Supplementary File 2

Table 1. National and institutional governance structures and arrangements in the selected countries.

Country	National and Institutional governance structures and arrangements
Portugal	Higher education in Portugal is organised as a binary structure comprising universities and polytechnics. Since the implementation of Law 62/2007—framed by NPM—the governance model blends considerable institutional autonomy with centralised state oversight. Within institutions, the chief executive – the Rector in universities and the President in polytechnics – is supported by a General Council that serves as the principal decision-making body by approving major institutional changes, electing the Rector, and guiding strategic directions. A Management Board handles administrative, financial and human resources matters, while an advisory Senate, when present, offers counsel on academic and pedagogical issues. Foundation institutions further augment oversight through a Board of Trustees, composed primarily of external stakeholders. Additionally, faculty-level bodies, such as deans and scientific or pedagogical councils, provide further internal management. Faculty influence on institutional decision-making in Portugal has declined due to the rise of managerialism and external regulatory pressures. Higher-ranking faculty and older academics tend to resist these changes, advocating for collegial governance, while younger faculty and administrators often see the shift as a necessary adaptation to a competitive global academic environment (Magalhães & Amaral, 2007; Cardoso, Carvalho & Videira, 2019; Carvalho & Videira, 2019).
Croatia	Croatian higher education, governed by the Higher Education Act, emphasises academic autonomy, transparency, and participatory decision-making. The highest authority is the General Assembly, comprising representatives of academic staff, administrative personneland students. A University Council functions as a supervisory and executive body, while an Academic Senate concentrates on academic and research affairs. The Rector, elected by the Assembly or Council, acts as the chief executive, ensuring that both strategic and day-to-day operations align with the legal framework. Historically, state-controlled governance models limited faculty power, but recent reforms aim to increase decentralisation and university autonomy. However, faculty members remain sceptical about whether these changes genuinely enhance academic self-governance or merely shift power to university executives and external agencies (Kovač, Ledić, & Rafajac, 2003; Brankovic, 2010; Obadić, & Aristovnik, 2011).

Germany	In Germany, a long tradition of internal self-administration coexists with significant state (*Länder*) oversight. Governance typically involves a University Council (*Hochschulrat* or *Aufsichtsrat*) that provides overall strategic guidance and includes both internal senior academics and external representatives from industry and local government. The Senate (*Senat*) is the principal academic decision-making body, responsible for curriculum design, research policy, and quality assurance. The Rector or President, elected by one or both of these bodies, manages daily operations and is supported by vice-rectors or management boards. Faculty-level governance is further decentralised through independent Faculty Councils that oversee local academic and administrative matters. Overall, while faculty members still have influence in university decision-making, there is a clear hierarchy where senior faculty hold most of the power. The shift towards managerial governance has further reduced the role of faculty as decision-makers, consolidating authority within administrative structures. Junior faculty remain largely dependent on senior faculty and institutional policies, with limited ability to influence broader governance decisions (De Boer, Enders, & Schimank, 2008; Jungblut, & Rexe, 2017; Hüther, & Krücken, 2018; Döhler, Hönnige, Kosmützky, Ruffing, & Staff, 2023).
Lithuania	Lithuania's governance framework, defined by the Law on Higher Education and Research, seeks to balance strong institutional autonomy with state oversight. The University Council (*Valdyba*) sets the institution's vision, approves major decisions and handles key appointments, while the Academic Senate (*Senatas*) focuses on academic matters such as programme approvals and quality assurance. The Rector (*Rektorius*) is responsible for day-to-day management and external representation. Many institutions also maintain faculty and departmental bodies to further decentralise decision-making. In Lithuania, academic influence on institutional decision-making has significantly decreased, particularly for junior staff. Senior faculty retain some power but operate within a system where managerial control is dominant. The shift towards market-driven governance and performance-based management has reduced academic autonomy, leading to increased hierarchical decision-making and less collegial participation (Leisyte & Kizniene, 2006; Leišytė, 2019; Želvys, Leišytė, Pekşen, Bružienė, & Rose, 2021; Leišytė, Pekşen, Rose, & Želvys, 2022).
Türkiye	The higher education system in Türkiye is highly centralised. The Council of Higher Education (YÖK), established by Law No. 2547 (1981), plays a dominant role by setting criteria for academic programs and quality assurance, approving institutional statutes and budgets, and directly appointing Rectors from a shortlist. Although internal governance structures—such as the Academic Senate (*Akademik Senato*) and the University Council or Board (*Üniversite Kurulu*)—exist to manage academic and strategic matters, their influence is limited by YÖK's centralised authority. External quality assurance processes are similarly driven by YÖK's guidelines. Over the past decade, academic influence on institutional decision-making has significantly declined, especially for junior academics. The shift towards political control and managerial governance has reduced academic autonomy, with decision-making power increasingly concentrated in appointed administrators and political authorities. While senior faculty still hold some influence, political affiliations play a growing role in career progression. Junior faculty members have little say in governance and face challenges due to job insecurity and administrative pressures (Balyer, 2011; Erguvan, 2013; Bozkurt, & Balci, 2020).

Israel	In Israel, HEIs operate under a framework established by the Council for HE, which is responsible for planning, accrediting, and supervising the sector. HEIs enjoy substantial academic autonomy in managing curricula, research, and internal affairs. The highest governing authority is typically a Board of Trustees that provides strategic oversight and financial management, as well as playing a key role in the appointment of the chief executive. The President or Rector serves as the chief executive officer responsible for both strategic leadership and daily management, while an Academic Senate—comprising senior faculty and student representatives—oversees academic policies, approves new programs, and ensures quality assurance. Faculty and departmental committees further decentralise decision-making, and periodic evaluations by the Council for Higher Education ensure that national and international standards are met. Academic influence on institutional decision-making in Israel is highly centralised, with increasing bureaucratic and political constraints limiting academic autonomy. Senior academics retain some influence, but administrative and government bodies dominate university governance. Junior faculty members, particularly those in marginalised groups, have limited input in decision-making and face structural barriers to advancement. The shift toward participative decision-making in certain sectors, such as Arab higher education, indicates growing faculty demands for inclusion, though implementation remains uneven and constrained by hierarchical traditions (Hendin, 2023).
Cyprus	In Cyprus, the HE system aims to balance institutional autonomy with adherence to national policy. In the Republic of Cyprus, universities are regulated by national HE legislation and are subject to independent external quality assurance. Each institution is generally led by a Rector, who is the chief executive responsible for strategic direction and day-to-day management, and governed by a University Council that approves major decisions and elects the Rector. An Academic Senate, where present, provides advisory input on academic matters. In Cyprus, faculty influence on institutional decision-making is limited, with administrators and government bodies holding most of the power. Senior faculty have some influence, but junior academics are largely excluded from decision-making. The governance system is hierarchical and market-driven, leading to frustration and disengagement among faculty members. There is a strong perception that academic voices are not sufficiently valued, particularly in private universities where managerial priorities dominate (Komodromos, 2014; Menon, 2022; Komodromos, 2014).