

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE EDUCATIONAL MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES BETWEEN PUBLIC AND PRIVATE UNIVERSITY IN MEXICO

Larios-GÓMEZ, EMIGDIO. Faculty of Business Administration,
Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla, Puebla, México
herr.larios@gmail.com

Abstract: *The objective was to identify best practices in education management strategies undertaken from their model Educational Management by public and private universities in México. An evaluative research-comparison and a Generic Benchmarking were performed, based on the Model V-Assessment Planning. A "commercial" trend was observed in the public and private universities to invest in infra-structure, offering tangible benefits to customers (students and parents), with modern facilities. It is essential for both quality and structures consolidated for compliance with its basic functions and encourage the creation of new knowledge. Although, private universities must learn from the public universities, for example in areas of research, development and promotion of science. In addition to a comprehensive educational model (research, teaching, extension, Academic Programs, internationalization, Teaching-Learning Process, Social Impact, Bonding, Philosophy and Institutional Financing). And in the superstructure Public Private must learn, as it has a sound and reliable organizational vision for their operation because it works from a commercial approach to achieving institutional and economic objectives.*

Keywords: *Educational strategy, educational management strategies, public university, private university.*

Introduction

The opening of Mexico to the international market, with the elimination of the import substitution model towards the end of the 1970s and the beginning of the eighties, forced, with priority, to develop in the environment of Mexican organizations a culture of competitiveness that to increase the productivity of goods and services generated by the country, and above all

the profitability of companies regardless of the sector to which they belong, social, private or public and even educational. With this, the companies of the country had to face international markets - and not only the national ones - beginning to compete with large foreign companies, international and multinational. Moreover, they had to face the beginnings of the globalization process, the international reconfiguration and the new scenario of the world economy, react and leave their organizational structures of the past, obsolete and past, developing actions (strategies) to respond to the competitiveness needs demanded by market circumstances.

It was then that Mexican companies gave importance to the theories of administration that emerged from the late nineteenth century - which were the result of the experiences and situations experienced during the Industrial Revolution - theories that were the axes of action of companies, from organization to business monitoring. From the classical and scientific theory of administration (with Frederick Taylor, Henry Ford and Fayol) to other theoretical schools of administration [1]. Today, in this social and commercial evolution - from the school of human relations, market behavior and the working climate with Weber, Kant, Elton Mayo and Abraham Maslow - to the beginnings of recent theories of strategic planning And the competitive vision with Peter Drucker, Senge, Mintzberg, Steiner and Michael Porter - with objectives based on results, new ways of working, processes and how to do things, being the center of all this theory Management.

Management is the simplified description of a reality that seeks to understand, analyze and modify if necessary [2]. It is the way in which the effective, social and academic interactions of the individuals that are actors of the complex educational processes and that constitute the institution to achieve the informative purpose of the individuals and of the groups are organized, these descriptions are executed By means of intelligent actions of decision, that are the strategies.

The management of a company is all the processes put in place, guided by the decision-making processes that determine the activity of the company [3]. Similarly, Drucker addresses the concept of management as a management function "the manager has to manage, he has to organize and improve what already exists and is already known, just like he should be an entrepreneur." Other authors [4] argue that "management encompasses a series of elements of different nature: an organizational structure, a series of management practices, a representation system and a personality model." Management is characterized by a broad vision of the real possibilities of an organization to solve a certain situation or reach a certain purpose. Finally, Mintzberg and

Stoner assume the term management as the "disposition and organization of the resources of an individual or group to obtain the expected results".

Educational management is a relatively new discipline, which unites concepts of administration (as in any organization, planning, organizing, directing, evaluating and controlling) with education concepts [5]. The International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP) of UNESCO, in the year 2000, points to educational management as a set of integrated theoretical and practical processes, both horizontally and vertically, in the educational system to meet and fulfill social demands to education. It is possible to define educational management, as the actions deployed by managers who manage large organizational spaces of a whole that integrates knowledge and action, ethics and effectiveness, policy and management of processes that tend to the continuous improvement of educational practices. Educational management has been divided into three aspects [6] according to the scope of its work in institutional management (related to structure), school management (community-related) and pedagogical management Classroom).

Table 1: Fields of educational management

Institutional management	School management	Pedagogical management
The institutional management comprises actions of administrative, managerial, personnel policy, economic-budget, planning, programming, regulation and guidance. It is a process that helps a good conduct of the projects and the set of actions related to each other, which enables the achievement of pedagogical intentionality in, with and for educational action in order to achieve the objectives	School management is broader and deeper management with the theoretical and methodological sufficiency to turn the school. Into an organization focused on pedagogy, open to learning and innovation. It consists of the actions carried out by the institution to direct and plan the school development and the set of tasks carried out by the actors of the educational community (principals, teachers, support staff, parents and students), linked to	Pedagogical management specifies educational management as a whole, relating teaching processes, curriculum, didactic planning, assessment and how to relate to students and parents to ensure learning. It is the coordinated action of actions and resources to enhance the pedagogical and didactic process that teachers perform in collective, to direct their practice to the fulfillment of educational purposes

set, the evaluation of the system and Compliance with the institutional mission. It is a tool to grow in efficiency, effectiveness, relevance and relevance, with sufficient flexibility, maturity and openness to new forms of work.

the fundamental task that Has been assigned to the school.

becoming management for learning.

a for

Source: own production with data from [6], [7], [8] and [5].

The changes that have occurred in recent years in the world economy, social and political relations, the organization of government and the management of university institutions, it have been influenced [9] by the new normative theories of the State that are Manifest in the notions of "New public management" and "Self-regulation" [10]. Similarly, other author, [11] have identified different ways of managing universities, which, respecting the particular characteristics of each university institution, approach business management techniques. These models have in common the attempt to find a balance between centralization and decentralization, between external (market) and internal (academic) influences, between stability and institutional flexibility, all with the aim of maximizing the capacity of Institutional development in a state or market control system, as shown in the following Table 2.

Table 2: Models of educational management

Model	Description
Adaptive University	The Adaptive University has to do with organizational adaptation that refers to changes and alterations in the components of the organization with the aim of adapting to external changes. It identifies five factors that facilitate the adaptive capacity of Universities: 1. An externally focused mission, 2. A differentiated organizational structure because not all universities are the same, 3. Collegial management, 4. Institutional autonomy and 5. Diversified funds.
Cybernetic University	The Cybernetic University, presents a conceptual approach to governance, management, and institutional leadership based on the cybernetic model of organizations. Higher education institutions are considered to be complex, seemingly disordered organizations with almost total lack of clear management structures. This stability is achieved

	<p>through cybernetic controls, that is, through self-correcting mechanisms at the micro-level, implying the establishment of organizational control systems.</p>
University of Academic Capitalism	<p>The University of Academic Capitalism refers to the changes in higher education in the dependence of resources in universities, which provoke the search for new sources of monetary resources. So the indicator of "academic capitalism" in the university is the increase of the commitment of the university to the market.</p>
Networking Organizations	<p>The Networking Organizations are the universities that in their forms of government and management can respond quickly to situations of increasing complexity. Since they are able to use their resources, programs and staff in a more flexible, more adaptive and more efficient way. Since there are structured relationships between individuals or groups with lateral and reciprocal communication exchange.</p>
University Entrepreneur	<p>The University Entrepreneur has central departments can also be self-sufficient; Collect money, actively choose between specialties, and in any case, make forecasts; Develop a set of fundamental beliefs that guide and rationalize the structure of change that provides a strong response capacity; And build a centralized management capacity with the aim of making broad choices that help guide the organization. The diversification of the funding base and the integration of the entrepreneurial culture in the organization are basic elements in the organizational structure of the University - "the paths of transformation" - seeking new opportunities, flexible to fit market changes And constantly seek new competitive advantages, through a new demand for their products and at the same time create new customers.</p>
Innovative University	<p>The Innovative University is the one that wants and tries to adapt to the changes of the environment and exert the same characteristics that the "paths of transformation". As well as the model referring to the evolution that has occurred in the field of university research, passing during the last decades from the so-called "Model 1" to "Model 2". The "Model 1" is present in those universities organized according to structures by disciplines and in "model 2" research is produced in the application context. The main characteristics of this model of knowledge production are its trans-disciplinarily, its heterogeneity, its organizational</p>

University that Learns	<p>diversity, high social responsibility and the new forms of quality control emanating from it. In the "Model 2" of knowledge production, faculties and university departments become organizational and administrative units rather than intellectual categories, emphasizing the importance of relationships, interaction and collaboration in the production of knowledge and would have implications In the organization and management of the University.</p> <p>The University that Learns is the university like a forum of learning and knowledge and is followed of a new and modern concept of "learning organization". It refers to the provision of an enhancement of learning ability, which depends on the development of new pedagogical methods, learning-based research, increased multimedia learning, student mobilization and interdisciplinary projects. According to Kristensen, it is based on the concept of self-evaluation, for the organization as a whole, which depends on the commitment of quality and an increase in competition, and the construction of internal and external networks.</p>
Corporate University	<p>The Corporate University is another way of developing higher education institutions under external pressures, such as the reduction of public resources, has been the administrative management to improve internal efficiency and increase opportunities for expansion of new activities And services, known as "New Public Management" or "New Managerialism", giving rise to the institutional model. In this type of university, the formation of corporate identity, the strengthening of a strong administrative level (that allows the distribution of the internal power of the Institution, an increase in the size of the administrative structure and the recruitment of external professionals), the Establishment of new priorities, conditioning the results to the available financing with the introduction of competitive elements in the public financing of the University and the orientation to the client increasing the quality of the services and defining the responsibility for the provision of the same. Producing a structure based on the systems and vision of private companies and the market.</p>

Source: own elaboration with data [12], [13], [14], [15], [16], [17], [18], [19], [20], [21], [22] and [23].

Alain Touraine [24] points out that the university is an establishment that protects and integrates three functions: production, transmission and utilization of knowledge. Then the "integrated university" [25], with the current needs of the educational and business market. They are finally reduced to the production of strategic knowledge by the University.

- The production of knowledge (research).
- The teaching of scientific knowledge (development of researchers).
- The application of science (professionalization).
- The diffusion of knowledge (strategies to make known the products of higher education).

The models of educational management in Mexican universities, some are focused mainly on the teaching-learning process - the teacher, research and student training - but do not reflect the productive reality of the context. On the other hand, other models bet on the professionalization of students, but most of the time with educational and non-strategy deficiencies that balance the operative-administrative part with the educational one for an adequate educational planning, existing a link between the conditions of learning (educational models) And factors that affect the educational process (strategic resource management models) [26].

It is clear that in Mexico there is no link between the academic and the productive world, where the Mexican educational system has had to copy models from other countries and has not adapted them to national contexts, making it difficult for universities to make innovative proposals that respond to the current demands of a globalized economy. In several Latin American studies on the quality of education and its relationship with educational management strategies, there is a priority concern with the equity and social relevance of education and knowledge for citizens.

Summarize this concern [27] when they affirm that "the pursuit of quality should not be done at the expense of equity" and the quality of service offered. Hallack [28] defends a proposal of school administration capable of articulating creatively the ideals of quality and equity in the effective provision of educational services. The new strategic role of universities is to be the builders of information and knowledge societies. This new paradigm - as competitive institutions - occurs in two important demands [29]:

1. The market perspective (economic survival).
2. That of their own formative nature transmitting knowledge.

To respond to the "Convergence of knowledge" with the administration of ideas, theories, technologies, information and communication to achieve productivity, efficiency and quality that ensure development, growth, productivity and competitiveness, not only before Markets, but in the new international markets. There is a quantitative and non-qualitative growth of mainly private and sometimes non-university universities, ranging from technical, scientific, even vocational approaches, which is the most common trend of global educational growth [30]. The causes of this growth are:

1. Growth of enrollment in the Higher Education System.
2. Emergence of various types of Higher Education Institutions.
3. The growing number of private education institutions (as a competitor of public education).
4. The reduction of public funding to public universities [31].

Design and process of research

The present work is the result of an investigation, which was based on the lines that explain the higher education in Mexico and its evolution as "Institution-company" was taken as subjects of study and analysis to the public and private universities in the State of Puebla, in Mexico. The objective was to identify best practices in educational management strategies for the imaginary of an educational-commercial model. In addition to being quantitative, descriptive, cross-sectional and non-experimental, the research was based on the generic benchmarking technique of Boxwell [32] -planning, doing, comparing and acting-and the model of weights by Spendolini [33].

For the "planning stage", the evaluation-comparison matrix was compiled with the information collected, based on the variables that make up the V-planning-evaluation model [34] of the CIEES-UDUAL (in acronym Spanish, mean: Inter-institutional Committees for the Evaluation of Higher Education - Union of American Universities Latin America and the Caribbean). It was weighed for comparative analysis - based on the importance of the university structure [35-36] - to the structure with 50%, followed by the infrastructure with 30% and finally the superstructure with 20%.

Likewise, it was determined to assign to each dimension the Value of 100 (one hundred) points and an individual percentage were assigned to each of the elements of each dimension (see Table 3). In the "doing stage" we identified the universities to compare each university, three public universities and three private universities (From this moment, will be identified as university-1, university-2 and university-3 of type public and university-1, university-2 and university-3 of type private). The instrument

was applied for 73 constructs (see Table 4). In the “comparing stage”, the information obtained was analyzed and benchmarking was evaluated-compared independently by type of institution that is, only between private institutions and then public ones (see Table 5).

Table 3: Weightings by dimension: superstructure, structure and infrastructure

Dimension	Weighting	Value	Category
Super-structure	20%	100	Institutional philosophy
			Academic model
			Strategic administration plan of the institution
Structure	50	100	Academic offer
			Academic model PEA (Teaching learning process)
Infrastructure	30%	100	Teaching resources, materials and equipment

Source: own elaboration with data [33-36].

Table 4: Research instrument

Dimension	Category	Sub- Category	Item
Super-structure	Institutional philosophy	Institutional objectives, vision, mission, values	1 - 4
		Basic elements:	
		1. Research	
		2. Teaching	
	3. Extension-dissemination		
	4. Academic offering		
	5. Internationalization		
	Academic model	6. Teaching-learning process	5 - 6
		7. Social impact	
		8. Bonding (social, business and governmental)	
9. Institutional philosophy			
10. Financing			
Strategic administration plan of the institution		Marketing plan	7 -8
	Human resources plan	9 - 12	
	Finance plan	13 - 16	
	Quality plan	17 - 18	
Structure	Academic offer	0. Study programs:	19 –

		bachelor, master's and doctoral	30
		1. Teachers academic degree	31 - 42 43 - 48
		2. Teaching experience	
		3. Work experience	49 - 56
		4. Lines of research	
		5. Institutional research	
		6. Teachers in the SNI- Conacyt	
		7. SEP-PRODEP profile	57 –
		8. Binding	61
		9. Relationship of study programs to the market	
		10. National exchanges	
		11. International exchanges	
		12. National conventions	
		13. International conventions	
		14. 5 student relationship with the production sector	
		15. University extension	
		16. Culture	
		17. Continuing education	
		18. Distance education	
	Academic model	Teaching-learning process	62
		Academic spaces	
		Social spaces	
		Sports spaces	
Infrastructure	Teaching resources, materials and equipment	Spaces for technology	63-73
		Libraries	
		Languages laboratories	

Source: own elaboration with data [35-37].

Table 5: Benchmarking of Educational strategies between public universities and private universities in Mexico

Variables	Private university						Public university							
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3		
Dimension	Weighing	VALOR	Bench	Weighing	Bench	Weighing	Bench	Weighing	Bench	Weighing	Bench	Weighing	Bench	Weighing
SUPER-STRUCTURE	20%	100	90.33	18.07	100.00	20.00	44.30	8.86	78.67	15.73	76.73	15.35	75.07	15.01
STRUCTURE	50%	100	85.89	42.95	88.36	44.18	54.49	27.24	90.64	45.32	59.53	29.77	47.95	23.98
INFRA-STRUCTURE	30%	100	78.95	23.69	89.20	26.76	39.00	11.70	88.50	26.55	77.50	23.25	45.00	13.50
Tota	100		255.18	84.70	277.56	90.94	137.79	47.80	257.81	87.60	213.77	68.36	168.02	52.49

Source: own elaboration.

Finally, in the act stage, the results of public and private universities were integrated into the same comparative matrix to determine best practices. Based on the highest weights, the best practices of each dimension were obtained. In addition to integrating a ranking of universities, one including both types and for each dimension to compare.

Results

Based on the type of research described in previous lines [37] (quantitative, descriptive, cross-sectional and non-experimental). The public university-1 with 278.93 points, followed by the private university-2 with 277.56 points. As can be seen in Table 6, this difference of points is not conclusive, at least from this perspective, in which they include the three dimensions. The difference of 1.93 points shows and confirms the position of a very close competition between public and private in the educational market currently offered in Mexico. For a more in-depth analysis, the data by size were compared.

Super-Structure

The only university with 100% in the institutional statutes is the private university-2 and is followed by the public university-1 with 95.50 points. As can be seen in Table 7, private universities have completed institutional strategic planning, which does not mean that public universities do not have it, since the difference is the commercial and social approach, respectively.

Structure

In this dimension, none of the universities (public or private) meets 100%. The public university-1 obtained 90.64 points and the private university-2 88.36 points. As can be seen in Table 8, there is no great difference (only 2.28 points), which reflects that the private university is investing more in the recruitment, development and certification / accreditation of its educational and teaching offer.

Infra-structure

Also in this dimension none of the universities (public or private) obtained 100%. The first positions occupy it, the university -1 pública with 92.79 points, followed by the private university-2 with 89.20 points. As you can see, the difference is relatively small, it is 3.59 points. As can be seen in Table 9, there is intense competition between the private and public universities for the provision of the best facilities (buildings, technology centers, language centers, study areas and coexistence) Students see their institutions as the best study options.

However, the private university has not managed to match the public's offer in terms of facilities, due to the budget dependence of its own funds. The public universities can count on observatories, telescopes or facilities with complete laboratories, thanks to the federal and state budgetary supports in the investigation and promotion of the new knowledge.

Table 6: Educational Ranking of Universities in México.

Position	Sector	University	Result	Weighing
1	Public	1	278.93	92.26
2	Private	2	277.56	90.94
3	Private	1	255.18	84.70
4	Public	2	213.77	68.36
5	Public	3	168.02	52.49
6	Private	3	137.79	47.80

Source: own elaboration.

Table 7: Educational Super-structure Ranking of Universities in México

Position	Sector	University	Result	Weighing
1	Private	2	100.00	20.00
2	Public	1	95.50	19.10
3	Private	1	90.33	18.07
4	Public	2	76.73	15.35
5	Public	3	75.07	15.01
6	Private	3	44.30	8.86

Source: own elaboration.

Table 8: Educational Structure Ranking of Universities in México

Position	Sector	University	Result	Weighing
1	Public	1	90.64	45.32
2	Private	2	88.36	44.18
3	Private	1	85.89	42.95
4	Public	2	59.53	29.77
5	Private	3	54.49	27.24
6	Public	3	47.95	23.98

Source: own elaboration.

Table 9: Educational Infra-structure Ranking of Universities in México

Position	Sector	University	Result	Weighing
1	Public	IES-1	92.79	27.84
2	Private	IES-2	89.20	26.76
3	Private	IES-1	78.95	23.69
4	Public	IES-2	77.50	23.25
5	Public	IES-3	45.00	13.50
6	Private	IES-3	39.00	11.70

Source: own elaboration.

Best Practices

Taking into account the categories in the dimensions of the model V-planning-evaluation (CIESS-UDUAL, 2009) proposals, best practices were identified based in the highest numerical evaluation. The best practices by size and category are described below.

Dimension: super-structure

Best Practice 1: private university -2 and public university -2.

Category: Institutional Philosophy

- Valid for 3 years, formulate or reformulate every 3 years, not exceed the projection to 10 years and be published in at least three internal media of the institution.

Best practice 2: private university -2.

Category: Academic model • Research, teaching, extension-dissemination, academic offer, internationalization, teaching-learning process, social impact, social, business and governmental linkage, institutional philosophy and financing.

Best practice 3: private university -2.

Category: Strategic management plan • Educational marketing plan: existence in the strategic plan, valid for at least 3 years, strategic elements: positioning, marketing, brand value and communication.

- Human resources plan: existence in the strategic plan, valid for at least 3 years, strategic elements: recruitment, selection, contracting, training, development and promotion. In addition to the health and safety plan and civil protection.

- Financing plan (finances): strategic elements, such as tuition, supplementary education, funding, research and publications, as well as certifications and accreditations of sound finances for internal and external institutions in the strategic plan, valid for at least 3 years.

- Institutional quality plan: existence in the strategic plan, valid for at least 3 years, certifications / accreditations in five aspects of institutional quality: academic, processes, customer service, study, administrative and social programs.

Dimension: structure

Best practice 4: private university -1, private university -2 and public university -1.

Category: Academic offer • 50% of undergraduate degree programs accredited by COPAES.

- 100% of undergraduate degree programs, certified by CIEES.

- 70% of master's degree programs, certified by CIEES.
- 70% of doctoral study programs, certified by CIEES.
- 100% of the undergraduate, master and doctorate programs, updated, with a validity of no more than 3 years.
- 50% of master's and doctoral programs registered in the PNPC of the Conacyt.

Best Practice 5: private university -2 and public university-1.

Category: Teachers

- Not more than 40% of hour-class teachers in the institution, for both bachelor's, master's and doctoral degrees.
- 100% of teachers with the academic degree equal to the level of the classes they teach (bachelor, master and doctorate).
- 70% of teachers (minimum), with the next higher level to the level that they teach (mastery for bachelor and doctorate for masters).
- 50% full-time (minimum) teachers with a PhD degree.
- 100% of teachers with at least 5 years of teaching experience in higher education.
- 100% of teachers with at least 5 years of work-professional experience in the teaching area.

Best Practice 6: private university 1 and 2 and public university 1.

Category: Research • 50 lines of research.

- Production of at least 300 investigations, on average during a school year.
- Publication of 70% of the research carried out.
- Have at least 60% of teacher-researchers, registered in the National System of Researchers SNI-Conacyt.

Best practice 7: private university -2 private.

Category: Bonding

- More than 10 academic boards made up of entrepreneurs, religious, alumni, executives and executives, politicians, academic opinion leaders, researchers, non-profit social associations and sports leaders.
- 80% of students take internships at the national level.
- 50% of the students take internships at the international level.
- Have more than 160 national conventions (throughout the Mexican Republic).
- Have more than 60 international agreements (in the four continents).
- Have an entrepreneurship program that offers incubator and accelerator.

Best Practice 8: university private -2 and university public -1.

Category: University Extension

- On average 65 activities per month to promote: culture, art, spiritual development, emotional intelligence, social interaction, creativity and knowledge development.
- Must offer refresher, training and flexible professional training: continuing education, executive programs (bachelor's degree) and online offer.

Best practice 9: university -1 and 2 private and university -1 public.

Category: Teaching-learning process

- The process should integrate: research, teaching, extension-dissemination, academic offer, internationalization, subjects of the teaching-learning process, social impact, social, business and governmental linkage and institutional philosophy.

Dimension: infra-structure

Best practice 10: university private -2 and university public -2.

Category: Didactic resources, materials and equipment • Have 100% of the rooms equipped with educational technology (multimedia projector or giant screen, audio and video player, unlimited Internet access, acrylic board, ventilation, climate or fan, water dispenser, furniture according to academic degree Work tables or executive chairs).

- To have 100% of the corresponding laboratories and adequate to the academic offer that counts (medicine, mechatronics, electronics, nutrition, marketing, etc.).
- Have at least one area of student coexistence, for each academic area of the institution (or areas of knowledge).
- Encourage sports: sports areas.
- Internet service (university community) without restrictions and demand capacity.
- Have a virtual and physical library.
- Have the language practice areas.

Conclusion

The best strategies developed by public and private universities to operate and fulfill their educational and commercial objectives are related to the basic functions of the university: academic offer, teachers, research, linkage, university extension and teaching process -learning. Each one of them based on the social, business, humanistic or commercial approach that they have set in their strategic objectives. Although the learning that the private university must learn from the public, in terms of educational management, it is mainly in the academic structure regarding research with focus, that is, research to transform and bring knowledge to society, including all sectors (National

System of Researchers, SNI in acronym Spanish), to provide science, knowledge and innovation to the institution, the students, the community, and so on. Based on the best practices identified in the educational management strategies of public and private universities in Puebla, a model of educational management for higher education institutions is proposed and shown, Table 10.

However, the public university must also learn from the private, from its superstructure. The private university has strategic institutional plans with objectives, goals, impacts, coverage and commercial scope that include aspects and strategic actions of marketing, human resources, finances, production of the educational service and quality. The differences between the educational management strategies used by public universities in relation to those used by private universities are relatively basic, that is, there is no great difference between the operational actions carried out by a public and private university. Although the difference is that the private university is concerned about remaining in the market as an educational company competing with its own type and with the public ones to obtain student-clients, ensuring the proposed "sale" in its commercial goals to finance its activities, Programs, institutional and educational projects. While public universities, still do not enter into the dynamics of operating commercially, are concerned to offer their product (educational programs for professional training) with educational quality, which meets the requirements of society: institutional philosophy, strategic objectives and mission-vision.

It is clear that every institution considers itself competitive, the best in the market, offering quality in the product and customer service, etc. Aspects that public and private universities contemplate in their philosophies. But in the administrative or management approach is the difference of one respect to another. The private university has an administrative management degree in order to be the best competitor in the market with economic profitability, as the first order of business importance. On the contrary, the public university has the administrative or social management intention to be a real university that "produces" science-knowledge for the transformation of society, as the first order of "business" importance.

One of the main challenges faced by both public and private organizations in the 21st century is how to create social structures that facilitate the organizational-administrative function of knowledge intermediation. That is, management strategies in which the company today can be able to turn information into useful and practical knowledge that responds to the needs of its market-customers, employees and suppliers. Thus, there is a need to create mechanisms of various kinds, administrative or organizational, that can process information for specific users, about specific topics and provide it in

real time, thus facilitating the mobilization and use of information and knowledge in decision making.

The new scenario of the global economy requires educational companies competitive management strategies for the need to have resources that allow investment for the development of educational and research projects, so that universities or public and private higher education institutions Must have the strategic tools that contribute to the achievement of their educational and management objectives, achieving a balance between these two aspects. Obviously, these strategies are carried out by the individuals who are in charge of the management and organization of the institutions, of academics, teachers, support staff and researchers, who each carry out actions (from basic functions and of structural importance) to the operation of the institution.

In this struggle for the market, public and private institutions execute strategic actions that they use to attract "clients" (the students), who have to select one or another university based on variables such as economy, brand value, educational quality, Job opportunity and philosophical identification.

References

- Steiner, George, A. (2000). Strategic planning. Mexico: CECSA.
- Sañudo (2005). The transformation of educational management. Madrid: CDEP.
- Pallu, B.R. (1990). Approach to a general theory of management. Madrid: Editorial Aguilar.
- Aubert, N., and Gaulejac, V. (1993). The cost of excellence. From chaos to logic or from logic to chaos. Buenos Aires: Paidós.
- Casassus, J. (2000). Problems of educational management in Latin America: or the tension between type A and type B paradigms. Preliminary version. Paris: UNESCO.
- Pozner de Weinberg, P. (2000) .Competences for the professionalization of educational management. Chapter II, Buenos Aires: IIPE.
- Tapia, G. (2003). Plan for improving the management of the school. Work documents. Mexico: SEP-SEB-DGDGIE-PEC.
- Rodríguez, C. L. (coord.) (2009). Pedagogical management of educational institutions. Mexico: Astra Editions.
- Pollitt, Ch. (1990). Managerialism and the public services. The Anglo-American experience. Cambridge: Wiley-Blackwel.
- Kells, H. R. (1992). Self-Regulation in Higher Education. A Multi-National Perspective on Collaborative Systems of Quality Assurance and Control. Higher Education Policy, S-15.

- Askling, B., and Kristensen, B. (2000). The learning organization as a Model of institutional governance. International Seminar Government and Management of Universities, Barcelona.
- Cameron, K. (1984). Organizational adaptation and Higher Education. *Journal of H.E.*, 55 (22), 122-144.
- Sporn, B., (1999) .Towards More Adaptive Universities: Trends of Institutional Reform in Europe. *Higher Education in Europe*, 24 (1), 23-33.
- Birnbaum, R. (1989). The cybernetic institution: Toward an integration of governance theories. *Higher Education*.
- Deem, R. (2001). Globalisation, new managerialism, academic capitalism And entrepreneurialism in universities: Is the local dimension still Important?
- Slaughter, S., and Leslie, I. (1997) .Academic capitalism. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Clark, B. (2000). Collegial entrepreneurialism in proactive universities. *Change*, 32 (1).
- Gibbons, M., Limoges, C., Nowotny, H., Schwartzman, S., Scott, P., and Trow, M. (1994). *The New Production of Knowledge: The Dynamics of Science and Research in Contemporary Societies*. London: Sage Publishing.
- Pawlowki, K. (2001). Towards the entrepreneurial university. *Higher Education in Europe*, XXVI (3), 427-436.
- Bleiklie, I. (1998). Justifying the evaluative state: New Public Management ideals in Higher Education. *European Journal of Education*, 33 (3), 299-316.
- Henkel, M. (1997). Academic Values and the University as Corporate Enterprise. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 51 (2), 134-143.
- Kristensen, B. (1999). The entrepreneurial university as a learning University. *Higher Education in Europe*, XXIV (1), 35-46.
- Mora, A. (2000). *New tools of public management: the balanced scorecard*. Spain: Gestión 2000 Editor.
- Castrejón, D.J. (1990). *The concept of the university*. Mexico: Trillas.
- Castrejón, D.J. (1992). *The concept of university*. Mexico: Trillas.
- Díaz-Barriga, A. F., and Hernández, R. G. (2000). *Teaching strategies for meaningful learning. One constructivist prevention*. Mexico: McGraw Hill.
- Braslavsky, C., and Tiramonti, G. (2007). How are the schools. In Tiramonti, G., Braslavsky, C., Filmus, D., Birgin, A. and FLACSO (Organization). (nineteen ninety five). *The transformations of education in ten years of democracy*. Buenos Aires: Thesis Grupo Editorial Norma.

- Hallack, J. (2000). *Introductory words. A future for learning, the financing of education. Documents of a debate.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Larios-Gómez, E. (2014). *Comparative analysis of the educational management strategies between public and private university in Puebla.* Doctoral Thesis: National Polytechnic Institute (acronym in Spanish IPN).
- Kinser, K., and Levy, D. (2005). *The For-Profit Sector: U.S. Patterns and International Echoes in Higher Education.* Working Paper, no.5.
- Topete, B. C., Bustos, F. E., and Chavez, M. (2007). *Challenges of the management of institutions of higher education from the perspective of intellectual capital.* IX National Congress of Educational Research (Comie).
- Boxwell, R.J. (1996). *Benchmarking to compete with advantages.* Spain: McGraw-Hill.
- Spendolini, Michael J. (1996). *Benchmarking.* Mexico: Grupo Editorial Norma.
- CIEES-UDUAL (2009). "Evaluation" Model-Planning. González-González, J., Galindo Miranda J.L. And Gold-Morgan, Cuernavaca, Mexico.
- Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (2010). *Education at a Glance 2008.* OCDE indicator. Paris: OECD.
- Slaughter, S., and Rhoades, G. (2004). *Academic capitalism and the new economy: Markets, State and higher education.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Kerlinger, F. (2002). *Behavioral research.* Mexico: McGrawHill.