Observatory for Fundamental University Values and Rights

Crisis, Cuts, Contemplations

How Academia May Help Rescuing Society

*Proceedings of the Conference
of the Magna Charta Observatory
17-18 September 2009*

Bastian Baumann
Pier Ugo Calzolari
Üstün Ergüder
Monique Fouilhoux
Steve Fuller

Andrew McIntosh
Jairam Reddy
Fabio Roversi-Monaco
Mostafa Abdel-Razek Saleh Hashem
Dimitris Tsougarakis

OBSERVATORY
MAGNA CHARTA UNIVERSITATUM

DAMIANI

Contents

Foreword

Pier Ugo Calzolari, Rector
University of Bologna

It is always a special honour for me to open the annual conference of the Observatory of the *Magna Charta Universitatum* and to have the opportunity to convey to all the participants the warmest welcome of the University of Bologna.

There is a special reason this year for an additional appreciation of the Observatory conference, which is rarely less than stimulating anyhow, and this reason is the theme selected, which directly addresses the perspectives and the future of our universities in the present situation dominated by a global crisis of unprecedented depth.

We will discuss this theme, but at the same time we are obliged to take into account that these new difficulties overburden an intrinsic problem of our universities.

Presently, higher education institutions appear to be objects of hopes but also of growing concerns. In many countries of the western world they live in the condition of institutions under scrutiny. This happened more than once in the past, but nowadays some unprecedented events mark new and worrying risks.

On the one hand, globalisation pushes universities into international competition, giving rise to a real higher education market and revising the comparative advantages of some countries and regions.

On the other hand, the increasing demand of mass high-quality educational services and of a more intensive involvement in research has begun, in most countries, to outrun the capacities of public funding.

The present world-wide financial crisis joins the previous and apparently permanent difficulties. Both the increasing importance of international competitiveness and the attention that funding for higher education has received have stimulated a wide debate about the value and effectiveness of higher education.

Some authoritative reports express frustration at the uncertainties of higher education institutions in taking more responsibility for the limitations of their financial means and others allege that higher education is itself threatened by uneven quality and lacking evidence of adequate performance.

Then, plunged within a scene, which has been upset by the ICT revolution, threatened by effects of globalisation, besieged by progressive decay in governmental subsidies, universities of the western world feel for the first time in their millennial history that a crisis of unprecedented depth is looming at the horizon of their familiar and old campuses.

A collective sense is developing of the need to do more than simply trying to ride out the storm even if this should involve redefining or questioning the "storm" itself [1].

We have to face *"Tough Choices: Tough Times."*[2], recalling the title of a famous report.

For this reason, we really hope that this well-timed conference of the *Observatory of the Magna Charta* will address the main issues of such a complex subject and that it will help us to single out solutions, hypotheses and good-practice examples.

---

[1] David Ward, *Current concerns and future prospects of higher education in the United States*, EUA, Lisbon, 2007.

[2] National Center on Education and the Economy, *Tough Choices: Tough Times*, 2007.

Opening Address

Fabio Roversi-Monaco, Honorary President
Magna Charta Observatory, Bologna

Since 18 September 1988, the anniversary of the Magna Charta has been celebrated in a rigorous and intense manner with representatives of numerous Universities: those that were present from the very beginning, totalling more than 400, together with others that over the years have come forward to sign it.

There are important legislative provisions in a number of European countries in which the Magna Charta is cited as a source of law. Moreover, it is the basis of the Bologna Declaration, signed in 1999 by the Ministers of 29 European countries, that makes explicit reference to it.

The Observatory, also founded by the University of Bologna with fundamental contribution of the European Conference of Rectors and the representatives of the universities that contributed to the drafting of the Magna Charta has a number of objectives that are clearly laid down in the Statutes.

These objectives were pursued in a continuous manner until 2008, the year of the 20ʰ anniversary, and although only

a few of the members of the Observatory contributed to the drafting of the Magna Charta, all of them were well aware of the objectives of the Observatory, and had a profound understanding of the meaning of the Magna Charta.

The work of those taking part, including the Rectors of a number of leading European universities, many of them founded long ago, eminent scholars appointed by the supranational organisations, and other esteemed colleagues, has been carried out on an entirely voluntary basis, with colleagues sacrificing their time without any form of economic support, because that document was the true expression of a spontaneous movement based on shared principles.

Under the auspices of the Magna Charta, the Observatory has published research reports and studies, and has served as the guardian of the principles laid down in the Charta. This mission has been carried out at times in difficult circumstances, at times with successful outcomes, but always with great dignity.

It is a great honour for me as the Honorary President of the Magna Charta Observatory and certainly the point of arrival at the end of a long journey that started in 1986 at a meeting organised by the University of Bologna on the topic of the shared identity of European universities.

This journey has been marked by moments of intense emotion, and comes to its natural conclusion with a number of serious concerns.

For example, today it is much more difficult for us to establish the essential characteristics of universities, as complex and extremely diversified institutions where higher learning has to go forward hand in hand with research.

It is difficult to identify the entities that correspond to the concept of "true" universities as laid down in the Magna Charta.

In addition, at times certain developments give rise to the impression that the Observatory is intended to play a different role, almost bureaucratic, with a tendency to duplicate the role played by international organisations such as the European University Association.

The purpose of my remarks is to appeal to you to intervene, if possible, to uphold the concept of our true and distinct mission. The Observatory has its own mission to carry out. To do this on the basis of freedom and awareness, it has its own small-scale but effective organisation. It is based in Bologna; it receives funding from the Italian Government (even if it has been inexplicably reduced) and needs to become once again the entity that it was.

The conditions are in place to identify the elements of innovation arising from social and economic developments in the world, where new messages are transmitted practically every day, and to move forward.

In conclusion, more than 20 years after the approval of the Magna Charta and after the setting up of the Observatory, the message that I have for the universities who first signed the *Magna Charta Universitatum*, and those who are about to do so, is that the Observatory, which exists as a free and voluntary association operating in complete independence and pursuit of its ideals, must continue to be true to itself.

Highlights of the Observatory Activities

Bastian Baumann, Secretary General
Magna Charta Observatory, Bologna

One year passed since the last conference, which was the 20th anniversary of the *Magna Charta Universitatum,* originally signed in 1988 in Bologna. It was indeed a remarkable event that attracted many universities and higher education organisations. A large number of new universities signed the document. But as it is visible also on this occasion, the attraction did not decrease and again many new universities will sign this year, bringing the total number of signatory universities to 662.

We are very delighted about the growth in the number of signatory universities. It shows us that we are on the right track; that our message has been, is and will also in the future be of fundamental importance to the higher education community world-wide. The fundamental values and principles of the University are the basis of scientific, technological, social, economical and cultural advancement for individuals as well as for society at large.

The Observatory is not a membership-based organisa-

tion. This has been a deliberate decision. But it does not imply that there are no duties and responsibilities; neither for the Observatory nor for the signatory universities. The Observatory has the responsibility to support the signatory universities in upholding, defending and promoting the observance of the *Magna Charta Universitatum*.

But the signatory universities also need to indicate their wishes and concerns. By signing the *Magna Charta Universitatum*, universities commit themselves to adhere to the principles and values laid out in the text. This entails more than the signing ceremony. It also entails more than joining the ranks of the most prestigious universities. The Observatory needs the signatory universities' active engagement in order to ensure that our activities are most meaningful to our constituency.

Many of the activities during the last academic year come back to the explicit request of signatory universities, have been organised jointly or have been facilitated through the provision of information. But also many other higher education organisations or some ministries have approached the Observatory, asking for assistance.

A range of signatory universities have invited the Observatory to be present at one of their important conferences or anniversaries. We have tried to respond positively to all invitations. Obviously, this always depends on personal availability and financial arrangements, but the requests by signatory universities are of prime importance for the Observatory.

But also many other organisations have invited the Observatory to various conferences, seminars, workshops and asked for an active contribution. The largest and most important of these conferences in the last year was the World Conference on Higher Education, organised by UNESCO,

that was held in Paris in July and the regional preparatory events. The event generated a lot of impetus and is leading to a wide range of follow-up actions, in some of which also the Observatory will play a major role.

Both last year and also this year, we are proud to have a large delegation from Kazakhstan present at the conference. This, not least, is also the result of the activities in Kazakhstan, where the Observatory offers its advice to universities for the implementation of major reform efforts. It is done in close cooperation with the Kazakh ministry of education. Jointly with the Council of Europe and the ministry, the Observatory organised a conference in Kazakhstan that brought together the leadership of almost all universities in the country to debate current reforms in the context of the values of the *Magna Charta Universitatum*.

Generally, the co-operations with other organisations have also expanded over the last year. The Observatory is working very closely on issues of common concern with, for example, the Council of Europe, the European Students' Union, the Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe, Education International and various national organisations. The increase of the co-operation goes hand in hand with a widening of the organisations the Observatory has relations with. For example, at this conference the Arab Association of Universities is present for the first time. The Council of Europe currently undertakes a study that looks at the development of a "standard setting instrument" directed at public authorities to ensure institutional autonomy and academic freedom in their legal systems. The Observatory is deeply involved in this initiative.

The organisation of universities in South-East-Europe is peculiar, as in the majority of cases, the faculties are organised as independent legal entities. The effects this has on in-

stitutional autonomy and on academic freedom is the focus of a comparative study the Observatory is currently undertaking. This will add the aspect of the fundamental values and principles into the debate that has been going on for a while on the future organisation of universities in that region.

Also in Latin America, the Observatory's activities have risen. This follows the trend that more and more signatories come from outside Europe and the Observatory therefore being more active outside Europe. Currently, there are discussions about establishing a regional chapter in Colombia in order to facilitate the exchange of information in both directions. If this endeavour proves to be successful, similar approaches could be taken in other regions with the support of the signatory universities. That would also help addressing regional specifics more adequately through for example regional conferences on a regular basis. But all these activities are again dependent on the wishes, needs and support possibilities of the signatory universities.

This June, the Observatory has again organised a summerschool, jointly with the Ionian University. The summer-school takes place every year on the island of Corfu and brings together, in a relaxed atmosphere, young representatives of universities from the wider Mediterranean to discuss a specific issue over one week. This year's summer-school focussed on the interaction between universities and societies.

The Observatory also acts as a mediator in cases of conflicts, disputes, tensions or misunderstandings. Most often these cases are rather of an institutional nature and concern the relation between a university and the ministry; in some cases it also involves individuals within a university. The Observatory usually tries to provide an unbiased, outside reference point on the basis of the values and principles contained in the *Magna Charta Universitatum*. Any university

can call on the Observatory in cases that are likely to seriously harm institutional autonomy or academic freedom. But not all universities are aware of this possibility.

In order to address this but also in order to establish a coherent practice in these cases, the Observatory is currently working on a more structured approach. At the annual conference in 2007, which was organised in co-operation with the European Students' Union, the proposal to establish an international Ombudsman for higher education was made. Since then, the Council of the Observatory has debated the topic several times and decided to investigate possible options for turning the proposal into reality. A working group within the Observatory has since discussed this further and developed a strategy for launching a feasibility project. Obviously, this undertaking does require a lot of resources. Hence, it is important to engage in dialogue with all possible actors and beneficiaries concerned to gain support. Only with broad support, it seems to be worthwhile to follow this path.

The Observatory functions as a think-tank, as an advisor, as a convenor and as a mediator within the remits of the mandate derived from the *Magna Charta Universitatum*. Within this framework of action it offers to the signatories its expertise. The signatories should address the Observatory in case they would like to get assistance, but also for joint conferences, projects, research activities and any other queries they might have.

Needless to say, the activities of the Observatory are dependent on the financial resources as well. This conference is addressing the current economical crisis, as it is also affecting universities and poses great challenges for them. Also the Observatory has experienced financial drawbacks lately, which directly influence its possibilities. Therefore,

I would like to thank wholeheartedly once more those signatory universities, which have despite their own financial situation made a voluntary contribution to the Observatory. This greatly helps our work and the Observatory will do everything to make sure that the signatory universities are also the direct beneficiaries of all the undertakings of the Magna Charta Observatory in the years to come.

Higher Education in a Time of Social and Economic Change:
What Contribution must Universities and Public Authorities Make?

Andrew McIntosh, Member of the Parliamentary Assembly Council of Europe

INTRODUCTION AND CREDENTIALS

The question of the contribution that universities and public authorities should make to 'rescuing society' comes at a time of global economic crisis, but also at a time when European public authorities and universities complete ten years of preparing, under the Bologna Process, for a European Higher Education Area, and are therefore obliged to give fresh thought to the future of higher education in Europe.

I come to this issue as a politician with long experience as a national Parliamentarian, a government minister, and now a member of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe (PACE).

I am not the first member of the PACE to address an anniversary of the signing of the *Magna Charta Universitatum*. At the opening meeting in 1988, on the 900th anniversary of the Alma Mater, the Parliamentary Assembly was represented by Mr Núñez Encabo, chairman of the then Sub-Committee on University Questions. Since then a number of

PACE parliamentarians have addressed the Magna Charta, most recently Professor Josef Jařab in 2006.

ROLE OF THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE (CoE)

The CoE has been prominent in public policy on higher education since the signing of the European Convention on Human Rights in 1952, in which Article 2 of the first Protocol asserts a fundamental right to education. The aim of the CoE is to achieve greater unity among its members, and this aim has been pursued over more than 50 years by common action in educational and cultural matters;

Notable landmarks during this period have included (among many others):

- the European Cultural Convention of 1954
- the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights of 1966
- the CoE/UNESCO Convention on the Recognition of Qualifications concerning higher education in the European Region (Lisbon Recognition Convention) of 1997.

In the past 10 years, the CoE has been an enthusiastic participant in the Bologna Process, and in particular its extension to states which are members of CoE but not the European Union, notably the Balkans, Turkey, Russia and the south Caucasus. Participation in Bologna is now virtually coterminous with CoE membership. The CoE is now an active participant in preparations for the launch of the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) in 2010.

ROLE OF THE PACE

The PACE has always maintained that public support for higher education requires active political as well as public support, and that the parliamentary dimension provided uniquely by the PACE, including all shades of political opin-

ion, is an essential complement to the leading roles of the higher education sector itself and of public authorities.

The PACE has therefore contributed on many occasions to policy and debate on higher education issues, notably and most recently in:

- Resolution 1762 of 2006 on university autonomy and academic freedom, which includes a commitment to "cooperate with the Observatory of the Magna Charta in monitoring the observance of the principles of academic freedom and university autonomy in Europe, thus adding a European parliamentary dimension to the work of the Observatory";
- Recommendation (2007) of the Committee of Ministers, adopted in May 2007, which set out policies for public responsibility for higher education and research in Europe, focusing on the responsibilities of public authorities;
- Document 11977 of 2009, on the contribution of the CoE to the European Higher Education Area, for which I had the honour to be the rapporteur, which was adopted by the Committee on Culture, Science and Education in May 2009, for submission to the PACE later this year. This records the contribution made by the CoE to the Bologna Process over 10 years, and proposes reforms to the steering and structure which will become necessary as the EHEA develops.

SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CHANGE: A CRISIS?

It is still not clear whether the turmoil of the last two years in world economies and financial markets will prove to be the worst for 20 years, for 50 years, or for 100 years. But however rapid any escape from recession may be, there are at least three consequences for higher education which cannot be avoided.

First, recovery in world economies may begin with growth in output and resumption of financial market activity; but it will be a very long time before there is any significant improvement in unemployment, let alone a return to full employment where that existed before. So higher education will need to have enhanced concern for the realities of underemployment, including graduate underemployment.

Second, recovery will have only been made possible, at least in developed countries, by unprecedented counter-cyclical state intervention. This means that public finances in future years will suffer from reduced tax income and increased debt repayment obligations. There will therefore be intense pressure on public spending, which will inevitably include pressure on the funding of higher education, whose contribution to economic recovery is not always and everywhere fully understood.

Third, the response of economies and governments to crisis has not, fortunately, brought a reaction against globalisation. Higher education will therefore continue, and increasingly, to operate on a world stage. My contribution from a European base must not be thought to imply a 'fortress Europe' mentality.

THE ROLE OF PUBLIC AUTHORITIES

The CoE Committee of Ministers (2007) rightly defines 'public authorities' widely: not just governments, but any body "empowered to...make decisions...on behalf of the population...irrespective of its legal status".

The Committee of Ministers also defines the purposes of higher education widely: in summary:
- "the development and maintenance through teaching, learning and research, of an advanced, comprehensive and diverse knowledge base"
- preparation for the labour market
- preparation for life as active citizens, personal development
- developing and maintaining democratic culture
- "effective equal opportunities to higher education contribute to social cohesion and to sustainable development".

They conclude that the role of public authorities is to provide or enable an adequate framework for higher education and research, including qualifications and quality assurance. They emphasise the need for international recognition of qualifications, and for internationally equal opportunities. In particular, they recognise the need for "substantial" public responsibility for the funding of higher education and research, including facilitating other source of funding therefore not excluding private provision or public/private partnerships.

CoE recommendation 1762 of 2006, based on a report by Professor Josef Jařab, should be seen as adding to the responsibilities of public authorities in the requirement that university autonomy and academic freedom should be "guaranteed by law", and that this should be a condition of CoE membership. There are related issues of the independent and decentralised governance of state higher education institutions, their freedom in the appointment of academic and other staff, and their freedom to select students, both home and international, without political intervention.

Are these adequate statements of the role of public authorities? And what protection do they provide for higher education and research in times of social and economic change?

I include the CoE and the PACE as public authorities, and consider what obligations are placed on us, and opportunities presented to us, by this analysis.

THE ROLE OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND RESEARCH

To an audience of university leaders, all that I say as a national and Council of Europe parliamentarian is based on the belief that universities cannot function without academic freedom in developing the knowledge base in general and that of the students they teach; and that this in turn requires a degree of university autonomy. Such an audience needs to reflect about the following questions:

- are you in a position where your response to crisis respects the fundamental role of universities, in maintaining and developing the knowledge base through teaching, learning and research?
- have you then, in your own context, made the economic and social case for higher education and research as a pillar of the economy and a civilised society?
- if you have made the case to your own satisfaction, have you promoted it to those in economic and social life whose support is necessary for your survival?
- have you done all that you can to ensure that you can fulfil your public obligations for example, on quality, on equal opportunities?
- can you demonstrate that you provide value for the funding which you need from public authorities?
- above, has your understanding of your role kept pace with changes in society and technology, which may well have become more intense in times of economic and social change?

Is Academic Freedom Affordable in a Time of Economic Crisis?

Steve Fuller, University of Warwick
United Kingdom

The economic crisis and its repercussions on academic freedom were part of the discussions at the 2009 signing of the *Magna Charta Universitatum* at the mother of universities, Bologna, Italy. Although the Magna Charta is the world's most visible and widely endorsed statement of principles for the promotion and protection of university autonomy, there remains a nagging sense that universities are luxuries now that ordinary people are struggling to make ends meet.

There has been always reason for concern. In the past, universities have been created in times of plenty, typically to encourage people to think beyond their immediate sense of survival to more edifying spiritual or national goals. Nearly fifty years ago, a statistically minded historian of science, Derek de Solla Price, observed in *Little Science, Big Science* (1963) that the best indicator of academic research production is a nation's energy consumption per capita: Both grow together. This is hardly surprising. From a strictly economic standpoint, academic freedom requires a relative immunity

to costs, whether from trial-and-error experimentation or more radical challenges to the status quo. But should universities now reduce their demands in order to meet the needs of the larger society, not least in terms of their carbon footprint?

THE ORIGINAL MEDIEVAL SETTING FOR THE UNIVERSITY: THE BOLOGNA LEGACY

Bologna is an appropriate place for these discussions, not simply because it was the first university in the strict historical sense of having come first. Bologna University was anchored in the legal profession, which consisted mainly of *glossators* - that is people who resolved gaps and contradictions in the law with novel concepts and categories. Behind this task was an idea that reached back to Biblical antiquity and continues to resonate today, namely, that society is constituted by language, which is the human extension of the God's creative *lógos*. It follows that stable social order requires a coherent mode of collective self-representation. The very concept of the university – *universitas*, normally translated as 'corporation' in English – was itself a creation of the glossators who were struggling to find a legally viable existence for a form of collective life that escaped the two main categories of Roman law, the *gens* (i.e. the unchanging family origin, the default category) and the *socius* (i.e. the temporary goal-oriented alliance, the exceptional category). The *universitas* was the 'artificial person', a social construction entitled to perpetual existence by virtue of possessing a spirit that transcended the particular spirits and interests of the individuals constituting it at any given moment. Into this new third category of legal existence fell not only universities but also churches, cities, monastic orders and guilds.

Bologna is also especially relevant to the current question 'Is Academic Freedom Affordable?' because the original Bolognese lawyers spent much of their time forging the precursors of modern economic concepts, especially those that we take to be indicative of the capitalist system. The situation there was intellectually very much like that which was responsible for the emergence of *universitas* as a linguistic innovation in the 12th century. Analogous to the *gens-socius* distinction was the distinction between, on the one hand, ordinary economic activity – the maintenance of the family household – and, on the other, the occasional buying and selling of goods in the market to make up for what one cannot produce in one's own home. Lacking was the third category of a perpetually self-sustaining market for goods regardless of their capacity to satisfy household needs: in other words, the production and distribution of goods for their own sake, the essence of capitalism.

An important linguistic innovation in this regard was 'interest', which comes from the Latin '*quod inter est*', i.e. 'what is between'. The phrase, associated with the great Bolognese glossator Azzone Soldanus, refers literally to the additional value accrued by money in the time spent between the provision of a loan and its repayment. Before the coinage of 'interest', the idea that one should charge for lending money was seen as taking advantage of another person's misery. However, Soldanus turned the old concept on its head, focusing on the opportunity that the loan provides the poor person to improve himself. After all, if the person can repay the loan with interest in the allotted time, then the borrower will probably have generated a profit in the interim, which would have raised the standard of his existence, thereby demonstrating his having been worthy to receive the loan. In short, interest turns the loan into a moral test of the borrower that is made possible through temporary self-restraint on the part of the lender. As Max Weber famously pointed out, this moralistic slant on

charging interest, which ideally leads to the improvement of both parties in the long term, came to be especially emphasised in Calvinist theology, the source of the modern capitalist spirit. In this context, the charging of interest became an explicit vehicle of moral instruction, which was licensed in part as marking the ontological difference between ourselves and God, who through the gift of Grace can save people without requiring anything in return – which in turn explains the disdain with which Calvinists held the idea that one could achieve salvation on one's own solely through good works, as if divine approval could be purchased.

An important academic legacy of this conception of interest reflects the fact that Bologna University was legally constituted by *both* teachers and students. Here I mean to recall the principle of academic freedom for students (Humboldt's *Lernfreiheit*), whereby teachers do not restrict access to knowledge but allow students to study whatever they choose (including the decision as to whether attend lectures at all), in return for which the students then sit examinations where they demonstrate whether they have used their time productively – that is, in addition to whatever the students may have learned for themselves in the academic year, they must also return responses to specific questions, which constitute the intellectual equivalent of interest on a loan. The payment of this 'interest' reinforces the teachers' belief in the value of what they have taught because the students have out of their own volition acquired access to the relevant knowledge.

THE UNIVERSITY'S SUBTLE POLITICAL ECONOMY: THE PURSUIT OF POVERTY

If universities are to remain universities in the sense originally laid down by the Bolognese lawyers, they should not reduce their demands on the larger society, even in times

of economic downturn. This proposal is not meant as an affront to economics. The efficiency savings of academia occur downstream from the activities of the universities themselves. In this light, universities may be the most consistently performing products of long-term capital investment, especially if one is inclined to think about 'investment' in society as a whole and the economy specifically in exactly the same terms. Why? In a slogan, the university's unique institutional mission is *to manufacture knowledge as a public good through the creative destruction of social capital*.

The new knowledge produced by original research is an instance of social capital formation. It results from academics and funders collaborating on projects that aim to increase the competitive advantage of each in their respective domains. Left at this stage, knowledge is simply intellectual property, access to which is restricted to paying customers. However, universities also have an institutional mandate to teach. This forces knowledge to be made more widely available, thereby breaking the effective monopoly that researchers and their funders would otherwise enjoy.

'Creative destruction', the phrase that the economist Joseph Schumpeter introduced to define entrepreneurship, aptly describes this process. Once teaching reduces, if not eliminates, the original competitive advantage associated with a piece of research, academics and their funders are forced to seek new sources of advantage by producing new knowledge. In the process, the larger public – those not involved in the original production of new knowledge – benefit through classroom instruction. In this sense, the heart of the university is located in its curriculum committee, as the mechanism by which research is regularly translated into teaching, generating new cycles of creative destruction.

Efficiency-minded knowledge managers nowadays say

that the very idea of the university as a place where the same people produce and distribute knowledge is a throwback to the Middle Ages. Today teaching is thus said to be more efficiently delivered on-line and research best delivered through dedicated 'science parks'. However, the sense of 'efficiency' that attracted the mendicant Christian orders, the Dominicans and Franciscans, to staff the original universities was rather different but no less relevant today.

The Dominicans and Franciscans literally lived by begging – that is, by depending on diverse sources of income, whose return to any particular investor was always unclear. The autonomy of these orders rested on a proven long-term ability to do more than expected with what they were given. The Latin word for this ability was *povertas*, or 'poverty' in English. While the word does not retain its original virtuous connotations, we still warm to the virtue of 'doing more with less'. In the case of the university, 'doing more with less' means allowing access to knowledge to students who lack the intellectual, political or fiscal resources that might have enabled them to produce it for themselves.

The two great mendicant orders pursued the virtue of poverty in their own ways, stressing complementary aspects of my Schumpeter-inspired view of knowledge as a public good resulting from the 'creative destruction of social capital'. The contrasting positions are illustrated in the chart below:

Order	FRANCISCANS	DOMINICANS
Public Good Phase	Creative destruction	Social capital formation
Preferred Academic Degree	Master of liberal arts (teachers)	Doctor of professions (researchers)
Economy of education	Labour-saving	Value-adding
Metaphysical basis for education	Replace body with mind	Extend mind over body
Poverty	End in itself	Means to an end

Universities perform their natural economic function when academics speak and write plainly, demystify jargon, present their ideas in alternative media and stress applications to domains that do not concern the academics themselves. In these ways academics enable knowledge to do maximum work at minimal cost to its recipients. Academic intelligence effectively overcomes the entropy normally involved in the translation of information to many recipients in time and space by compensating for potential misunderstanding by improved expression. In practice, students and other beneficiaries of academic knowledge may become as empowered as their teachers without having to exert so much of their own energy in the process. In sum, universities prove their worth if students find it easier to appropriate academic knowledge than the academics themselves originally did.

In the second half of this paper, I explore the origins and prospects of what I call the university's 'natural economic function', which consists of the movement of knowledge across media of expression. Along the way I develop a proposal for a renewed sense of 'general education' that brings the mediaeval conception of the university up to today's 'digital age'.

THE LIBERAL ARTS AS THE PRE-HISTORY OF GENERAL EDUCATION

The idea of 'general education' is an updated version of the 'liberal arts' associated with the original medieval universities. These institutions were essentially finishing schools for people who would make a living without others telling them how to use their hands. Thus, a premium was placed on the communication of knowledge through the ultimate hands-free medium, speaking. Writing was also taught as a discretionary manual activity – i.e. one did more than sim-

ply copy words; one also wrote down one's own thoughts, a practice that became increasingly important as the centuries wore on. The curriculum of not only the trivium – logic, grammar and rhetoric – but also the quadrivium – arithmetic, geometry, astronomy and music – could be understood as disciplined applications of speaking and writing.

The content areas of the original liberal arts would be regarded as restricted by today's standards (e.g. the Bible, Aristotle, Ptolemy, etc.) but what made the experience truly 'educational' was that it imparted to students a facility in translating one's thinking (i.e. living as a spiritual being) into various media of public expression. Thus, *Homo sapiens* was trained up into a proper human being by acquiring the freedom to move between media – and hence not remain restricted to one mode of embodiment. It is not by accident that Marshall McLuhan, a practising Roman Catholic, and the generation of scholars who followed him (e.g. Walter Ong, SJ) who promoted the idea of media as 'the extensions of man' were steeped in the medieval liberal arts and especially sensitive to the implications of technological innovations like the movable type printing press and television for our capacity to embody thought.

The most important dimension that the modern 'Humboldtian' university added to this conception of liberal arts was *Bildung* as the goal of instruction. In other words, the student was to think of him/herself as engaged in a journey of personal development that followed the path of inquiry that others had previously taken – with the ultimate goal of superseding them in 'Enlightenment'. To be sure, this idea was already present amongst the Franciscans who staffed the original medieval universities (e.g. St Bonaventure) but it was regarded as verging on heresy, insofar as it seemed to imply that the curriculum could be organised in such a way

that in the end one could reach intellectual union with God.

In its modern secular guise, *Bildung* has encouraged the teaching of content areas in a rationalised historical mode, whereby one starts in the distant past with deep but unwieldy questions of existence, which over time are logically refined and empirically qualified to produce a variety of perspectives that can be taken forward into future as each student sees fit.

This capsule history of the liberal arts is meant to justify two features of the proposed General Education curriculum:

It should be based on skills that enable the translation of content between different expressive media. While these skills must continue to include speaking and writing, they also need to include the technologically enhanced 'digital' media through which content is increasingly conveyed.

The content should be presented historically so as to enable an understanding of how various translations came to be proposed, the trials they faced and the responses that resulted. However, for all academic disciplines – including the professions – to contribute to this endeavour, it is essential that the content areas be broadly defined and alternative historical trajectories allowed in framing the content.

ADAPTING GENERAL EDUCATION TO CONTEMPORARY NEEDS

The revival of the general education curriculum would demonstrate the advantage of a university education as such in a time when its 'value added' character is increasingly questioned. 'GenEd' extends beyond vocational training to training for life itself – especially a life in which one is expected to change jobs every few years. In fact, GenEd is not unfairly seen as training for (*pace* Max Weber) 'life as a vocation'.

Current debates over the import of new digital media provide a useful frame of reference for discussing this matter. Much of the discussion revolves around *disintermediation*, that is, the removal of the various layers of experts and expertise – both academic and technical – between people and the information they wish to acquire or produce. Blogging, YouTube, wiki-media, interactive simulations and open source programming exemplify different aspects of this phenomenon, which together potentially undermine the authoritative position of universities.

At the same time, even supporters of disintermediation realise that it raises problems relating to what digital media people call *curation*, that is, the transfer of content from one medium to another, since as more people from different backgrounds enter the knowledge system, both the form and the content of knowledge are bound to change and diversify more rapidly. Content may thus be easily ghettoised, needlessly duplicated or unwittingly lost altogether.

Over the centuries, universities have periodically appealed to their curatorial function to reassert their societal relevance. Traditionally they curated by integrating disparate bodies of knowledge under a common philosophical system that effectively constituted an intellectual lingua franca, as in the great idealist schemes that characterised the revival of the German university. In this context, all forms of knowledge could be understood as combinations or subdivisions of certain fundamental categories or principles.

However, starting in the mid-19th century, curation took a new turn as the laboratory-based disciplines entered the university. It was in this context that the Cambridge natural theologian William Whewell coined 'scientist' in the 1830s to name a profession that required university training. We now take Whewell's innovation for granted as the 'scientific

method', a procedure that enables the translation of speculative, typically philosophical hypotheses into the terms of experimental testing, the results of which are then recorded as moments of scientific progress.

The significance of this innovation should not be underestimated. Before Whewell, the production and distribution of natural scientific knowledge was irregular because it could only be accessed through membership in private clubs like the Royal Society, matriculation in makeshift mechanics colleges or else journalistic reportage of the more striking or lucrative findings and inventions. After Whewell, it was gradually expected that academic courses would grant students from varied backgrounds access to forms of knowledge that might otherwise remain restricted to those embedded in the right socio-economic networks.

In more strictly academic terms, Whewell's innovation served at once to legitimise the emerging special sciences and to keep the traditional liberal arts from slipping into obscurity. Translated into pedagogy, the claim was that the technical and mechanical arts could not be properly understood, conveyed or developed without the ability to cast one's specialist activities in traditionally humanistic terms – that is, disciplined speech and writing. Perhaps unsurprisingly Whewell was also instrumental in establishing the British Patent Office.

The *textbook*, with its structured order of learning, might be the most lasting legacy of Whewell's move to incorporate the distinctive techniques and media of the special sciences while preserving those of the liberal arts. Again, the significance of combining visual and textual representations in a hybrid medium should not be underestimated. Textbooks provided a common conveyance for literary and non-literary sources of knowledge. Just as text was no longer solely chas-

ing text, an original medieval practice still common in most of the humanities, so too craft-based knowledge required for experimental design was no longer treated as inherently 'tacit' and hence subject to esoteric rites of apprenticeship.

Digitally based media now need to be channelled into the mainstream of academic knowledge production and distribution. An increasing amount of scientific knowledge is produced and tested on computer simulations, and more general knowledge is produced and consumed in video form. Left to their own devices, these media have already and will continue to be cultivated ad hoc, often through technical training courses that are only sporadically in contact with the people and media through which academic knowledge is normally conveyed.

There is already a generation of successful people in their 40s and 50s – Bill Gates and Quentin Tarantino readily come to mind – who are digital virtuosos without exhibiting any of the competences associated with either the arts or the sciences, as they have been conventionally understood. These digital virtuosos stand to contemporary higher education in much the same way as, say, Henry Ford and Thomas Edison did a century ago: In both cases, we are faced with people who are in the vanguard of wealth creation, cultural recognition – and knowledge production – who appear to owe virtually nothing to academic modes of thought.

In response, GenEd would not only equip students to contribute reflectively to the intellectual migration to digital media that Gates and Tarantino exemplify but also reassert academia's own centrality to the curation of knowledge as a public good. But one implication is that the university itself will need to engage in *self-disintermediation*, to coin a term that probably sounds more graceful in German. The policy amounts to the academic equivalent of the 'my enemy's en-

emy is my friend'. Whatever deep differences might exist between the arts and the sciences are eclipsed by the rift that currently exists between those in and out of tune with the emerging digital media – and academics are the ones out of tune.

Harvard President James Bryant Conant introduced GenEd in 1946 to ensure that all students become familiar with all bodies of knowledge. But he was especially keen that arts students become 'connoisseurs' (his term) of natural scientific knowledge, such that they could pass judgement on the viability of new scientific projects, based on their general knowledge of how science has been done. While Conant failed to convince other universities to follow his lead, he impressed one Harvard physicist, Thomas Kuhn, who sometimes substituted for Conant in his own course. Kuhn went on to write the most influential account of scientific inquiry in the second half of the 20th century, *The Structure of Scientific Revolution* (1962).

At the dawn of the 21st century, GenEd should similarly cultivate connoisseurship in all the media through which knowledge is conveyed, now also encompassing digital media. Connoisseurship in this sense consists of two sorts of skills:

1. General features of the craft of translating ideas from one medium to another, in terms of the constraints and choices available.

2. Editorial selections made within a particular medium to enhance or inhibit various effects, both intended and unintended.

These skills are best presented as having undergone a process of development, as illustrated by case histories.

THE BASIC PROPOSAL:

- In the first of a three-year undergraduate degree, students would take 2 GenEd modules and 2 specialist modules.
- The teachers for the GenEd modules would be drawn from across the university, including the professional schools.
- Each year the GenEd courses would be organised about a theme (e.g. 'the environment', 'value') whose both timeless and topical character would enable all faculties to contribute courses that tailor the theme to their respective disciplinary strengths.
- Each GenEd module would aim for connoisseurship in one or more media in terms of the year's general theme, as presented in historical perspective.
- Students would be required to have both old and new knowledge media represented in their GenEd module selection.
- 'Old media' focus on speaking and writing, but interpreted broadly to including theatre and various academic and public rhetorical contexts.
- 'New media' focus on those with a digital basis, ranging from computer simulations to audio-video productions.
- A particular module may be co-taught by staff with expertise in old and new media around the year's common theme.
- Students would have an opportunity to pursue the issues raised in the GenEd modules as final year dissertations that may count for as much as half the year's marks.
- There may be an opportunity to change specialist major at the end of the first year, in light of the GenEd experience.

Higher Education as a Key to Further Development Lessons from the Arab World

Mostafa Abdel-Razek Saleh Hashem, Secretary General
The Association of Arab Universities

The 1960's witnessed a significant increase in the number of universities in developed countries and developing countries as well. This growth continued in the following decades and has not shown any slowdown since then.

The Arab countries have experienced the same phenomenon and the number of universities rose from a total of 20 in 1960 to 32 in 1969 and around 395 in 2008. In fact, some Arab countries did not have any universities in 1960. One other phenomenon that characterised the development of higher education in the Arab world is the growth of private universities, especially during the last decade where the number of these institutions grew in a short period from a handful mainly in Lebanon to a total of forty spread out in a number of Arab countries.

The number of students enrolled in higher education institutions followed the same trend. Whereas the number was 137,000 in the year 1960, it grew to 400,000 in 1970 and to 1,300,000 in 1980 and has reached now a total of 7.2 mil-

lion students. The main cause for this rapid increase in the number of students is the high rate of population growth in the Arab world, which is around 2.5% as compared to that of the world as a whole, which is around 1.5%.

These trends have created the following challenges:

1. The need to establish new universities to meet this ever-increasing demand or to increase the number of students in the available universities, which is not a practical solution. The option of establishing new universities requires substantial financial allocations.

2. The need for large numbers of qualified faculty members and staff to meet the needs of this growth. Unfortunately, in many cases there were no programmes for staff development, which led to a critical shortage of qualified staff. It is estimated that almost double the number of the currently available staff is required in order to have a reasonable student staff ratio.

3. The growing amounts of required funding to cover the cost of university education. In 1970, the financial support of Arab universities by their governments was US $307 million. It reached US $9.6 billion in 1996, which is about 1.3% of the total national income of Arab countries during that year. The financial outlays required are increasing rapidly and governments are beginning to feel the heavy burden of meeting these demands.

4. A number of economic, social and political challenges resulted from globalisation and new information technologies. They also resulted in the appearance of new patterns and methods of education such as open and distance education in addition to education through the Internet and other new technologies. Such developments and changes require a continuous re-evaluation of the educational system and methodologies. Also, a redefinition of priorities needs to be

made, whereby education becomes of primary importance. These new types provide a partial solution. For example, some socio-cultural factors have been identified as being responsible for low female enrolment in some parts of the Arab countries as well as the difficulties facing some males living in remote villages to access education due to poverty and mobility factors. These new technologies offer education for the sake of education rather than education that is related to labour market or to social and human development. In addition, most new patterns in education tend to focus on humanities rather than scientific fields.

As the financial crisis started, experts throughout the world found out that one of the solutions would be to increase the general governmental expenditures on launching new schools, universities, hospitals and infrastructure projects. This solution would have a noticeable affect in decreasing unemployment by labour – intensive investment and at the same time providing society with needed services. Therefore, this adopted solution has benefited people in particular rather than the states themselves.

Challenges facing the Arab World increased after the crisis. The rapid population growth, the growing demand on education, and the need for employment opportunities are major challenges. Countries in the Middle East and Africa have large proportions of young adults and children as per statistics 60% of Arab population are under 20, whereas in most developed countries the majority have old or "aging" populations. The population's age structure affects how that population lives.

The public sector was traditionally the main source of financial support for universities in the Arab world until the latter part of the 1980's when the private sector was allowed to finance and administer higher education institutions. This

trend was accelerated in the 1990's and by the year 1996 private universities constituted 28% of the total number of universities in the Arab world. It is expected that the trend will continue and a greater percentage of universities will be privately financed and administered. Previously, some Arab countries did not even allow private investments in this field. After the crisis, it became vital that private provision in education should intensify in the future.

Arab countries vary greatly in the level of expenditures on higher education. The percentage of the national income allocated for higher education in 1996 ranged from 0.3 in some of the Arab countries to 3.4 in others, and the overall percentage for all Arab countries in the same year was 1.25. The range in industrialised countries is from 0.7% to 2.1%. However, the average cost per student in Arab universities for the same year was US $2444, which is significantly below that in the industrialised countries where the number may reach about US $40,000. Thus substantial allocations must be made in a number of Arab countries to support higher education and to upgrade its quality.

There is an increasing awareness in the Arab region of the need to invest in higher education, and in the training of personnel and of staff. During the last decade, some Arab states, that previously did not allow the establishment of private universities, such as Libya, Syria and some Gulf states, opened the door to private stakeholders in a step to broaden access to higher education. The increase in numbers of private universities is expected to further go up. The private enrolment share reaches the highest value in Lebanon, more than 49%, then Jordan (25%), and Egypt (around 17%). It is worth mentioning that Private universities give the students the chance to pursue their own interests freely, whereas in public universities, admission is based on their grade point

average. However, the expansion of private provision is expected to create a negative impact on equity of higher education opportunities.

It is worth mentioning that after the September 11 attacks, the number of Arab students travelling abroad for education has dropped. New providers appeared on the scene in the form of private institutions financed by the local market or in partnership with US-American or European institutions. There was a need to transmit foreign universities to the Arab region to facilitate the provision of education services for students in their home countries. Undoubtedly, foreign investments in Arab countries will grow further during the coming years.

Programmes of study currently offered by private institutions tend to be concentrated on new subjects that are not available at government universities and at the same time tend to meet the global market. Having diverse choices, the quality of knowledge generated within higher education institutions, and its accessibility to the wider economy is becoming increasingly critical to national competitiveness. Such choices have advantages such as increasing access to higher and adult education programmes, developing higher education and research, increasing mobility of students and competitiveness which will positively affect the quality of education. At the same time there will be a fear of losing control over higher education through foreign dominance, and the inability of national systems to compete in global systems and with foreign providers.

This coupled with the reduction of the public sector needs for university graduates, either as a result of saturation or due to privatisation of some of the functions that were traditionally handled by the public sector. This led in many countries to serious unemployment conditions among university graduates.

Due to the emerging of new trends and the availability of various options for students, it has become imperative to monitor the quality of these options. It is vital to set up national mechanisms which can address accreditation and quality assurance procedures for the academic programmes of new and foreign providers. Indeed, upgrading and reforming higher education systems is costly and this is another challenge. That is why international and regional quality assurance agencies are being established all over the world. The focus on new concepts such as institutional autonomy, governance, accountability and academic freedom is a priority concern for Arab countries in order to respond to labour market needs and to launch reform projects.

These concepts are implemented in a positive way in Arab countries as a means of improving the quality and efficiency of higher education through competitive development. Higher education will be judged in terms of outputs and the contributions it makes to national development.

This development is beginning to reflect in a positive direction in the region. Taking into consideration the admiration of the Western model of education, in particular that of the U.S., newly emerging private universities began to work in accordance with these new concepts and are precisely being taken into effect in private universities because they seek to prove themselves, especially that public universities are more or less stable. But at present, public universities are looking forward to achieve university autonomy and more academic freedom.

To succeed, many changes and amendments to regulations and laws in Arab countries should be undertaken. As a government service unit, a public university has limited autonomy and has to comply with all prevailing regulations applied for a government service unit. On the other hand, private universities have more freedom and autonomy as they are financially independent.

Arab countries need to face these challenges. Sooner or later they will be forced to commence reform plans to ensure equity, quality and efficiency to both public and private institutions within a regulatory framework that introduces incentive mechanisms and grants some degree of autonomy.

Finally, the current crisis may be a good opportunity for Arab countries to restructure their economies, to upgrade, adjust, and improve the efficiency of resource allocation. It is the suitable time to invest in infrastructure and achieve a long-term and sustainable development at a higher level.

Conclusions from the Working Groups

Anne Corbett,
Roberto Grandi,
Koen Geven,
Robert Quinn,
Aleksa Bjeliš

In the first working group, naturally, there were a very large number of questions asked and most of them were impossible to answer. There were three themes and perhaps two conclusions can be drawn. The first theme was a bit odd, as the title of the session was "*How can universities contribute to solving problems caused by the crisis?*", actually, most of the time was spent on "How can universities be helped at a time of crisis?".

How it should be done? There were several answers as to how universities might be helped. One was based on the experience of the former Rector of Leuven University. He had a number of detailed suggestions but the general conclusion has been that there is a need for a good advocacy and it is helpful to be in a small region where the university weighs heavier. Another important answer was that universities need to adopt more entrepreneurial practices. The University of Leuven has adopted the so-called Triple Helix Model, the interconnection of teaching and research and service to the

community. Quite clearly there is a lot of experience about how universities interact with their regions, with local business and how this does indeed help local society. Several speakers pointed out that autonomy was always a rather double-edged weapon and particularly claiming more autonomy at a time of financial crisis, means getting the freedom to manage but not getting the resources.

The second theme was on the solutions coming from the universities. This naturally led to many discussions about the Bologna Process and some of the items Andrew McIntosh was referring to. But what a number of people were also saying was that there are actually different crisis. Not all of the signatories to the Magna Charta are suffering the same sort of crisis. In effect, a crisis that really hits universities in some countries, and particularly in developing countries, would be that of brain-drain. That discussion led to the third theme, which is answering the question "what can universities contribute to solving problems caused by the crisis?". Of course, it is a very short answer and applies particularly to North American and Western European universities, which is to revise their economics curricula. There was also an implicit call for the Magna Charta Observatory to increase the numbers of those who are signing up for common values. But if the crisis has the implications that Andrew McIntosh was spelling out about the raise in unemployment, there is a necessity for large cyclical spending despite the likelihood of reduced public expenditure. Latvia has had its education budget reduced by 30%, which led to many social equity questions that universities and the government face. Perhaps there is only one answer about what universities can do. They have to try to improve their image across to the public, which does not necessarily seem to have been very successful in recent times. The universities are not privileged and

special institutions at this time. However, they can produce a kind of knowledge and a kind of critical thinking that makes for creative people. Perhaps ultimately what universities can do in difficult times is to have those people in leadership positions who are creative, who are able to make universities responsive and imaginative.

The theme of the second working group was "*Dying of species – the Darwinism of academic disciplines*". There were debates about academic disciplines and the structure of universities facing new social demands. The debate arose from the point of view of the content, of the management, of the organisation of university, and of the level of different geographical and institutional situations. Of course, the starting point was the model of our university, the Humboldtian model, where teaching relates to research, and the academic disciplines were created in this link.

The first point of the debate was the establishment of disciplines and there seems to be a difference in the way in which the traditional disciplines were created and the way in which new disciplines are created. The traditional way was clear, it was from one discipline to another one, more or less directly, like, for instance, sociology derived from philosophy or as a separation, a specialisation, as restructuring of a common field that is giving rise to specific new branches. A third way is practicing research with some field of activity, for instance the creation of new disciplines like management. By working in a certain kind of area, sub-disciplines are established like marketing.

However, there are also other ways to create disciplines. There might be less academic reasons but for instance political or promotion reasons that lead to the establishment of certain disciplines. There was an example where Chemical

Engineering was changed into Chemical Biological Engineering. The teaching is the same but it just sounds more up-to-date. For reasons of promotion and prestige, in Europe, each city wants its own university and this leads to the fact that the universities have to create more and more courses. This is happening in different countries and the reason why there is an explosion of universities in Europe and beyond.

Another point is what are academic disciplines used for? Of course, for the production of knowledge, for the dissemination of knowledge. But the disciplines are also created because of the influence of scientific committees at the national, as well as at the local level. What are these scientific committees doing? Primarily, they choose; there is a choice of the researchers in terms of disciplines. However, they also operate as lobbies and thereby increase the power of disciplines for reasons different other than academic.

Hence, there are some good and some bad usages of committees that are based on disciplines. Universities are, in any case, centred around academic disciplines. Faculties, departments and courses are based on the disciplines. Often it could be noticed that if there is a course where something is not working well, instead of rethinking the basis, the paradigm of disciplines, other disciplines are added. Therefore, in the courses of history there is a little bit of sociology, geography, archaeology, etc. Hence, sometimes disciplines are added instead of rethinking the original discipline. The organisation of the university is based on disciplines and it worked well until ten or twenty years ago. Now this system is not that efficient anymore because at that time the university was much more focused on the elites. The new social demand from the university is to equip students with competences so that they are ready to get a job or to do something more useful for society. That led to a contradictory relation between

the new social demands and the organisation of academia based on disciplines. There are changes, multidisciplinary courses, market oriented courses. The traditional organisation changes, for instance different content of the courses, their duration, etc. There is on the one side a re-composition of academic branches; on the other side there is pressure to place the different disciplines one against the other.

The working group discussed some further related problems. One of them was the identity of a professor who is professor of a discipline and was trained to be professor of a discipline in a world where there is a necessity of multidisciplinary. There are also problems inside the discipline creating problems of identity: who am I as a researcher? Another problem exists with regard to the interdisciplinary flow that is happening at the level of university and the top-down decision of the Ministers of education, that are not seldom contradictory. Also, it becomes problematic when some disciplines are imposed by the government. The governments in some countries impose certain disciplines inside the courses, of course out of ideological believe. The need to reorganise the universities that are traditionally built on disciplines is evident, yet very difficult to realise. It is a thin line between reforming this kind of organisation and putting in place a new form of organisation, which is not merely market-oriented but rather one that corresponds more adequately to the current challenges. There is a need to balance between the critical mass of a discipline (without a critical mass a discipline cannot be a discipline) and the necessity of quality in research and teaching.

The third working group discussed the issue of "*Private or state influence on academic programmes: a threat to freedom?*" This topic already started being addressed by some of

the previous speeches. Both the public and the private sectors can influence the mission of higher education and thus university autonomy. Universities should be responding to outside demands whilst carrying out their mission and respect the public values. Indeed both the private sector and the state could have influence on the university, which can decrease its autonomy in different ways. There is fear within universities that the private sector, when investing in higher education, could slowly start to creep up and overtake its mission, while the state, in some cases, can try to impose its ideology and convince the university to reproduce the dominant ideology. It was also noted that the state is trying to actively define the subjects in universities. Hence, one has to ask who is the biggest enemy? Is there one enemy? In fact this depends strongly on the political context in which universities are operating, on the country that they are operating in and also the history of the country. For instance, it is very different to speak about the state influence in countries formerly part of the Soviet Union and other countries. However, both the state and the private sector can in fact be friends. Universities should not necessarily think of them as enemies, but should rather find a way in which they can proactively approach the outside world and engage with them in a cooperative dialogue, treating them as potential groups for cooperation.

When discussing this issue in the context of the financial crisis one is immediately faced with the problem that it is hard to really assess. We are not yet fully aware of the implications of the financial crisis on higher education today. However, it is already visible that there are, now at the start of this academic year, severe problems. At least from that side it seems that the crisis would have a direct impact on the finances of the university, which might also affect the issue of university autonomy and academic freedom.

Looking at possible solutions, it is important to realise that there is no one-size-fits-all solution for this topic. When discussing the question of who is funding universities, it was said that there should be multiple sources of income for them. Indeed this would lead to a situation in which a university is not just dependent on one actor. Thus, there is also not one standard setting institution for the university, who can define and threaten the university with withdrawing funding if it does not act according to the funder's wishes. However, this is of course a contextual issue because, depending on who invests and which actors the university engages with, a different balance of power could emerge.

This is something that is interesting from, not only a political science perspective, but the very concrete perspective that a university is working in. Whilst one of the dangers is that still those actors could threaten the universities' mission, there is a need to define more precisely what the mission of a given university is and how to use the funding that comes from different sources to make sure that the mission is adhered to. When multiple actors are involved in funding they might have different interests for doing so. Hence, there is a need for making sure that the fundamental mission of the university is still kept.

It might be very interesting if authorities would sign the Magna Charta, or if ministers would declare to uphold and support the values of the Magna Charta, meaning that they would very publicly say: we will not hurt your university autonomy and academic freedom. The practical effects of such words – decreasing detailed regulations – could be manifold, for example with regard to the content of curricula. In some cases a university, in a certain context, would not be strong enough to engage with the private sector or the state directly. Therefore, it could help if there would be a strong (national)

representative who could interact on behalf of the universities and thus create a stronger leverage in funding negotiations.

It is also important to look at what kind of role the Magna Charta Observatory could play in dealing with these issues. It seems clear that in the process of globalisation and especially in times of crisis an institution, which is promoting values on an international level and which is influencing international discourses, could play a very important role to continue promoting the proactive standards that universities can adopt and thereby promote solutions by upholding university autonomy and academic freedom.

The topic of the fourth working group was "*Business and economic studies, academic freedom and ethics*" and this is of course within the lands of the current crisis or the recent crisis. The interlocutor, Stefano Zamagni, started by pointing out that there has been an explosion of business studies over the last thirty years. This growth was in parts the result of the force of globalisation. The very significant transition from the larger Humboldtian model to the release of the Lisbon model and the consideration of universities as international and no longer national entities implies that also civil society and not just the state have a role in supporting the university.

The cooperation between the university and the business sector is much more expected, much deeper now than it had been and the university is now a mass or a popular educational experience. It is no longer an elite institution as it used to be. This transition did occur before this crisis and had itself consequences. The research process transformed from more cooperative to more competitive. Nowadays, individual staff are isolated and competing against each other, departments are competing against each other and institutions are competing against each other. This has fractured the sector in a way that

makes it weaker and harder for it to resist some of the challenges in terms of research content. The research content became subject to its marketability as opposed to the academic desire of the institution.

In some way the economic studies community has had a role in contributing to the crisis, both in its academic products that it delivered and how those are used by the commercial and the policy sector. About two years ago, it was evident that things were in a difficult place and could lead to a crisis. The business and economic sector at the university either did not or failed to effectively communicate warnings. Is there a responsibility, how should the sector have behaved and how would we like to see it improved for the future?

Despite focussing the discussion to the business and economic sector, a similar discussion about many other or in effect all other disciplines in the university could take place. It would be possible to discuss biological sciences and ethical considerations. One could ask what products are they putting out and what are the ethical consequences. It is unsustainable to have a sector that does not fully engage with the real world. There are two sets of value problems in this area.

One is erosion problems; erosions of the values and this already happened before the crisis. There was an erosion of academic freedom, university autonomy and the social responsibility function of universities. The transition to a Lisbon model, losing the original Humboldtian structure, left out any new structures that could put the values firmly in place. As a result, the sector was vulnerable to contributing to the crisis and lost its important function to warn or prevent. Because the values were not as strongly in place the power of the sector could not be mobilised.

In the second set of areas where there are problems related to academic freedom due to the reforms, it is indispensable to

come up with solutions for how to deal with them. There is an evident need for raising academic freedom, autonomy and social responsibility. Learning from this experience is warranted. Resources and funding are a major concern as part of the erosion problem. The competition for funding became more and more dynamic and the ability of the institution to focus on the values diminished. There must be a primacy on the public role in ensuring and developing the institution and the sector.

Within the institutions, there must be an understanding of the central value of pluralism and an openness to academic discourse on debate, which is not just a question of the individual scholars or that of scholars and the community but it is in the allocation of the resources. The departments and the university leadership have to make sure that the funds received are allocated in a way that is making sure that there is not just one dominant mode of thinking.

Certainly, in the area of economics and business one could argue that there was a dominant mainframe. It is very hard as a practical matter to find the resources to conduct research to test, challenge and argue against that dominant mainframe and this paves the way for a crisis like the one that we have just experienced. There has to be a more ethical and humanistic approach to all disciplines. In the business and economics sector we have seen that there is a purely mechanistic model for this area of practice. It can lead to the types of devastating consequences we have encountered. It is necessary to include more ethical components into the training.

Amongst the economists around the world, there have been arguments for an ethical code. They are aware of the consequences of what they are doing but that of course raises other issues if we try to impose some new content to the curricula. This might be considered as intervening with academic freedom and autonomy. It is a classical dilemma; on the one hand,

the apparent need to reform, on the other, the need to respect the values. Especially in this new era, there is a meaning for the inclusion of the values in the new model of the university. Isolation of the institutions of the disciplines, of the individual faculties was one of the major components of why the sector has problems resisting against big forces. Organisations like the Magna Charta Observatory are essential for ensuring these linkages especially across the distances and head off the traditional lines so that values are shared and there is ample room for discussing how to proceed concretely.

The fifth working group was addressing the issue of "*Are changes in university governance necessary as a reaction to economic challenges?*" There have been two major inputs. One is that economical changes in universities are always realised in view of present changes, not only in the economical sphere but also in others, e.g. social changes etc. The second input is that not all changes are coming from the outside, some changes are produced from inside, from within the universities. Terms or concepts like globalisation and competitiveness are not unknown to universities. It happens all around the world, maybe more profoundly at research universities, that the demand for competition is steadily on the rise.

Universities and the public need to remember that there are four main purposes of education: employability, active citizenship, personal development and maintaining a broad and advanced knowledge base. Unemployment is of course very critical but employability cannot be the only driver, especially not in times of crisis. In this context, the role of public authorities should be better recognised and defined. The accountability of public authorities could be very useful also for universities and this could define in a clearer manner the obligations of all partners in this process.

In some countries, the universities do not feel much of the crisis though due to all the stimulus packages and actions from both authorities and the universities themselves. On the other side, the situation in other countries is deteriorating significantly. Receiving more autonomy often means getting less funding from the state. In this situation, when trying to find the best ways of governance, it is difficult to find the balance between democracy and efficiency. In this context, also the importance of Boards of Trustees, particularly the presence of external members, needs to be looked at. There is a need to combine competence and democracy in the governance within universities, which should take due account of the four purposes of higher education, as students should be treated in a multidimensional and complex way. Students consume – in the affirmative sense, not in the pejorative sense – they are members of the academic community and finally they are sources of information. Hence, they should play also multiple roles in university gevornance.

Reactions to the Working Groups

Jairam Reddy, Consultant on Higher Education
South Africa

Through experiences gained from a range of contexts – having lived and worked in academia in Apartheid South Africa; subsequently chaired its National Commission on Higher Education appointed to transform the higher education landscape; consultant for higher education change in Africa, Russia, the Middle East, Afghanistan; chairind the Board of the United Nations University, Tokyo, Japan, I have come to distinguish three distinct contexts for any academic discourse.

First, Western Europe and North America or the developed world where universities operate in relatively stable democratic societies, are well resourced, in general efficiently and effectively run and where institutional autonomy and academic freedom are well established concepts and are respected both by the university and the respective governments. Participation rates are anywhere from 30-50% of the 18-21 year old age cohort eligible to enter university.

Second, a group of countries that are in transition – among them are Brazil, Russia, South Africa, India, China,

Singapore, Malaysia, South Korea. Many of these countries have emerged from long periods of conflict, repression and underdevelopment. Major socio-economic developments are underway in all sectors of society including the universities. Higher education institutions are trying to reassert the notion of institutional autonomy and academic freedom where these concepts have either been emasculated or severely attenuated. Participation rates in higher education may vary from 5-25% of the relevant age cohort eligible to enter universities.

Third, there are countries in the developing world – many in Africa and the Middle East, the former Soviet states, some in Latin America and others in deep conflict such as Iraq and Afghanistan. The lack of a democratic culture, authoritarian governments, deeply divided societies and underdevelopment are their characteristic features. Participation rates in higher education are anywhere from 10%. Governments are firmly in control of universities with regard to appointments, finances, management etc; institutional autonomy and academic freedom are alien concepts.

The globalised world in which we live is highly differentiated; countries are at very different levels of development with wide variations in higher education participation rates. Academic discussion and analysis must take these realities into account.

INSTITUTIONAL AUTONOMY AND ACADEMIC FREEDOM

Although these notions have endured for centuries, it remains a fragile concept in many parts of the world. Its enduring nature is dependent on the existence of democratic governments who respect the independence of universities in fulfilling their missions.

There are many definitions of institutional autonomy and academic freedom. In its simplest understanding, institutional autonomy means that universities are free to manage their operations including appointing staff, formulating and offering academic programmes, raising and managing funds without any outside interference. Academic freedom means for the university – who may teach, what may be taught, how it shall be taught, who may be admitted to study; it also includes the freedom to undertake research of one's choosing and to publish and disseminate the findings as widely as possible.

Conceptually, institutional autonomy and academic freedom are legal concepts and it is desirable for them to be included in the constitution of the country e.g., in South Africa it is so included under the Bill of Rights as one of many essential freedoms including the independence of the judiciary, freedom of the press and freedom of association. Under these circumstances it would be more difficult for governments or universities to subvert these essential freedoms.

These freedoms should, however, not be regarded as absolute but are circumscribed in the sense that they are to be balanced by accountability. It is a truism that academic research has always been subject to the scrutiny of peers e.g., of whether it should or should not be published in reputable journals. It is also entirely reasonable that universities should account to governments from whom they receive funds as to how theses funds have been utilised. In addition, quality assurance of all operations of universities has become a defining feature of modern universities[3].

In general, governments exercise a 'steering' function, but not control over universities by devolving responsibility

---

[3] National Commission on Higher Education (NCHE) of South Africa – A Framework for Transformation: (1996); pp 193-197

to independent governing boards. These boards exercise a fiduciary responsibility; on the one hand ensuring their institutional autonomy and academic freedom and on the other hand making them accountable for the financial management and quality of academic programmes.

The Magna Charta Observatory is a vital benchmark for the continuing existence and strengthening of institutional autonomy and academic freedom. The signatories of 662 universities worldwide, are testimony to this fact. The Observatory should continue to monitor these freedoms and to speak out whenever attempts are made to diminish them. It is wise to remember that they can be undermined both by external (usually governments) or internal elements (usually university administrators or boards).

SOCIAL TRANSFORMATIVE ROLE OF UNIVERSITIES

In the transitional countries alluded to above and to a lesser extent in the developing world, major socio-economic transformations are underway. Universities are expected to be a central part of these developments. Among them are the development of the appropriate human capital of high levels, skills and knowledge, providing access to an increasing number of university entrants and undertaking research for the solution of problems such as combating climate change. In addition universities have the responsibility of inculcating a new set of values in its young graduates – of nation building, of tolerance, democracy, justice, equity and critical citizenry. They are expected to accomplish these tasks with limited or even diminishing resources.

In their quest to meet these formidable challenges, universities need to engage with governments of the day, the corporate sector and civil society. As Castells has labelled the modern world as a network society, the building of part-

nerships to strengthen the capacity of universities to meet societal challenges is a crucial part of their mission[4].

A HOLISTIC APPROACH TO EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The educational sector comprises six sectors – preschool, primary, secondary, technical-vocational, university and continuing or life-long education. Of these the technical-vocational sector with enormous potential for contributing to education and training is often under resourced and neglected. The example of Afghanistan illustrates the point. By 2012 there will emerge 700,000 students from the secondary schools eligible to enter university. The universities could accommodate about 100,000 of this output. The public technical-vocational sector currently has capacity for 50,000 students. The fate of the remaining 550,000 with little employment prospects is grim indeed. Will they be recruited by criminal gangs, warlords, fundamentalists or drift along aimlessly? This is a problem of many developing countries characterised by the so-called "inverted pyramid". In the developed world the tech-voc sector is about double the size of that of the university sector whereas it is the reverse in the case of most developing countries.

The advantages of expanding and developing the tech-voc sector are:
- It costs considerably less to educate and train students than in the university sector
- It offers a range of qualifications from certificates, diplomas and associate degrees

4   Castells M (1993) The University System: Engine for Development in the New World Economy. In Ransom, A, Khoo, S-M, Selvaratnam, V (eds). Improving Higher Education in Developing Countries, World Bank, Washington

- It offers a wide array of courses and programmes – carpentry, plumbing, motor mechanics, television repairs, electricians, photography, cooking, computer studies, music, languages and a myriad of other courses.
- Open admissions make them highly accessible to the students and members of the community of all ages
- Many of the emerging graduates of the sector are ideally suited either to be employed or to develop the small, medium and microenterprises, one of the few sectors that is capable of generating significant levels of employment
- The better performing students can transfer to universities with credits being awarded for courses already completed
- Reverse transfer i.e., students who have completed a university degree in the humanities and social sciences can complement this with skills training of varying duration at the tech – voc college
- Griffith & Connor in the USA pointed out that at the turn of the century, only one out of four workers would require a bachelors degree – mainly in the professional fields such as law, engineering, medicine, while three out of four jobs require some form of post-secondary education[5]. Furthermore, workers will have to be constantly retrained for the emerging and competitive global economy. It is estimated that many of the jobs in the US economy are created by small businesses, estimated to be 18 million in 1994 and to grow to 25 million by the turn of the century.
- What contribution can universities make in developing this sector? There are at least three contributions of note:

[5] Griffith, M and Connor, A 1994. Democracy's Open Door, Boynton/Cook Publishers Inc.

- Training the teaching staff of the sector, often a severe constraint in its development
- Establish agreements with tech-voc colleges for transfer and reverse-transfer of their respective students
- Establish a Research Chair for Tech-Voc studies to undertake research to better understand the sector, diagnose weaknesses, identify strengths and find ways and means of promoting and developing the sector.

Developing countries in particular should take note of the importance of a holistic approach to education and pay particular attention to developing the technical-vocational sector as a major contribution of education and training skills for sustainable development.

SCHOLARSHIP REVISITED

In 1990, Ernest Boyer undertook an important study for the Carnegie Foundation entitled "Scholarship Revisited"[6]. A summary, analysis and application of his findings are highly relevant to the mission of contemporary universities. Historically, the core functions of universities comprised teaching, research and service. Research first took root in England in the 1870s and these reforms hoped to make Oxford and Cambridge a place of learning as well as of teaching. Scholarship includes a variety of creative work; its integrity lies in the ability to think, to communicate and to learn. Academics generally undertake research, publish and teach. Theory leads to practice and practice shapes theory. Teaching at its best shapes both research and practice. Scholarship includes research, looking for connections, building bridges between theory and practice, and communicating knowledge effectively to students.

[6] Boyer, E (1990) Scholarship Revisited, Carnegie Foundation

The Professoriate is in general involved in the pursuit of four scholarships:

• Discovery
• Integration
• Application
• Teaching

DISCOVERY: research is central to higher learning; knowledge for its own sake; freedom of inquiry; increases pool of knowledge; contributes to intellectual climate of university with phenomenal advances in medicine, astronomy, physics, chemistry etc.

INTEGRATION: interdisciplinary; interpretive; integrative; gives meaning to isolated facts; putting them into perspective; making connections across disciplines; illuminating data in a revealing way in order to make it comprehensible; interpret, draw together and bring to bear new insights on original research; through connectedness research is made more authentic; includes research across disciplines; what do research findings mean; leads to more comprehensive understanding; moving beyond traditional boundaries.

APPLICATION: apply knowledge to problem solving; can social problems define a research agenda; higher education must serve the interests of the larger community – e.g., land grant colleges in the USA; provides the equipment for service; professional schools connect theory and practice; one must differentiate social service and projects that relate to scholarship itself and must be tied to ones fields of specialised knowledge; must be serious and rigorous work; new intellectual understandings emerge from application; a dynamic interrelationship between application and knowledge; knowledge can no longer be confined to the "ivory tower" but must be of service to the world.

TEACHING: if defined as scholarship, teaching both educates and inspires future scholars; Aristotle said "Teaching is the highest form of understanding"; to teach properly is to be intellectually engaged and widely read; teaching brings understanding and aids student learning; pedagogical procedures should be planned, continuously examined and updated; stimulate active non-passive learning; encourage students to be critical, creative thinkers; inculcate the capacity for life-long learning; staff are also learning in teaching; teaching transmits knowledge as well as it transforms and extends it; inspired teaching keeps the flames of scholarship alive.

Boyer has described a more inclusive view of scholarship; knowledge is acquired through research, synthesis, practice and teaching; in the four scholarships, the intellectual functions are tied inseparably to each other; they dynamically interact to form an independent whole.

While it would be desirable for every academic to be proficient and willing to be involved in the pursuit of the four scholarships, the reality is different. There should therefore be space for academics to pursue one scholarship in preference to another e.g., some would be predominantly researchers, some would be predominantly teachers and yet others may have the inclination to pursue research and teaching to an equal degree. Universities should accommodate the varied interests of its academic staff in order to obtain the optimum results.

RANKING OF UNIVERSITIES

Rankings of universities are becoming increasingly popular across the world. Despite very differing methodologies and limited criteria by which universities are assessed, their place in becoming the yardstick of determining world-class universities is gaining acceptance.

The emerging concept of "world class universities" associated with rankings is a model that reflects the Ivy League, elite or ultra-elite institutions such as Harvard and Stanford in the USA and Oxford and Cambridge in the UK. Although there is much debate about what constitutes a world class university its essential features is captured by Niland: "A world-class university will be widely recognized as an eminent institution, as a place where top staff will wish to congregate. Given the chance, staff from other universities will migrate to the world-class university, and top faculty attracts top students. The process is auto-catalytic. This means that such a university almost certainly be a research-intensive university. It also must teach well. But first and foremost it is a place where people will want to spend time for the experience and to associate with the fame and respect that goes with this. Absolutely fundamental to building such a climate is the quality of the staff, especially the academic faculty members"[7].

This idea of ranking universities has captured the imagination of many especially in the developing world, an idea that is regarded as synonymous with excellence in research and scholarship. One commentator in the Middle East languishes the fact that not one Arab University features in the first 500 across the world. These rankings began about ten years ago to determine the effectiveness / quality of higher education institutions in the context of massification. They have been confined almost exclusively to the developed world although their reach is now widening to include more countries and more universities.

[7] Niland, J (1998). The Challenge of Building World-Class Universities in the Asian Region. A public lecture delivered at the national University of Singapore, 25 June

There are no fewer than 30 different rankings:
- Macleans, US News, World Report; Asia Week
- Times Higher Education Supplement (THES); Shanghai Jiao Tong University (SJTU)
- Research specific – New Zealand, UK
- MBA rankings – countless across the world
- The indicators usually include input, process and output variables. Some compare programmes, other institutions but rarely teaching. Their characteristics:
- Student entry qualifications
- Institutional resources – financial and other
- Staff qualifications – staff / student ratios
- Employment rates
- Research publications

Weighted arbitrary score for each cluster of indicators is awarded. At times there is a dramatic decline in rankings due to change in methodology e.g., Malaysia – two top universities slipped by 100 places. There is growing discontent with rankings e.g., Asia Week and Macleans with the result that many universities have boycotted them by refusing to provide data. Many question this Anglo Saxon exercise obsessed with competitiveness, intolerable infringement on universities' independence and flawed methodologies. Most successful institutions in rankings are from English speaking areas: SJTU – 2005: top 68 of 100 institutions in English speaking areas. Most are top research universities favoured. It excludes excellent undergraduate institutions and the process also favours elite institutions. There is no universal standard definition of quality. SJTU and THES rankings – only 42% appear on both lists; only one institution received the same ranking. Despite these shortcomings there is a passion for rankings! One benefit is that rankings stimulate dis-

cussion of critical issues affecting higher education e.g., in France. There was no research in the Grand Ecoles, the elite professional schools and therefore their rankings were low.

This seems to be based on esteem, prestige and reputation of universities and not on a rigorous appraisal of teaching, research, management etc[8]. Among essential features of universities that are not clearly evaluated are:

- The quality of teaching
- The mission of a university and its strategic plan to achieve those goals
- The alignment between its graduates and the workplace
- Equity targets in providing admission and support to women students, those who are physically challenged and minorities
- Transformative goals especially in transition countries – values such as nation building, tolerance, justice, respect for the other, democratic ideals etc

These rankings are likely to have a negative impact on universities in the developing world. Instead of responding to the developmental challenges in their specific countries, the quest for world-class universities is likely to distort the mission of these universities by responding to a narrow range of indicators that would push them up the ranking ladder. Given the limited resources of most universities in the developing world they should focus their mission on the needs and requirements of their specific societies for high level capacity building, relevant research and community engagement. Through the institution of quality assurance

[8] Marginson, S. (2007b). Global University rankings: implications in general and for Australia. Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, V 29, No 2, pp 131-142

systems based on a development trajectory, partnerships with other universities and the business sector, steady incremental change would serve them in good stead.

Furthermore, rather than aspiring for an ideal university type, the establishing of a diversity of institutions to meet the range of needs, specific contextual conditions and affordability should be the determinants for establishing a higher education system in these countries[9]. Among the university prototypes are – predominantly teaching universities, predominantly research universities, comprehensive universities incorporating both teaching and research, technological universities etc. In addition the technical-vocational sector should be developed in close association with universities to develop the mid-range skills so desirable in the developing countries.

Establishing a diversity of institutions to suit different contexts should be a desirable trajectory for developing higher education systems especially in the transitional and developing countries. The technical – vocational sector as a complement to the higher education sector is an important priority for producing the range of educational and training skills necessary for sustainable development. Instead of being concerned with the ranking of so-called world class universities, formulating rigorous but non-intrusive quality assurance systems would ensure a steady and incremental improvement of the quality of higher education graduates. The governance of universities must be underpinned by upholding institutional autonomy and academic freedom within the ambit of public accountability. The *Magna Charta Universitatum* is an important historical benchmark for

[9] Graham, G. (2005). The Institution of Intellectual Values. Realism and Idealism in Higher Education. Exeter, Imprint Academic

these freedoms and its increasing number of signatories is testimony to this fact. Continuing the Observatory's work as a human rights organisation, a think tank, an advisor and a monitor is essential for upholding what is eloquently stated in the Magna Charta itself: "To meet the needs of the world around it, its research and teaching must be morally and intellectually independent of all political and economic power". Expanding its future vision to include Central Asia, Latin America, North America and the Arab World is to be welcomed. The African continent should be included in this vision.

Reactions to the Working Groups

Monique Fouilhoux, Deputy General Secretary
Education International

In the context of the current scenario in which countries in Europe and the world have been overshadowed by first the financial, then the economic, crisis we must not remain unaware of the constraints and the negative consequences that such a crisis places upon universities and on all members of staff working within them.

There is a clear need for greater awareness of both the real impact and future threats posed by the global financial and economic crisis. In countries where such an impact has not yet been felt, there is a need to be open to the reality of looming problems and to *wake up* to the real possibility that the crisis will inadvertently affect universities in the same way that it has already affected most of the public sector across Europe.

Education International has witnessed the impact of the crisis across the education sector and on all types of teachers and staff within educational institutions. The situation is more severe in some countries, notably Ireland in Western Europe

and Latvia in Central and Eastern Europe. Since the beginning of the global financial and economic crisis, Education International has helped its affiliate education unions in combating the effects of the crisis and in campaigning for investment in quality public education as a key element in post-crisis regeneration. Education International's member organisations have discussed these issues at length, and have contributed to campaign materials by devising a strategy for teachers' unions to emerge from the crisis, by collecting good practice from across the Central and Eastern European region. In this respect, the higher education staff union from Croatia has provided a positive example on how higher education staff unions can ensure the best possible working conditions for staff in the post-crisis regeneration period. This is in stark contrast to what seems to be the rather relaxed attitude of universities in reaction to the dangers posed by the crisis.

Universities have a *key responsibility* and a *clear role* to play as educational institutions in designing solutions to the crisis. In particular, universities which provide a large number of financial and economic programmes notably MBAs – and which were somehow unable to predict that the crisis would take place are now in a position in which they carry a high responsibility to reform the mainstream thinking and principles usually inculcated in students of such programmes, and to instil in their students a sense of social responsibility and an awareness of the greater consequences of risks taken in the financial sector with the purpose of pure economic gain.

On a wider scale, universities have a strong role to play in negotiating with government authorities to ensure continued and sustainable funding for higher education, and, in turn, to secure access to all levels of higher education, in particular to students from poor socio-economic backgrounds.

Along the same lines, universities are also responsible for safeguarding academic freedom for their members of teaching or research staff, striving to guarantee, at the same time, the maintenance or improvement of higher education staff working conditions in order to ensure quality higher education for their students. It is only by means of quality higher education, offering the right mix of skills for the post-crisis regeneration period, that countries can hope not to have to face a crisis of this sort in the future.

In turn, it is crucial for universities to engage with teachers' trade unions, who, across the world, are working steadily to find solutions to the crisis and to ensure societal recovery both as workers in the public sphere, as well as a group which is key in developing the critical capabilities of students and in advancing knowledge and innovation in society. Our teacher and higher education staff unions are eager to work with universities, both in developing research on the effects of, and solutions to, the crisis as well as with the purpose of ensuring a clear path towards sustainable funding of public higher education.

Within the wider framework of society, universities are to strive both to safeguard their own autonomy as well as individual academics' academic freedom. This is a principle strongly enshrined both in the *Magna Charta Universitatum* and in the 1997 UNESCO *Recommendation Concerning the Status of Higher Education Teaching Personnel*. Academic freedom of higher education staff is both a right and a responsibility of academics in the wider context of societal development. It is important to realise that the trends towards greater privatisation and the drive towards efficiency under the pretext of 'doing more with less', which the crisis has created, lead to increased pressures on academics, in particular in the form of restricted time and funds for research.

Where budget cuts have taken place and where alternative funds have been sourced for university funding, academics find themselves in a situation in which their right to academic freedom is violated.

Education International works tirelessly on this issue. This year Education International produced its triennial report to CEART (the joint ILO/UNESCO expert committee on the recommendations concerning the status of teachers). Evidence in this report shows both how academic freedom can be compromised through measures taken by governments to counteract the impact of the global financial and economic crisis, as well as by the other State measures which at times impede academics' rights through the adoption of laws which directly or indirectly restrict academic freedom. The state can therefore be a threat to academic freedom; however at the same time it is the institution which needs to safeguard academic freedom and university autonomy in terms of legislation and enforcement of that legislation. Universities need to ensure that the state plays its role positively in safeguarding this key constitutive principle of higher education.

Also in relation to the principle of academic freedom as attested in the *Magna Charta Universitatum* and the mentioned 1997 UNESCO *Recommendation Concerning the Status of Higher Education Teaching Personnel*, universities are to enhance the value of democracy by sustaining their own democratic governance structures. It is crucial for both higher education staff as well as students to be adequately represented in all decision-making bodies within universities, and it is the responsibility of universities themselves to ensure that they avoid any trends towards having small 'management-type' boards composed of outsiders and completed disconnected from the everyday reality of the university.

In conclusion, we have to open our eyes, to wake up to the reality that is around us and to tackle head-on the manner in which the global financial and economic crisis is affecting higher education and universities themselves as both victims of this situation as well as key drivers to the solution out of the crisis. We have to work together with our teachers' trade union organisations, with the students and with the governing bodies of universities to ensure that our longstanding traditions of university autonomy, academic freedom and collegiate governance are not compromised by economic constraints posed by the crisis, and to ensure that current and future generations will have access to quality public higher education, which is crucial if we want to secure the prosperity and advancement of our societies in the future.

Universities and Regional Development

Dimitris Tsougarakis, Rector
Ionian University, Greece

Universities traditionally are thought to affect their region both in terms of economy and in terms of society. However, the notions of both what a University is and what constitutes regional development are undergoing change today, so a reconsideration of the relation between the institutions and their region is perhaps in order. But before coming to regional development, it seems appropriate to first examine briefly the evolution of the University, until it became the institution that we have all known.

Unlike the policies and theories of regional development, higher education can trace its roots back to ancient times. The predecessor of the modern university evolved from the cathedral and monastic schools of late medieval Europe. New places of study, known as *studium generale,* grew up to provide further training in law, medicine and theology. The decisive step was the organisation of masters and students into guild-like corporations (*Universitas Magistrorum et Scholarium*) and the granting of papal charters. This entitled them to

award generally recognised degrees and gave them a certain degree of independence and right to self-government, provided they shunned heresy and atheism. The first two institutions normally acknowledged as universities are the University of Bologna, and the University of Paris. These pioneers served as models for the new universities which soon followed in many other parts of Europe. It is claimed that the university, next to the Roman Catholic Church, is the oldest institution in the Western world with a continuous and unbroken history. The element of institutional stability, tradition and cultural inheritance is emphasised. As Clark Kerr noted, "[t]hey have experienced wars, revolutions, depressions and industrial transformations, and have come out less changed than almost any other segment of their societies" (Kerr, 1980: 9). He rightly pointed out that many of the institutions "are still in the same locations with some of the same buildings, with professors and students doing much the same things, and with governance carried on in much the same way".

The relationship between the universities and their local surroundings, however, could be strained. The university "was in the city, but not of it" (Brockliss, 2000: 164). On the one hand, renowned scholars would lend lustre to the city or town in which they operated. The universities attracted talented people, injected new ideas, enriched cultural life and strengthened the local economy. Masters and students should be lodged, fed and clothed, and medical professors ran their extrauniversity practices. The combination of vibrant cities and the trans-local networks brought in by the universities made cross-fertilisation possible. On the other hand, the new pluralism of intellectual life and the gathering of many foreign men with disparate backgrounds created tensions. The conflicts between 'gown' and 'town' are well-known. There were riots and confrontations between students and towns-

people and between scholars and local authorities. The coming of the Protestant Reformation and the rise of territorial states led to a new demand for an educated clergy and for university-educated lawyers. At the same time the universities were turned into places of vehement battles, following confessional and political cleavages. A new mental space was emerging. In places like Leiden, Geneva and Edinburgh, fresh initiatives were taken to redefine the orientation and identity of the universities. Here a new civic and humanistic spirit was introduced, strongly supported by enlightened cities and municipalities which undertook to rescue the universities. The development of new knowledge was given priority over the reproduction of authorised knowledge, which had been the scholastic mode of teaching.

In the end of the 18th and the beginning of the 19th centuries, of the many attempts to reorganise the universities, the Humboldtian reforms at the new University of Berlin, created in 1810, were epoch-making and soon came to serve as a model for university reformers all over Europe and even in America and Japan. The new idea of the university was to foster *Bildung* – the cultivation of man. This implied the enlightenment and progressive formation of personal character through general liberal education, which involved a search for knowledge, freedom of learning and teaching, and an institutional infrastructure conducive to such activities. This new social organisation of knowledge led to the emergence of the research university in late-nineteenth-century. The initiatives marked a special blend of philosophical idealism and practical *raison d'état*. However, the reforms resurrected the universities as prestigious places of learning and a new conception of scholarship and scientific work was introduced. Modern science, based on rational investigation, empirical observation and experimental methods, found a home in the university.

The rise of the research university has been described as "a denial of place" (Bender, 1998: 8). This is because the ideal of scientific enquiry is to strive for universalism. Thus, the evolution of the modern university is imbued with paradoxes: What made the university really useful to the issuant industrial society and the nation state were the steps taken towards autonomy, the unity of teaching and research, and the development of an institutional structure in which roles, norms and incentives were geared to the incessant generation, transmission and validation of secular knowledge.

After the Second World War the original regional policy was a government policy of equalisation within the nation's boundaries. It was the self-reinforcing growth processes in central areas that created a need for a compensatory effort in the lagging regions. The policy was aimed at 'the others' – the backward and disadvantaged. But during the past ten years regional policy is definitely different from the policy of old. Key questions were asked regarding the role of Universities:

• What policies, practices and mechanisms promote mobilisation of higher education for regional and city development?
• How to make reforms happen?
• Which brings greater benefits to cities and regions: a high performing regionally focused HE system or a single world class university?

Now that the territorial frame of reference and player focus have changed, each individual region has assumed responsibility for its own development. In order to construct regional knowledge-based advantages, the geographical clustering of activities in city regions is generally supported. The policy deliberately aims to promote diversity. Regional policy

has to a high degree become a regionalised innovation policy.

The link between innovation and region was clearly reinforced by the escalation of EU regional policy of the late 1980s. After the Single European Act was signed in 1986, the Structural Funds were reformed in 1988 and their size doubled between 1987 and 1993. The strengthening of EU regional policy was intended to counterbalance the geographical inequalities which were expected to follow in the wake of economic integration. The aim of the inter-regional transfers was to accelerate the long-term restructuring of less-developed areas. At the same time, the programmes were part of the political construction of Europe, a new alliance between the EU Commission and the regions, built around tangible and visible projects with a European dimension.

Universities' purposes are intimately related to knowledge, learning and innovating – universities create new knowledges, challenge existing knowledge, diffuse and circulate that knowledge, exchange it with other academics, transfer it to businesses and teach it to students. However, universities are nowadays operating in a very different environment to that which they hitherto operated, and those trends are having profound consequences on the impacts that higher education institutions can have and are having on what we call human capital (which is something different from what was traditionally called "labour force"). Marketisation, globalisation/ regionalisation, the rise of the network society and shifting underlying social values are changing the ways in which universities perform this core function of raising human capital.

There is increasing emphasis on providing access to previously excluded groups, widening access to higher-level educational experiences that do not necessarily produce a formal degree qualification. At the same time, the pressures

of globalisation and regionalisation are encouraging a degree of harmonisation within the sector; the rationale behind the Bologna Process is that mobility between institutions is an effective way of encouraging greater human mobility within Europe. Within this, there is an implicit acknowledgement that the system functions through upgrading human capital, providing opportunity for individuals to move upwards and to improve themselves.

An interesting tendency that clearly can be observed in Europe is how innovation policy is becoming ever more comprehensive. New topics and layers are being added to the notion of 'innovation systems'. This has come about in the wake of the increased focus on Europe's competitiveness *vis-à-vis* the USA and Japan, and the new objectives of making the EU, by 2010, "the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world, capable of sustainable economic growth with more and better jobs and greater social cohesion". The perspective has been expanded in many ways. Among them we see more and more fields of policy being included as relevant in an innovation context. Increased emphasis is being put on education and training, employability, the quality and skills of the labour force and lifelong learning. People and human resources are being brought into focus. Similarly, social cohesion, i.e. the reduction of regional socio-economic inequalities, is an integral component of policy. The policies related to innovation and competitiveness must address the challenges of unemployment, poverty and exclusion and ensure social security and full participation in society. They must also contribute to sustainability and environmentally sound development. Another area of priority is place development. This means establishing creative and enterprising places in which both people and companies want to locate and invest.

As we already said, Universities traditionally are thought to affect both the economic and the social dimension of the region. The key factors with economic impacts are local gross output, local disposable income and local employment. In each case overall local impact is the combination of direct income or employment, indirect income and induced income effects. Direct income and employment is generated at the University itself. Indirect income and employment arises when expenditures at the university generate business for local firms. Induced income and employment is generated as a result of the expenditures by the University and local businesses. The key social impacts, on the other hand, upgrading the human capital stock and raising the cultural level of the local community, gives new employment opportunities in that region and limits the outflow of young people to urban centres. In other words what the University is expected to do is to improve what is called the "basic image" as well as the "specific image" of a region.

So it is generally admitted that higher education institutions have always played an important role in the development of their respective regions. What is expected of them, however, is to contribute mainly, if not exclusively, to the economic growth of the region. As societies have become increasingly engulfed by the notion of globalisation, practically every higher education system in the world has become forced to limit its involvement in regional development to specific economic, scientific and technological development activities. These activities range from the intention of creating closer links with industry to the setting up of impressive science and technology parks. The universities face increasing pressure to actively promote regional economic development by contributing to business innovation, the training of human capital, and social, cultural and environmental de-

velopment. If the variations that are due to specific regional contexts and long-established institutional dynamics are taken into consideration, it may generally be observed that there has been an attempt to provide mechanisms at governmental and institutional level that stimulate, among other things, the development of new academic programmes, the setting up of new liaison offices with the business sector, the creation of technology transfer offices, the laying down of regulations on intellectual property and even methods for assessing the impact HEIs have on a region's economy. The efforts made to streamline syllabuses and study programmes to meet the needs of the job market more efficiently and quickly should also be highlighted.

However, there is a growing number of people who believe that this contribution cannot and should not restrict itself to economic development, but should include social, cultural and environmental considerations. This requires greater cooperation between institutions with their communities and changes within the institutions, allowing that regional development activities of this kind are put high in their agenda, all the more so as almost every single higher education institution boasts of the importance it places on the development of the region in which it is located. An OECD study shows that HEIs generally carry out an impressive range of activities that go towards promoting the social, cultural and environmental development of their regions. This means, amongst other things, that institutions have realised the need to develop more coherent actions between institutions and between them and various organisations of civil society, companies and governmental entities, which should translate into suitable incentives, indicators and the monitoring of results. However, it should be highlighted that these activities are often seen as marginal or incidental to the

fundamental tasks of universities. The very fact that these functions are set to one side – both in terms of documentation and institutional administrative structures – contributes to the idea that these activities have nothing whatsoever to do with teaching and research. However there is a growing volume of opinion that HEIs should value academic excellence, research and greater participation in regional development as complementary rather than exclusive.

Taking a step back and looking at the broader picture, it becomes visible that from various quarters there is an attempt to form an "ideal" University, an institution which, to quote the OECD study referred to before, is a regionally engaged multi-scalar entity, joining together resources, systems and processes at the global, national and regional level, integrating between teaching, research and civic missions and producing a profitable virtuous cycle of growth.

The question which naturally arises is: can the universities really perform such a broad range of tasks? Can a model for university organisation, in which universities become system integrators with the capacity to deliver large public interest projects integrating teaching, research and a wide range of socially useful activities, really work? Or should universities retain relatively limited missions, and a tight focus that has so far ensured their funding through articulation of a clear public interest. If I can offer an opinion, my sense is that the universities' capacity to deliver social value and play a transformatory role within their region and the society in general is better ensured in the latter case.

Concluding Remarks

Üstün Ergüder, President of the Council
Magna Charta Observatory, Bologna

We are living in times of change – change and transformation the speed and scope of which has, probably, never been equalled. We have gone through disasters like the world wars and have successfully managed to wreck our cities in addition to the terrible human toll caused. Yet, we have successfully rebuilt our cities and institutions. The change and the challenge we are now experiencing is not destructive. It has to do with the transformation of how we do things. It is full of opportunities and fraught with dangers.

Yet, these constant pressures to change are not only limited to higher education systems. The speed of technological change and ever increasing globalisation challenge the way we do things wherever we are and in whatever sub-system – political, economic, social – in which we may be operating.

Similarly, despite our traditional belief in being left alone in our ivory tower to do what we do best – that is to generate knowledge through research and disseminate what is accumulated through teaching and publication – more and more

of our institutions of higher education are being sucked into the daily hustle and bustle of these transformation that our societies are going through.

We are asked to educate the masses. Educating the elite few does not suffice anymore. Applied research is becoming a major concern of ours. We are asked to contribute, and be a focal point, of technological change. Universities are called upon to be an engine of socio-economic change and growth while at the same promoting the causes of democratic citizenship and social justice. Continuing or lifelong education is being placed on the agenda of higher education institutions.

Furthermore, universities as we know them as public or non-profit institutions are being challenged by for-profit institutions the outstanding examples of which are University of Phoenix (Apollo Inc.) and Laureate Inc. – both United States based institutions. Private enterprise is making inroads into a sector which was once dominated mostly by traditional institutions of higher education. Increasing mobility of students and staff across borders are also new developments universities are facing.

Accreditation and quality assurance has long become a part of the life of higher education institutions. Internal "assurances of quality" simply by hiring the best published researcher and the most knowledgeable and articulate lecturer – a process we are so much used to in ivory towers – does not suffice any more to assure our stakeholders (including students) that we are doing a good job in return for their support and demand.

Another related development is that business and industry increasingly demand both research and teaching that is relevant to the needs of the market place. The state involvement in higher education as a major funder is also on the decline and this is having a major impact on how we manage our institutions.

A cursory examination of the statistics and reports of international agencies such as the OECD and UNESCO provide ample evidence. Higher education institutions can no longer rely on the cushion of safe state funding. Fundraising and income generation are becoming key areas of activity for the leadership of higher education institutions. Finding funds no longer requires an exclusive ability to explain the programmes of universities to plead for funds from state authorities. Fundraising has become a multi-dimensional effort ranging from going after state and international funds for research to philanthropic fund raising and income generation by offering services to the society.

One can be more specific in providing examples about the challenges universities are facing in the beginning of the 21st century. Let it suffice to say that these are very important challenges. On the one hand universities have to respond to these challenges. On the other, the universities have to preserve an institutional culture and modes of governance that make universities as knowledge generators a very distinctive type of organisation.

Being an ivory tower with very loose ties to the society and the market place may not be any more functional. Yet, ignoring the ivory tower tradition completely poses the question of whether universities are universities any more. That is, are we neglecting our traditional functions of independent research and teaching?

A very important question is whether our methods of governance and leadership based on collegiality, debate, decentralisation based on empowering academic disciplines and departments (namely a horizontal and a collegial mode of organisation) would enable universities to meet new challenges

while preserving those values that make our institutions distinctive. This is a very important matter of leadership.

Rectors or university presidents are being increasingly forced to lead our institutions. Collegiality may not anymore be sufficient to steer institutions to strategic goals. More proactive leadership seems to be the order of the day. Yet, ignoring collegiality in the name of managerial efficiency may certainly be self defeating.

Throughout the conference we had very rich and fruitful discussions on most of the themes I tried to summarise above. Did we answer the questions many of our speakers posed? My answer is no and I am sure your answers will not be much different from mine.

We, however, I strongly feel, jointly developed a better understanding of these issues. This is much better than finding universal and simple answers to these questions. Internalisation of these problems and issues is perhaps what we have to do rather than coming up with answers and formulas.

After all, we have to deal with these issues in our own different contexts. We should, however, never lose sight of the fact that the values we share as universities are universal. Yet, our solutions may take note of the local context.

Andrew McIntosh stated that universities cannot function without academic freedom to further their goals of research and teaching. Steve Fuller gave a very interesting analysis of what a true university is. He stated that teaching and research cannot be isolated. They are inseparably linked under the roof of the universities. He further stressed that institutional autonomy is really what makes that linkage possible. Andrew McIntosh went further and asked us what we do to maintain those values.

A simple answer is not possible yet I would like to stress at this point that the Magna Charta Observatory and the val-

ues it upholds is a significant and global effort that should not be taken lightly. We have to be persistent, patient, insistent, and not easily discouraged in upholding these values that are dear to us. Conferences, meetings, and worldwide networking like we witness during these annual events are very important activities within this context.

The Speakers

BAUMANN Bastian is Secretary General of the Magna Charta Observatory since 2007. He has his academic background in law, having studied at universities in Germany and Spain. He started his higher education engagements with the student union in Trier, and then worked as International Officer for the German National Union of Students before working 3 years for the European Students' Organisation (ESIB). He was a representative in the Bologna Follow-Up Group between 2002 and 2005. He was also a member of the working groups compiling the European qualifications frameworks for higher education and lifelong learning. He worked as a freelancing consultant, amongst others for the European Universities Association and the European Network for Quality Assurance. He undertakes expert activities for example for the European Commission and the Council of Europe and has worked in many countries both in Europe and beyond. He has been a member of the Executive Committee of the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD)

and worked as the personal advisor for the president of the European Language Council.

CALZOLARI Pier Ugo is Professor of Applied Electronics at the University of Bologna. He was Head of the Department of Electronics, Computers and Systematics from 1988 to 1994. He was also a member of the Senate Committee which drew up the new General Statutes of the University and a member of the University Senate until October 1996. He was the Rector of the University of Bologna from 2000 to 2009. Since 2007 he is a member of the Council of the Magna Charta Observatory and was recently elected as a Vice-President of the International Association of Universities.

ERGÜDER Üstün is currently the Director of the Istanbul Policy Center at Sabancı University. He studied in the UK, the United States and Turkey. He holds a PhD in Political Science and joined the academic staff of Boğaziçi University in 1970. Between August 1992 and August 2000 he served as the Rector of Boğaziçi University. Prior to his appointment as Rector, he chaired the Department of Political Science and International Relations. In addition to his academic responsibilities, he is the Chairman of both the Board of Trustees and of the Executive Committee of the Third Sector Foundation of Turkey, an organisation formed by the participation and support of foundations and NGOs in Turkey. He also sits on the executive board of the Vehbi Koç Foundation. Between 1996 and 2000 he served as a member of the Executive Board of the Turkish Radio and Television Network and as a member of the Board of Trustees of Koc University. He is one of the founders of the Turkish Economic and Social Studies Foundation as well as

currently serving as the Chairman of its Advisory Board. In terms of international involvement he sits on the Advisory Board of the International Centre for Not-for-Profit Law, the Board of Trustees of Robert College, the Board of Governors of the European Cultural Foundation and is a member of the Governing Council of the European Foundation Centre. He is also a member of the International Committee of the Council on Higher Education on Accreditation with headquarters in Washington. He is currently serving as the President of the Council of the Magna Charta Observatory, located in Bologna.

FOUILHOUX Monique is Deputy General Secretary of Education International (EI). She holds both Bachelor and Master degrees in Law from the University of Clermont-Ferrand in France. She started her career as a civil servant in the ministry of internal affairs and joined the University of Clermont-Ferrand in 1973 at the creation of the Department of Further and Adult Education. Involved in the trade union movement, she was elected Deputy General Secretary of the national trade union for technical staff and in 1987 became elected National Secretary of the French Education Union (FEN). She has been involved with EI since its creation in 1993, working on various areas, in particular higher education and research issues and the impact of GATS and trade agreements on education. She is particularly engaged with the most pressing issues concerning academics and researchers, such as working conditions, careers, academic freedom, and mobility. She is also Secretary of the EI European Higher Education and Research Standing Committee and moderator of the ETUCE Higher Education and Research online Network. She held various positions within the French higher education system and was a member of UNESCO's

NGOs Liaison Committee and President of the UNESCO International NGOs Conference between 1998 and 2003. She is also a member of the Editorial Board of the Global Monitoring Report on Education for All since 2004.

FULLER Steve is Professor of Sociology at Warwick University, United Kingdom. He holds a BA in History and Sociology as well as an MPhil and a PhD in History and Philosophy of Science**.** He is best known for his work in the field of 'social epistemology', which addresses normative philosophical questions about organised knowledge by historical and social scientific means. He has published sixteen books and his work has been translated into nearly twenty languages. Fuller was awarded in 2007 a 'higher doctorate' (D.Litt.) by Warwick for long-term major contributions to scholarship.

MCINTOSH Andrew Robert was born in London and educated at Jesus College, Oxford and Ohio State University. He was the UK's Minister for the Media and Heritage at the Department for Culture Media and Sport from 2003 to 2005. His responsibilities included broadcasting and press regulation, heritage and architecture, libraries, and gambling regulation. He was also spokesman in the House of Lords for Treasury, Trade and Industry, Culture Media and Sport, Scotland, and Transport from 1997-2005. Since 2005, he has been a member of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, where he is member of the Committee on Culture, Science and Education and chairman of its Sub-Committee on the Media. He is the Assembly's Rapporteur on the European Higher Education Area and submitted in this capacity a contribution to the Bologna Process ministerial conference in Leuven/Louvain-la-Neuve 2009.

He served as a councillor in the London Borough of Haringey 1964-68 and represented Tottenham on the Greater London Council 1973-83. In 1983, he became a life peer as Lord McIntosh of Haringey and was appointed a Privy Counsellor in 2002. He has 40 years professional experience in market and social research.

REDDY Jairam holds the degrees of Master of Science of the University of Manitoba, Canada, and Doctor of Philosophy of the University of the Western Cape, South Africa. He has held academic positions at the Universities of London, England, Temple and Washington, USA, Western Cape and Durban-Westville, South Africa. He was Vice-Chancellor of the University of Durban Westville from 1990-94. He has lectured widely and is the author of numerous articles. In January 1995 he was appointed to chair the National Commission on Higher Education of South Africa on whose report much of the White Paper on Higher Education and the Higher Education Act are based. He was appointed by the Secretary General of the United Nations to serve on the Council of the United Nations University, Tokyo, Japan for the period 1998-2004. He was elected to chair the Council for a two year term from 2000-2002. As a researcher and consultant in higher education, He has undertaken the following in recent years: advisor to UNESCO on establishing a University in Zanzibar, evaluation of the SIDA/Nuffic programme on higher education management in African Universities, evaluation of the NUFU (Norwegian) funded higher education programme, Visitors Advisory Programme, Salzburg Seminar to Russian Universities, Chair of Panel to evaluate the Quality Promotion Unit and SERTEC, South Africa, chair of Panel to advise the Ministries of Health and Education on the incorporation of the

Colleges of Nursing into the higher education sector. He was a member of the Board of the Higher Education Quality Committee in South Africa (2002-05) and is currently Auditor of the Australian Universities Quality Agency and Chair of the Board of the Durban University of Technology. Until 2008, he was Director of the United Nations University International Leadership Institute, Amman, Jordan but has now returned to South Africa and works as a consultant in higher education.

ROVERSI-MONACO Fabio is the President of the Fondazione Cassa di Risparmio, Bologna. He is Doctor in Law by the University of Bologna. He was Professor at the Faculty of Political Sciences and the Faculty of Law during almost 10 years. From 1978 until 2006 he was the Director of the School of Administrative Science of the University of Bologna. He was a member of the Board of Directors of the University of Bologna and between 1985 and 2000 he was Rector. Currently he is President of the European Secretariat for Scientific Publications, President of the Inter-University Association "Almalaurea", President of the Association of Italian and Spanish Public Law Professors, President of the Bologna Art Academy and President of the Mozart Orchestra in Bologna. He is also Director and member of the scientific committee of numerous magazines of public law and member of the committee of the Italian Academy of Advanced Studies in New York. He is author of many studies, articles and publications. He has been awarded honorary doctors by numerous universities from the Americas, Europe and Asia. He was the initiator of the *Magna Charta Universitatum* in 1988, founding member of the Magna Charta Observatory and first President of its Collegium for eight years. He is now Honorary President of the Magna Charta Observatory.

SALEH HASHEM Mostafa Abdel-Razek is Secretary General of the Association of Arab Universities. He received his BA in Russian Philology from Ain Shams University, Egypt and his MA and PhD in the same field from Leningrad State University. He is Regional Chair for the Middle East and North Africa area within the International Association of University Presidents. He was President of Ain Shams University until 2005 where before he was also Vice-Rector of Higher Studies and Research as well as Dean of the Faculty of Foreign Languages. He has undertaken extensive work as a translator. He is also a member of the Supreme Council for Culture and a member of the Supreme Court for Values of Egypt. Besides several other functions and memberships, he is a member of the Advisory Board of the Arab Thought Foundation and Honorary President of the Arab Network for Quality Assurance in Higher Education.

TSOUGARAKIS Dimitris obtained his first degree from the Department of History and Archaeology of the University of Athens, from which he also obtained a degree in English Studies. He went to the University of Oxford (Exeter College) for post-graduate studies, from where he obtained his D.Phil. in Byzantine History. He was a Visiting Fellow at Dumbarton Oaks Research Centre, Washington D.C. and researcher at the Research Centre of Medieval and Modern Hellenism, Academy of Athens. He has been teaching Byzantine History at the Ionian University since 1985. He was Head of the Department of History (1994-1998, 2002-2004). He is currently Rector of the Ionian University during his second mandate. He is author of articles on the history of Byzantium, and of a range of monographs.

Magna Charta Observatory Publications

Autonomy and Responsibility
The University's Obligations for the XXI Century
>Proceedings of the Launch Event for the Magna Charta
>Observatory
>21-22 September 2001
>*Out of print*

Managing University Autonomy
Collective Decision Making and Human Resources Policy
>Proceedings of the Seminar of the Magna Charta
>Observatory
>17 September 2002

Managing University Autonomy
Shifting Paradigms in University Research
>Proceedings of the Seminar of the Magna Charta
>Observatory
>15 September 2003

Universities and the Media
A partnership in institutional autonomy?
>Proceedings of the Seminar of the Magna Charta
>Observatory
>17 September 2004
>*Out of print*

Managing University Autonomy
University autonomy and the institutional balancing of teaching and research
>Proceedings of the Seminar of the Magna Charta
>Observatory
>15 September 2005
>*Out of print*

The Politics of European University Identity
Political and Academic Perspectives
> Proceedings of the Seminar of the Magna Charta Observatory
> 14 September 2006

The Management of University Integrity
> Proceedings of the Seminar of the Magna Charta Observatory
> 19 September 2007

Past, Present and Future of the Magna Charta Universitatum
Celebrations of the XX Anniversary of the Magna Charta Universitatum
> Proceedings of the Conference for the Magna Charta Observatory
> 18-20 September 2008

Case Studies
> *Academic Freedom and University Institutional Responsibility in Portugal*
> 2003
> *Out of print*

Case Studies
> *Academic Freedom and University Institutional Responsibility in Mecklenburg-Vorpommern*
> 2003
> *Out of print*

Case Studies
> *Academic Freedom and University Institutional Responsibility in South East Europe (1989-2003)*
> 2004
> *Out of print*

Case Studies
> *Higher Education in Turkey: Institutional autonomy and Responsibility in a modernising society*
> Policy Recommendations in a Historical Perspective
> 2008

Essay
> *The Interpretation of the Magna Charta Universitatum and its Principles*
> Stephen Lay
> *Out of print*

Essay
> *Academic Malpractice, Threats and Temptations*
> By the Magna Charta Observatory and The National Unions of Students in Europe (ESIB)
> 2007

Essay
> *Inventing Tomorrow's University, Who is to Take the Lead?*
> By the Magna Charta Observatory
> 2008

Free copies are available on request

Please contact:
Magna Charta Observatory
Via Zamboni 25 - 40126 Bologna, Italy
by E-mail: magnacharta@unibo.it
or by fax: *+39.051.2098710*
All publications can also be downloaded from the web:
www.magna-charta.org