1), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.6531/JFS.202409_29(1).0001

Libo-on, R., Mingmin, Z., & Maoyun, X. (2025). A strategic action plan for building modern industry colleges at Jiangxi University of Technology in China: Insights from stakeholder assessments. *Journal of Innovation and Partnerships*, *3*(9), 52–58. https://doi.org/10.69569/jip.2025.541

Morrill, R. (2010). *Strategic leadership: Integrating strategy and leadership in colleges and universities*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Murray, M., Pérez, J., & Fluker, J. (2022). Digital literacy in the core: The emerging higher education landscape. *Issues in Informing Science and Information Technology*, *19*, 1–13. https://doi.org/10.28945/4957

Nestorenko, T. (2025). A scenario approach to ensuring sustainable development of displaced universities during war. *Ukrainian Journal of Applied Economics*, *2025*(1), 232–236. https://doi.org/10.36887/2415-8453-2025-1-38

Pavlova, E. (2020). Enhancing the organisational culture related to cybersecurity during university digital transformation. *Information & Security: An International Journal*, *46*(3), 239–249. https://doi.org/10.11610/isij.4617

Peñaranda, J. (2025). The "weaving of worthiness" continues? Alternative futures for a Philippine state university to 2051. *Open Access Research Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, *9*(2), 46–51. https://doi.org/10.53022/oarjms.2025.9.2.0031

Redecker, C. (2017). *European framework for the digital competence of educators: DigCompEdu* (Y. Punie, Ed.; EUR 28775 EN). Publications Office of the European Union. https://doi.org/10.2760/159770

Szalma, E. (2018). Transforming universities for the digital age: Policies, business models, resources. *Opus et Educatio*, *5*(4), 397–404. https://doi.org/10.3311/ope.281

Tamkang University. (n.d.). *Triple objectives of education*. https://about.tku.edu.tw/en/objects.html

Tamkang University. (2025). *Tamkang University launches Smart Cloud Campus 3.0, pioneering a new blueprint of AI+SDGs=∞*. *Tamkang Times*. https://tkutimes.tku.edu.tw/edtl.aspx?no=58989

Tamkang University. (2024). *2024–2025 Tamkang University catalog*. https://english.tku.edu.tw/doc/2024-2025TKUcatalog.pdf

University of Helsinki IT Helpdesk. (2025). *Generative AI at the University*. https://helpdesk.it.helsinki.fi/en/instructions/information-security-and-cloud-services/cloud-services/generative-ai-university

University of Helsinki. (2020). *Strategy – Helsinki Centre for Digital Humanities (HELDIG)*. www.helsinki.fi/en/helsinki-centre-for-digital-humanities/strategy

University of Helsinki. (2024). *Guidelines for the use of AI in teaching at the University of Helsinki*. Confirmed by the Academic Affairs Council on 30 May 2024. https://teaching.helsinki.fi/instructions/article/artificial-intelligence-teaching

University of Helsinki. (2024b). *University of Helsinki guidelines support researchers in the responsible use of AI*. University of Helsinki.www.helsinki.fi/en/news/university/university-helsinki-guidelines-support-researchers-responsible-use-ai

University of Turku. (n.d.). *Digitalisation Programme*.www.utu.fi/en/university/programmes-and-policies/digitalisation-programme

Valdés, K. N., y Alpera, S. Q., & Cerdá Suárez, L. M. (2021). An institutional perspective for evaluating digital transformation in higher education: Insights from the Chilean case. *Sustainability*, *13*(17), 9850. https://doi.org/10.3390/su13179850

Zou, M., Xu, M., & Libo-on, R. (2025). Stakeholders' assessment of status, challenges, and pathways of modern industry colleges at universities in China: Inputs to development strategies. *Pacific Economic and Management Journal*, *39*(4), 544–550. https://doi.org/10.70838/pemj.390409

Index

Abulibdeh, A. 127
academic capitalism, as a framework for university financial and organisational behaviour 25–26, 230, 248, 262, 264
academic freedom 51, 179, 183, 185; Academic Freedom Index 2025 and institutional autonomy as a core dimension 268–269; in the digital age 163
academic integrity: AI-generated content and 48–50; assessment redesign for 49–50; generative AI and the erosion of traditional assessment authenticity 260–261; remote proctoring and 49
academic leadership: building digital organisational culture through 100–102; ecosystem leadership and network coordination in 96–98; ethical dilemmas of 102–104; evolving landscape of, in digital university 90–92; labour relations and institutional negotiation in 98–100; organisational change and 92–94; transformative leadership theory and digital vision in 94–96
Actor-Network Theory 19
Adachi, C. 132
adaptive learning systems 40
advanced persistent threats (APTs) 79
Aghion, P. 182, 188
Alenezi, M. 130
Anbarasan, P. 241, 242
appreciative inquiry 159
Aquino, J. 148, 154, 160, 164
Becher, T. 154
Beck, U. 151
Beckman, K. 260
Beeson, J. 254
Bergmark, U. 181
Bergsteedt, B. 245
Bernstein, B. 151, 162
Boden, R. 183
Bourdieu, P. 151, 162
Bring Your Own Device (BYOD) 79–80
burnout, academic staff, workload and insufficient institutional support as risk factors 205, 266
Bygstad, B. 187

Cadena-Povea, H. 266
Calderwood, S. 179
CARE Principles for Indigenous Data Governance 27–28
Castells, M. 151, 162
Cekuls, A. 245
Chairuddin, A. 246
Cheong, P. H. 182, 184
Chief Information Security Officer (CISO) 80
Clark, B. R. 155, 241–242, 247, 254, 265
Cluley, R. 209
Coates, H. 260
communities of practice, mentoring and peer learning in digital skills development 154, 160–161, 205–206
context collapse 60
COVID-19 pandemic: as catalyst for digital third-mission outreach 58;

in digital transformation of higher education 2, 37–39
Cox, M. D. 154
Current Research Information Systems 21
cybersecurity: board-level financial cybersecurity and ransomware risk 233–234; financial operations and, in university 10; governance of, in universities 79–81

data colonialism 26–27
Data Management Plans 22
Data Protection Impact Assessments (DPIAs) 82
Data Protection Officer (DPO) 82
data sovereignty 83–84; digital sovereignty and national infrastructure strategies 174, 178, 185; platform dependency and vendor-controlled data governance 267–268
datafication, of academic data ("assetisation") 176
de Wit, H. 244
decentralised autonomous organisations (DAOs) 29
Decentralised Science (DeSci) 29–30
differential privacy 28
DigCompEdu (European Framework for the Digital Competence of Educators) 200, 298, 301, 309
digital credentials: micro-credentials and blockchain-based verification 281–282; micro-credentials as 44–45; risk of educational stratification through 46; stackable learning pathways and 45–46
digital divide 26–27; "GenAI divide" in student AI literacy and use 260, 262–264; in cultural readiness for digital transformation 158; in online and blended learning access 46–48; in third-mission public engagement 64–66
digital literacy 47, 65, 138
digital marketing and communication, institutional: AI and personalised stakeholder engagement 214–216; marketing-IT convergence, leadership, and governance 216–220; platforms, content strategy, and channel governance 211–214; stakeholder theory and internal/external communication flows 209–211
digital maturity, institutional 128–129, 136
digital research ecosystems (DREs): application and analysis layer of 21; artificial intelligence and automated curation in 23–25; balance of openness and protection in 30–31; data and repository layer of 21; definition and evolution of 17–19; four-layer architecture of 20–22; future of, and Decentralised Science 29–30; geopolitical inequality and data colonialism in 26–27; governance, legal, and privacy contradictions in 27–29; infrastructure layer of 20–21; philosophical and theoretical foundations of 19–22; power, academic capitalism, and publisher monopolies in 25–26; research data lifecycle within 22–23; socio-institutional layer of 21–22
digital-era academic strategy: foresight and scenario-based planning in 134–135; human dimension of, culture and faculty capacity 137–138; as institutional recomposition 130–133; integration with digital governance 136–137; rationale for reconfiguring traditional planning 127–130; roadmap for operationalising 139–141; stakeholder participation and legitimacy in 138–139; three strategic pillars of 135–136
Docka-Filipek, D. 265
doxxing 62–63

e-Science and grid computing 17–18
Edmondson, A. C. 153
electronic human resource management (e-HRM) 109
Emergency Remote Teaching (ERT) 37–39
Enlightenment epistemic monoculture, critique of, and alternative knowledge traditions (sumak kawsay,

Ubuntu, Tao of Great Learning, Ecoversities Alliance) 186–187
enterprise resource planning (ERP) systems 91, 110–112, 228–229
entrepreneurial university, concept of 155, 164; Clark's five organisational pathways revisited for the digital era 241–242, 247, 254, 265; Clark's triangle of coordination revisited in digital governance 174–175, 189
Espeland, W. N. 232
European Open Science Cloud 20–21
Extended Reality (XR), immersive learning: accessibility challenges of 44; cost and access constraints of 44; in engineering, architecture, and natural sciences 42–43; in humanities and social sciences 43; in medical, nursing, and health sciences education 42; virtual and augmented reality in higher education 278–279

faculty and staff unions 7, 98–100
faculty learning communities 154
FAIR (Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, Reusable) principles 17, 22–23
financial management, digital transformation of: analytics infrastructure (ERP, business intelligence, dashboards) 228–230; new financial risks and governance response 232–234; reshaping the economic model (revenue, cost, investment, risk) 230–232; strategic governance vs. back-office function 226–228
Fitzgerald, A. 245, 249
Floridi, L. 249
Foss, N. J. 253
Foucault, M. 232
fourth paradigm of scientific discovery 17
Freeman, R. E. 209

General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) 27, 215, 222; cross-jurisdictional conflicts and 83–84; Data Protection Officer and impact assessments under 82; data subject rights under 81–82
global university rankings 76
Gourlay, L. 181
Guarino, C. M. 265

Hanley, M. 159, 164, 165
Hardy, I. 173, 177, 178
Helsinki, University of 141; Helsinki Centre for Digital Humanities (HELDIG) as a mission-driven collaboration platform 291–293; institutional AI Roadmap, guidelines, and CurreChat generative AI service 292–293
human capital, digital transformation of: changing academic roles and skill requirements 200–202; human resource strategy (recruitment, training, leadership development) 201–203; people-centric approach and AI in HR processes 205–207; performance management and career pathways 202–204; as a strategic management challenge distinct from technology procurement 199–200; well-being, technostress, and burnout 204–206

infrastructure studies 19–20
innovation committees 93, 97, 282
innovation hubs and startup incubators, as extended developmental peripheries (Clark) in the digital era 6, 60–61, 247
Intellectual Property Non-Fungible Tokens (IP-NFTs) 29
internet censorship, national firewalls and 83–84
InterPlanetary File System 29

Jarernsiripornkul, S. 182
Jongbloed, B. 210

Kassen, M. 246, 249
Kayyali, M. 244
Kinzelbach, K. 183
knowledge commons 20
Komljenovic, J. 176

Laufer, M. 247
Laurea University of Applied Sciences: digital transformation through the

Learning by Developing (LbD) pedagogical model 294–299; teacher support structures (dCELL unit, digi-lecturers) and quality management 296–299
learning analytics: algorithmic bias in 41–42; MOOC course analytics and dropout prediction 213, 215; privacy and surveillance concerns in 41–42; promise of 39–40; reductionism and measurable-proxy risk in 40–41
learning management systems 33, 36, 40
Lee, D. 261
León, P. M. S. 263
Li, W. 247
loosely coupled systems, universities as 95, 118
Lovakov, A. 183
Luthra, A. 148, 152, 153, 157, 161, 165

Mabotha, P. A. 127, 130
Marginson, S. 242
Marín, Y. R. 259, 261
Mariyono, D. 244
Marjanovic, O. 242
Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs) 6, 36
Mauti, J. M. 249, 253
McConvey, K. 178
McCowan, T. 186, 187
McNaughtan, J. 180
Mihus, I. 249
Minor, J. T. 180, 185
misinformation 66–68
Mitchell, R. K. 210
Mondragon University (Mondragon Unibertsitatea): generative AI approached through informed engagement rather than prohibition 303–304; teacher digital competence, DigCompEdu, and the COMDID framework 301–302; technopedagogical framework and cooperative institutional values 299–304
Morley, C. 243, 246
Morrish, L. 179
Mountz, A. 163
Muradian, R. 244

National Student Survey (UK) 182
Ndidi, O. M. 242
new academic wave: central organising concept introduced and developed throughout the volume 1, 4–5, 8–9, 12, 81, 127, 173–174, 178, 187–189; contradictions and structural tensions (ethical dilemmas, inequality, resistance, institutional autonomy) 258–272; emerging horizons (AI, immersive learning, networked university, micro-credentials) 275–285; framing as a paradigm shift via five core characteristics (agility, global interconnectedness, data-driven culture, hybrid roles, ethical mandate) 241–255
Nichols, T. P. 268
Ntshoe, I. 185

online and blended learning 35–37, 52–53
online harassment, of academic researchers 62–64
open educational resources (OER) 101, 245–246, 249
Open Science movement 17, 25–26, 28
organisational culture, academic and digital: as cultural rather than technical challenge 150–152; digital-ready academic culture, characteristics of 152–155; integrated model of innovative-and-inclusive culture for 163–165; mitigation strategies, ownership and support networks 159–162; obstacles and tensions in digitally driven change 155–159; preserving core academic values while enabling adaptability 162–163; shift from digital strategy to digital culture 148–150
O'Neill, O. 179, 186

Padua, C. 148, 151, 154, 158, 161, 162, 163
performative participation 78–79
Popescu, M. 177, 183
Power, M. 232
predictive analytics 228–230; in administrative and student-support

decision-making 108, 112–114; customer relationship management (CRM) systems in student recruitment 214–215; in institutional governance and retention 75–77
Prinsloo, P. 175, 178
psychological safety 101, 153
publisher monopolies 25–26, 29
Pybus, J. 173

ransomware 79–80
Reichman, H. 183
reproducibility crisis 29
research data lifecycle 22–23
right to disconnect 103
Rivera-Gutiérrez, E. 130
robotic process automation (RPA) 109
Ross, J. 179

Sangwa, S. 243, 252, 253
Saura, G. 173, 175
self-driving laboratories 30
Selwyn, N. 152
Seyama-Mokhaneli, S. 180, 186
Singun, A. 130, 262
slow scholarship movement 163
smart city initiatives 61
social media: in academic public scholarship 58–60; harassment and abuse via 62–63; institutional marketing and communication portfolio 211–213; misinformation and disinformation spread via 66–68
Spalding, H. H. 210
Sposato, M. 245, 246, 249, 276
student participation, in university governance, typology of (formal, substantive, performative) 180–182
surveillance, institutional and algorithmic: in administrative data systems 113–114, 119–120; algorithmic opacity and indirect accountability of vendors and platforms 176–178, 186; audit society, disciplinary power, and rankings-driven reactivity 232; in digital leadership and data governance 102; in learning analytics 41–42; in university governance dashboards 74
Sustainable Development Goal 4 (SDG 4) 148, 158, 162, 186, 248, 279–280
Szadkowski, K. 174, 182

Tamkang University: all-cloud smart campus programme and the 5C Tamsui Tiger generative AI assistant 306–308; triple objectives of education (globalisation, information-orientation, future-orientation) and futures studies 305–306
Tang, J. 243, 266
technological subsidiarity, principle of 52
technology transfer offices (TTOs), Graphene4Life case study of technology-transfer success factors 57, 61, 247–248
technostress, as a standing condition of academic work vs. techno-eustress 157, 204–207
Teymourifar, A. 186
Thelwall, M. 186
third mission: digital equity and structural exclusion in 64–66; digital public scholarship and 58–60; evolution of, from regional outreach to digital ecosystems 56–58; innovation ecosystems and the "third space" 60–62; misinformation and the networked public sphere 66–68; online harassment and institutional support frameworks 62–64
third-space professionals, role in configuring and supervising algorithmic systems 61, 178
TPACK (Technological, Pedagogical, and Content Knowledge) 297, 300–301
Triple Helix model (university-industry-government relations) 57
Turku, University of, Digitalisation Programme as institution-wide implementation of Strategy 2030 141, 293–294

Universal Design for Learning 44, 47–48
university administration, digital transformation of: automation

and modernisation in 107–110; data-driven decision-making in professional services 113–114; enterprise systems and digital infrastructure in 110–113; ethical, social, and governance implications of 119–122; libraries and digital knowledge environment in 116–118; organisational culture and resistance to change in 118–120; student services and 114–116
university governance: adaptive, value-grounded paradigm for 86–87; constitutional design framework (joint governance bodies, statutory anchoring) for digital oversight 185; cross-jurisdictional and global challenges in 83–85; cybersecurity and digital risk in 79–81; data-informed, and institutional analytics in 75–77; digital infrastructures as political and governance instruments, not neutral technical layers 173–178; distributed, and digital participation in 77–79; polite, ritualised consultation masking asymmetries of authority 180, 185; regulatory compliance and data protection in 81–83; sociotechnical reconfiguration of 73–75; technocratic efficiency versus collegial values in 85–86
Ustyuzhantseva, O. 174, 178, 185

Varsik, S. 263
Vehviläinen, S. 184
Velázquez Avila, R. M. 277
Velkoska, C. 242, 248
vendor lock-in 112, 121; educational "rentiership" and subscription software dependence 231; platform power, financial and epistemic dependency 267–268

Wan, Z. 276
Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 47, 65
Weinberg, L. 176, 179, 180, 186
Wenger, E. 154
Williamson, B. 152, 230, 232
workload, academic, digital tasks added without workload model adjustment 202–206
Wu, Z. 245

Zhuang, T. 180