



## Values of the University

**Andrei Marga**

*[Paper prepared for the UNESCO Forum on Higher Education  
in the Europe Region: Access, Values, Quality and Competitiveness,  
21-24 May 2009, Bucharest, Romania]*

Authors are responsible for the choice and presentation of the facts contained in their text and for the opinion expressed therein. There are not necessarily those of the organizations and the partners of the Forum.

# Values of the University

**Andrei Marga**

Rector

Babeş-Bolyai University

Cluj Napoca, Romania

## Summary

*Higher education institutions are at the same time open and obliged to ensure competitive scientific research, high quality education and specialized services for the community. Universities are caught between the attraction of some classic organizations and the lucid consciousness of the changes in society. They try to ensure their stability within a world that challenges them to take initiatives. Universities satisfy their mission within society by accomplishing functions which develop along with the changes around them. They are asked to integrate in the functioning of societies and to explore better alternatives for their organization and evolution. Universities promote and incorporate values. Is the discussion on values en contretemps with the urgencies for action that appear in different countries of the international community? Is discussion on values en contretemps with the requirements for sustainability and operationalization of the action programmes? Does an institution dedicated to formation, scientific research, community services, and the promotion of rational solutions actually need to clarify values or does it need technical solutions? Which perspective on values can explain the financial and economic crisis that began in 2008? At a distance from traditionalism, and from the positivist-utilitarian or functionalist-structural approaches of today, this paper attempts to look at the crucial problems facing universities today, from the point of view of a value-oriented and value-based education. Finally, this paper is analyzing these issues and attempts to provide proposals on policy consequences.*

## **Introduction and context**

Higher education and its place in the system of values in society are now gaining new attention and being considered as having great importance in various productive functioning of the university [a generic reference to various types of higher education institutions]. Such issues as academic freedom, institutional autonomy, promotion of truth, social responsibility, integrity, and also creativity have been used in the public debate on universities. These topics can be looked at from several angles: achievements, social effects, quality, relationships with students etc. We may also deal with higher education, from *the point of view of incorporating values*, and it is our duty to do so.

The approach to higher education, from the point of view of values, has continual reasons (the organizational traditions and humanistic culture which are at the origins of the European university, the dependence of university achievements on ethical commitments) as well as reasons related to present day reality and characterizing it globalization. It has been rightfully said that “the lives and experiences of youth growing up today will be linked to economic realities, social processes, technological and media innovations, and cultural flows that traverse national boundaries with ever greater momentum. These global transformations, we believe, will require youth to develop new skills that are far ahead of what most educational systems can now deliver. New and broader global visions are needed to prepare children and youth to be informed, engaged, and critical citizens in the new millennium”<sup>1</sup>.

There is a prevailing view that in the future that has already begun multiple abilities such as; “the disciplined mind”, “the synthesizing mind”, “the creative mind”, “the respectful mind” and “the ethical mind”, together with non-instrumental values, will become indispensable qualities of graduates. This is going to require rethinking of our approach to education. As noted Howard Garden; “We acknowledge the importance of science and technology but do not teach scientific ways of thinking, let alone how to develop individuals with synthesizing and creating capacities essential for continual scientific and technological progress. And too often, we think of science as the prototype of all knowledge, rather than one powerful way of knowing that needs to be complemented by artistic and humanistic and perhaps also spiritual stances”<sup>2</sup>. In such case, value-oriented and value-based education is part of the culture characterizing the era of globalization.

Taking into consideration the recent evolution of universities in the countries which are of our particular interest at our conference – those in Europe and North America as well as Israel, the question needs to be studied in the global context. Therefore the following questions become pertinent:

- Can values still be discussed, considering the urgencies for functioning and action, which frequently appear in different countries and in the world community (actions that nowadays are being rightfully directed towards Africa, above all)?
- Is the talk about values nowadays somewhat in contradiction with the requirements for sustainability and the operationalization of such action programmes, for the purpose of productivity and competitiveness demanded by globalization?
- Does an institution dedicated to teaching and learning, research, community services and the promotion of rational solutions, such as the university, need the clarification of values or does it rather require organizations, governance and management capable of mobilizing resources and of being productive and efficient?
- What perspective on values eventually explains the current financial and economic crisis?

When analyzing the way universities function nowadays, it can be observed that some of them remain very **traditional** in which inflexibly following the vision consecrated two centuries ago; other universities act in a **positivistic-utilitarian** way, understanding their mission as a duty to solve educational and scientific research problems within a context; others are dominated by **functionalism**, considering themselves to be accomplishments of pre-established roles within a system. In order to clarify the situation of values within higher education today, one has to go beyond the points of view generated by traditionalism, utilitarian positivism and functionalism, and look upon the new initiatives in university organization and functions. This paper has been written from such perspective and attempting reassessment of academic values in a new environment. When values are being approached, one may either deconstruct them, by indicating their dependence on the historical contexts of every promotion of values, or postulate a loyalty towards values despite the complexity of experiences people are living. However, another approach is necessary. Let us observe, for instance, **academic freedom**. Thinking freely, exercising education and scientific research without constraints represent, as we know, values to which higher education is intimately and profoundly related. Nowadays, however, it is unrealistic to ignore the factual dependency of the way in which the university professor assumes his/her role under the technical, administrative, legal conditions which are established above him/her. The appeal to academic freedom remains indispensable, as the exercise of the academic profession is conditioned by this value, but, if taken singularly, the appeal is ineffective if it is not organically continued by an analysis of other dependencies and the promotion of the right to academic freedom in their environment. Equally important at this point is the issue of **university autonomy**. To take decisions in situations related to education and scientific research, in matters of internal organization which affect education and scientific research, without external interferences, represents the value that the university’s efficient functioning always depends on. However, nowadays, it is not realistic to ignore the fact that universities depend, in both cases, i.e. education and scientific research, on

decisions of educational policies and policy of science, on financial resources, which they cannot control. Institutional autonomy is not dispensable, as its absence affects achievements, but now operates under conditions which are more complicated than ever.

The paper is analyzing and trying to give answer to the above-mentioned questions in as well as look at the current issues and alternatives [based on experiences in the countries of UNESCO Europe Region - Europe, North America, and Israel]. It also reflects on political consequences of the university's values which are indispensable in a new era of modern history.

### **An assumed history**

In the modern era, *comprehensive rationalism* in the setting up of the university, expressed in a classical way by Humboldt and John Henry Newman has won a durable profile and as such it generates nostalgias which has repercussions, so that the clarification of the values of higher education today requires some reflection on this classical concepts of the university.

Responsible for the organization of the University of Berlin (1810), Wilhelm von Humboldt, saw higher education as “the highest peak where all exclusively made for the nation’s moral culture is brought together”<sup>3</sup>. Within a university, knowledge, under the advanced form of sciences, is promoted without obstacles, but this promotion is delineated by a “moral culture”. The institution itself is organized on “principles”, such as academic freedom, the disinterested pursuit of truth, institutional autonomy, while philosophy and arts crown it.

Half a century later, Cardinal Newman considered the university as “one of those greatest works, great in their difficulty and their importance, one which are deservedly expended the rarest intellects and the most varied endowments”<sup>4</sup>. The university represents the gathering of the main forces consecrated to obtaining and using knowledge, which are dedicated to the promotion of “Truth”. “What an empire is in political history, such is a University in the sphere of philosophy and research. It is, as I have said, the high protecting power of all knowledge and science, of fact and principle, of inquiry and discovery, of experiment and speculation; it maps out the territory of the intellect, and sees that the boundaries of each province are religiously respected, and that there is neither encroachment nor surrender on any side. It acts as umpire between truth and truth, and, taking into account the nature and importance of each, assigns to all their due order of precedence. It maintains no one department of thought exclusively, however ample and noble; and it sacrifices none. It is deferential and loyal, according to their respective weight, to the claims of literature, of physical research, of history, of metaphysics, of theological science. It is impartial towards them, and promotes each in its own place and for its own object”. The university is comprehensive, not only etymologically, and philosophy represents the field that crowns the curricula of an academic institution, being committed by its own nature in relation to the “Life” of individuals. In this regard Cardinal Newman stated the following:

“The philosophy of an imperial intellect, for such I am considering a University to be, is based, not so much on simplification as on discrimination. Its true representative defines, rather than analyzes. He aims at no complete catalogue, or interpretation of the subjects of knowledge, but a following out, as far as man can, what in its fullness is mysterious and unfathomable. Taking into his charge all sciences, methods, collections of facts, principles, doctrines, truths, which are the reflections of the universe upon the human intellect, he admits them all, he disregards none, and, in disregarding none, he allows none to exceed or encroach. His watchword is *Live and let live*”<sup>5</sup>.

The comprehensive rationalism has explicitly placed the university on the foundation of the “disinterested pursuit of truth”, considered to be a generator of moral values, and has exalted the importance of philosophy as promoter of an integrative vision upon human life and as a discipline that gives culture a direction.

Another approach to setting of the university derived from *the positivism* which was particularly pertinent in the first part of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. The university founded by Napoleon (1802) was dedicated to the needs of training personnel capable of management, while the “civic universities” (1852) in England set as one of their purposes to satisfy the needs of training personnel for the emergent economy of that time. Walter Ruegg gives a following description of the Napoleonic model:

“Napoleonic university policy both retained certain innovations from the eighteenth century, such as specialist colleges, and reversed the opening up of the university system to all, a feature of the radical revolutionary period. There were three primary goals: first, to secure for the post-revolutionary state and its society the officials necessary for political and social stabilization; second, to make sure that their education was carried out in harmony with the new social order and to prevent the emergence of new professional classes; and third, to impose limits on freedom of the intellect if it seemed likely to prove dangerous to the state”<sup>6</sup>.

Several decades later, in Great Britain, there were created “new institutions which tried to make up for the deficiencies of the traditional universities through private or municipal initiatives. As a result there was a variety of types of higher educational institutes, which in contrast to the French and German models had few internal connections. It is only possible to speak of a ‘model’ during the period covered at the end of this volume, when a degree of national coherence was imposed on the originally heterogeneous British university system. Various factors played a part in this: the success of the new universities, the influence of the German model, efforts to restructure the old universities, the creation of an academic career path, which, because of the way that the professors in the newer universities looked to Oxbridge, meant that the various universities had a good deal in common”<sup>7</sup>.

Universities took the responsibility to support, with qualified staff, the functioning of institutions in society and economic development, which have become, in time, direct or indirect criteria for the evaluation of academic achievements. Therefore, higher education was integrated with the developmental programmes of the national administrations.

After World War I, many European universities were subject to “**politization**” **within certain ideological interpretations of history**. The autonomy of thought and the solidarity with the values of liberty and justice were not only undermined, but also programmatically attacked. Heidegger is nowadays considered to be the most representative exponent of the offensive against them by arguing that the university began in spirit from Socrates’ contemptuous and insolent distancing of himself from the Athenian people, his refusal to accept any command from them to cease asking: What is justice? What is knowledge? What is good? Hence doubting the common stand about such questions and trying to impose the rule of philosopher.

Particularly trying times for the values of the university were the 1930s when persons like Heidegger put academic values at the service of the German culture [as interpreted at that time]<sup>8</sup>. It is the time when Heidegger condemned “academic freedom” and that time rector of the University of Freiburg in Breisgau argued that academic freedom, had to be banished from the university, as it was “negative”<sup>9</sup>. Instead of “academic freedom”, he proposed three “oaths and services” - “work duty” as service to the community of people; “value duty” as service to the nation and its history; “knowledge duty” in service of the progress of the German people.

The suspicion regarding modern values has persisted. For instance, several decades later, Carl Schmitt reassumed the formula of the “tyranny of values” according to which any value would

become tyrannical and, therefore, restrictive<sup>10</sup>. Values are seen here as constraints, therefore it would be recommended to replace them with direct actions.

Certainly, Heidegger had not been the first advocate for the connection of the university to the objectives of some political forces in society. The thesis formulated during the *Komintern* Congress (1928), i.e. the world conflict due to the “contradiction”, considered to be irreconcilable, between the “capitalist world” and “communism”, served as justification for the measures taken by the Soviet state to subordinate civil society and for the repression measures taken against their opponents<sup>11</sup>. In countries of Central and Eastern Europe, the university had been embodied in the institutional ensemble that promoted a “communist/socialist education” and which submitted to ideological dictate; higher education started to see itself as an instrument for ideological education in support of the state and party politics.

After World War II, people lived **the moment of engaging universities in the promotion of the open society, under the sign of reviving the classic academic tradition**. At that time, the “renewal of the university” was assumed under the given circumstances of the destruction of autonomy in favor of ideological arguments. This renewal meant the reestablishment of that “idea of university”, which preceded the institution’s instrumentalisation. It also implied the state’s self-limitation of its powers over the university. University and dictatorship reciprocally exclude each other<sup>12</sup>. The university capable of offering the unity of knowledge and the rational interpretation of world events, in a society of the plurality of freely expressed opinions, had once again become the academic ideal.

**The year 1968** was an important turning point in post-war social history with profound implications for higher education, particularly in Western Europe and the United States. New generations of students rejected the political and ideological concepts that followed World War II and requested societies to submit to new requirements of societal organization. During the students’ movements, philosophical currents and political doctrines that could hardly reach an agreement were manifested. However, it is clear that they imposed, beyond their diversity, a new sensitivity<sup>13</sup>. In fact, in 1968, Europe’s “old university” collapsed, engaging the crisis of its professional and ethical rigors, the relaxation of elitism and of its obstacles, making room for an organization that is still evolving. Philip Altbach in his analysis of this development concludes that:

“Without question, the unprecedented student unrest of the period contributed to a sense of disarray in higher education. The unrest was in part precipitated by deteriorating academic conditions that were the result of rapid expansion. In a few instances, students demanded far-reaching reforms in higher education, although they did not propose specific changes. Students frequently demanded an end to the rigidly hierarchical organization of the traditional European university, and major reforms were made in this respect. The «chair» system was modified or eliminated and the responsibility for academic decision making, formerly a monopoly of full professors, was expanded – in some countries to include students. At the same time, the walls of the traditional academic disciplines were broken down by various plans for interdisciplinary teaching and research”<sup>14</sup>.

Reforms were actually undertaken in different Western and Eastern countries. However, at the beginning of the ‘1990s, a general tendency of “restructuring European universities through improving the administrative efficiency and accountability of the universities” was installed. The productive organization has become the dominating topic.

Since the second half of the 1970s, European universities have tried to satisfy **the needs of the advanced industrial society** and to reorganize themselves on grounds of achievements in education, scientific research, and community services. The continuous technical and economic development in modern societies, under the conditions of democracy, was the framework for the enlargement of higher education towards different social classes and for the development of

scientific research in universities. The number of universities has increased; the number of professors and students has reached unprecedented sizes; the massification of academic studies has begun; the costs related to scientific research have greatly increased; scientific research has passed to the direct support of industrial development; science has been more and more considered under the aspect of its useful effects on economic growth; the legitimization of the academic programmes and of scientific research have been set to be dependent on relevancy in relation to economic technical development<sup>15</sup>. Academic freedom and university autonomy have always proved to be prerequisites for a competitive university, so that, by the end of the 1980s, these values started to be formally presented. A particularly place in it has the signing in September 1988 in Bologna of the *Magna Charta Universitatum*. One may see that this historical document made a return towards **the reassuming of classical understanding of the university**, away from the positive or functionalist reductions typical for industrial societies, under changed conditions. It reassumed the concept of the university as “a centre for culture, knowledge and research” and emphasized the autonomy of the university in relation to the political, economic and ideological powers existing in a society: “freedom in research, industry and formation, as fundamental principles of academic life, must be guaranteed and promoted by the public powers and by universities”<sup>16</sup>. The *Magna Charta* considers the academic freedom and university autonomy both as value and right which are essential for the mission, organization and functioning of a university. Respecting and protection of these values and rights is assisted by *The Magna Charta Observatory* which gathers information, express opinions and prepare appropriate documents and undertake appropriate actions. The Observatory works together, or in agreement with other national, European or international organizations pursuing similar or compatible aims.

During the 1990s, European universities benefited from **the suppression of the ideological divide of the continent**. On the other hand, the association of the European universities after World War II was premonitory, anticipating the European unification. Above all, after the “historical turn” in Central and Easter Europe, around 1989, universities were confronted with the requirements for competitiveness of the era of globalization, where they tried to handle both sides of European academic history: the orientation towards society from the perspective of the traditional humanism and the orientation towards technological and economic efficiency supported by sciences<sup>17</sup>. Finding a common measure for accumulation and transfer of learning outcomes, conceiving the mechanisms for quality assurance, making the academic systems compatible, adopting better practices that favor the efficiency of higher education, and reaching social purposes have become important points on the agenda of higher education.

Nowadays, we are in the same moment, only that we are living in a “super-complex” world, and the “walls” of the university, which separate it from the external environment, are transforming into “bridges” towards industry, economy, and society. It is felt, in many places, that there is a need to complement the acquiring of academic freedom and university autonomy, as well as the commercialization that is spreading together with the assessment of the values proper to the university, within the framework of re-conceptualization of efficiency as effectiveness and social responsibility<sup>18</sup>. Moreover, the tendency to change the “development pattern” of the modern society<sup>19</sup>, after the crisis that started in 2008, is now not only on the horizon, but also a fact of experience. New reflections on higher education are being developed at the moment, especially within universities, the quests being stimulated by the new “challenges” of the universities. However, unlike other institutions, universities cannot completely solve their own problems without taking into consideration their own history, and, in a way, without assuming it.

## Systemic changes and re-thinking of the model

Universities today, find themselves in a complex situation. They are actually caught in between the attraction of the classical rationalism, which supports the self-confidence developed on the road to false *grandeur* and the rational awareness of the changes in modern society, which claim the change of the universities themselves. These tensions, we can even argue about the crises of the classical model of the university when looking at such recent developments as:

- the diversification of academic specializations which has exceeded the inherited organization of the faculties at the middle of the 19<sup>th</sup> century;
- development of experimental sciences that they stroke through the philosophical frame prescribed by classicism has diminished the place of philosophy and humanities in knowledge pyramid; and
- diminishing role and lost monopoly of the university on basic research.

At least three signs are marking this crisis and make pressures on the structure and functioning of the university:

- i) the continuing change of the type of knowledge required by the globalised markets in favor of knowledge that can be technically valued, which requires a reorientation towards knowledge with technological impact (taking the term “technology” in a broader sense than industrial technology) and, together with it, a change with implications on the level of materializing the mission in functions;
- ii) the universities’ loss not only of their monopoly on scientific research, but also of the monopoly on the training of specialists, as a result of the increasing number of education suppliers, universities being therefore determined to re-identify their position within the differentiated societies of our time;
- iii) the new concentrations of economic power in the era of globalization, and the concentrations of political and media-related power nowadays increase the university’s dependency (under crucial aspects, such as establishing specializations, the orientation of the scientific research, financing) on forces of society, which lead to a new proportioning of dependency and autonomy.

The university is now more than ever before placed in the competitions of a highly differentiated society, where it is “challenged” to find its profile. It is just as true that the university, as an institution, has no rivals as to the capacity to unify knowledge and to elaborate the picture of reality as a whole. Consequently, the investigations carried out by universities, under the conditions of academic freedom and university autonomy, still provide the greatest part of scientific discoveries and the intellectual works of our time. Academic expertise is decisive and the most sought after. A correlation between economic and social development of different countries and the development of higher education has already been noticed. For these reasons, as well others (taking into consideration the exercise of the university’s multiple functions), one may legitimately say that the university plays crucially important roles in an era in which the dependence of societies and individual lives on competences, culture, values, integrative visions increases with the “cultural turn” that we are living<sup>20</sup>. In this situation, the university’s need to find a new profile are inevitable<sup>21</sup>, but the dramatization is just as unrealistic as the grandiloquence, with able action solutions being always necessary.

In the 1960s, on both sides of the Atlantic, proposals for the reorganization of universities had already been noted, in order to overcome the crisis of the classical university and to respond to the new situation. Some pleaded for the recovering of that “common spirit of the university” associated with the Humboldtian university model in order to prevent the university’s dispersal under the pressure for greater utility from the point of view of the economic systems<sup>22</sup>. Others proposed **the revival of the Humboldtian model** as a normative leading model with certain adjustments to the

new conditions<sup>23</sup>. However, the long-lasting initiative of those years was undoubtedly the launching of **the research university** – a university based on “three missions”: research, teaching and public service, understood as “a company of scholars engaged in discovering and sharing knowledge, with a responsibility to see that such knowledge is used to improve the human condition”<sup>24</sup>.

Meanwhile, the discussions on what universities had to do in view of new challenges have intensified. The promoters of *postmodernism* were already recommending the abandonment of the great integrating visions and of any attempt to make a hierarchy of knowledge, preferring instead the elimination of classical boundaries between various academic disciplines, elimination of discipline-related faculties<sup>25</sup>. The advocates of structural functionalism argued that the functional differentiation of politics, science and education had already reached the level where the possibility of conceiving them together was closed forever, so that the Humboldtian idea of the university could no longer be re-launched. The representatives of *discursive rationalism* showed that, under the conditions of the continuous differentiation of activities, only communication could provide an environment for the unity assumed by the classical university, so that one should proceed to the reconstruction of that university<sup>26</sup>. The **reconstruction of the Humboldtian university** was also supported by those who advocated for the strengthening of the humanistic culture in late modern society, based on experience of the graduate schools of arts and sciences that assured the achievements of the American universities<sup>27</sup>.

As a reaction to postmodernism, American scholars proposed the revival of that Western rationalistic tradition that made possible the success of the Western university, and, as consequence, argued for the cancellation of the concept of “relativization”, reduction of the academic achievement criteria to group adhesion, dissolution of the distinction between professionalized culture and daily culture. In all this would eventually result in dissolution of postmodernism<sup>28</sup>.

However, the initiative that has marked, on a particularly great and global scale was launched by Burton Clark project of **the entrepreneurial university**. This involves, before all, the modification of the universities’ attitudes in favor of a proactive attitude, associated to a reconciliation of new managerial values with traditional academic ones as well as expanded developmental periphery, interdisciplinary-oriented research centers. This would not only lead to a diversified funding base but would change departments and faculties into “entrepreneurial units”. The entrepreneurial university has, among its premises, the availability **to transform the “public university” into a “foundation university”**, to change some statutory collegial bodies of the university, the availability to assume together the self-determination and search for academic excellence and the change-oriented and integrated administrative core<sup>29</sup>.

Following the “entrepreneurial university”, the recent project of **the new university**<sup>30</sup> has emerged. It proposes the reorganization of specializations by “problem-based” criterion, instead of the traditional “discipline-based” criterion. It also brings about reorganization resulting in emergence of new specializations [e.g. cultural engineering, system engineering], the replacement of chairs with departments, the development of faculties as “schools” [e.g. school of human evolution, school of earth studies]. In “the new university”, professorships, which maintain their crucial importance, are reconfigured in a new relationship with the environment in which a formula of “shared professorship” becomes dominant. Students spend most of their time in libraries, laboratories and debate clubs, forming wide networks of intellectual investigation. Such a university, that remains accessible to large categories of persons who study, and becomes very selective towards its research students, needs competitive specialists, who can no longer be obtained unless the occupying of professorships and the establishment of academic leadership are decisively internationalized. Such a university is conditioned by the provision of leaders, who represent much more than a large number of bureaucratic bosses and managers and competitively initiate necessary changes. The evolution of

this university depends on the professors' excellence, which can always be verified in relation with two reference points, and on the leaders' culture.

It is worthy to pay attention to a more recent project for the university model that of a **public purpose university**. It represents an attempt to maintain university studies, in spite of the privatization trends, among "the public goods", and to reorganize university considering, at the same time, the inevitable confrontation between the university and the markets in an era of globalization. The "public purpose university" is a modification of the old public universities: an entrepreneurial university, partially financed from public resources, a large part of its programmes being delivered online, oriented towards applied research and the fulfillment of the need for qualified staff, at local level, with the governing board representing several stakeholders. These profound changes in funding and motivation of public universities require a new classification, a new model, identified by mission, not by ownership<sup>31</sup>. This university is going to lead to a separation within the group of public universities themselves and it will complement "the research university" and "the private research university".

### **The mission and functions of the university in the context of values**

Placed in a late modern society that recorded structural change and was challenged from many directions, yet also determined to reconcile to some extent contradicting imperatives such as, for instance, gaining economic relevance and promoting autonomy, the university has been forced to explicitly clarify its profile and to reorganize itself. Many of the universities' dilemmas are being solved by clarifying this profile. This means, above all, to clarify its mission and functions. But how can one establish today the mission of the university and what is the role of values in this context?

From the very beginning we have to say that the mission of the university does not allow for a reduction to a 'lists of goals' that are so frequent in the statutes of today's universities. This mission can be established – without deriving it from general outlooks, which have become unrealistic, on knowledge and society and avoiding a restrictive functionalism, which, in turn, is incapable of taking over the diversified functions that contemporary universities fulfill – by taking as a starting point the lasting experience of prominent universities<sup>32</sup>. From this point of view, if by "**mission**" is understood the specific task designed for an institution, then it can be said that the mission of today's university is preparing specialists at the higher level of knowledge in order to increase knowledge and to improve people's living conditions.

Several important delimitations are implied with this determination: the mission of the university is not reduced to training, since it includes higher education and the formation of abilities to develop knowledge; this mission cannot be overlapped with scientific research, since it is directed to training; the mission of the university is not exhausted through services, since these are conditioned by training and by its own scientific research.

If by "**function**" is understood the activities that need to be carried out in order to fulfill the mission, then it can be said that the functions of the university are multiple. Parsons and Platt defined, in their work on the "American University", following four main functions: research and the preparation of the new generations of researchers; the academic training for a profession; general training; contributions to the cultural self-understanding and intellectual enlightenment<sup>33</sup>. In the view that is made possible today, the functions of the university are more than this and are ordered differently, as they have complex inner links.

The mission of training specialists in order to increase knowledge and to improve people's lives, can be achieved today – under the circumstances in which the universities ensure the cooperative

search for truth and use their autonomy as an indispensable premise of their excellence, as well as under the circumstances in which the technological, economic and social development of communities depend on this excellence – only if the university assumes **multiple functions**. The following functions are as important as evident: the training of specialists capable of taking over and further knowledge developing through higher education; carrying out competitive scientific research; the training of specialists able to take on and put into practice the application of knowledge through higher training; providing updated technologies through technological innovation; the analysis of the evolutions in the economic, social and administrative environment; the assessment of situations and the commitment for civil rights, social justice and reforms. Therefore, the functions of the university are nowadays comprehensively assumed and have the best chances of success if the university is considered as a formative institution for sharing and increasing knowledge; being a centre of performant scientific research; a formative institution for taking over and applying knowledge; a source of technological innovation; a forum for the critical analysis of situations; a place of committing to civil rights, social justice and reforms.

This range of functions makes one realize the lasting profiling of the university in today's European and American societies without the refuge in a past that has willy-nilly become a part of the museum, and without the surrealist claim to a future inevitably more complicated than one thinks. It means an understanding of the university in which this institution continues to ensure the cooperative and argumentative search for the truth, under the beneficence of autonomy, without reclusion and without allowing itself to be dissolved by the evolutions around it.

This range of functions certainly has an explanation based on the understanding of the university mission and on its historical evolution, which was presented in the earlier part of this paper. More important, however, than the possibility of this explanation is the fact that this range of functions allows us to find a solution to on-going reflection on the university as well as resist to those claiming “the death of university” under the burden of the functionalist grounds, highlighting the clues of the cooperative search for the truth and of the functional autonomy of the university. It can resist giving in to the temptation of reducing university education to the training naturally required by the economic environment, by highlighting the university as a formative institution for the increase of knowledge and as a centre for competitive scientific research. It can face the temptations from inside the universities to imagine them as places for the non-committed search for truth, isolated from the events of society, affirming, in a beneficial way, the university as a source of technological innovation, a forum for critical analysis and a place of commitment to civil rights, social justice and reforms. It can steer clear of the temptation of deforming university courses and seminars, transforming them into places for exchange of information by developing the university as a formative institution for the taking over, sharing and increasing of knowledge, a centre of competitive scientific research and system of specialized community services. In an era of proliferation of institutions only self-entitled as universities and of unprecedented requests addressed to higher education, it can also help to clarify what the university proper means today, and therefore, when we deal with “**true university**”<sup>34</sup>.

At least two additional circumstances determine today what a true university means even if relatively few higher education legislations present a clearly defined concept of what higher education means and even fewer with a precise connotation of the university. It might even be too challenging taking into consideration that there are views that there is no single criterion, necessary and sufficient of what counts as a university<sup>35</sup>. This does not mean, however, that we should give up searching for criteria. This can be done by extracting **criteria** of the true university by examining the mission and functions of the university.

This discussion touches the phenomenon of the diversification of higher education and growth of specialized higher education institutions concentrated on a very narrow range of academic

disciplines, e.g. languages, physical education, etc. Some of the functions of the true university – competitive scientific research, competitive higher education, specialized community services, forum of critical analysis of situations and the public commitment to democratic values – are not followed, and even less fulfilled in many cases<sup>36</sup>.

One of the institutional responses of mass higher education has been diversification of the higher education institutions. To the comprehensive universities, specific to the classic era, numerous other types of universities have been added: mono-specialized universities such as some technical universities, medical universities, and universities focused on distance learning, universities that prolong foundations, banks, companies etc. The universities' profile registers a sometimes disconcerting variation, therefore the following question is legitimate: when are we actually dealing with a university and when are we talking of a higher education institution or a "pluriversity"? However, before any other interrogation regarding a placing in the class of universities, it should be underlined that belonging to a class of higher education institutions is conditioned, before any other criterion, by the professors' integrity. In fact, there is no education where integrity is harmed, and any education is built on the credibility ensured by integrity, professionalism and the capacity to form beliefs. The prestige of the university is conferred, before all, by the professors' integrity and practices. It also confirms that through their mission and functions, **the university embodies values while its functions must be based on certain values and promotes values within society.**

### **The presence and effectiveness of values**

A particularly pertinent question for issues being analyzed in this paper is: Where do values intervene in the organization and functioning of a university?

As any other institution in highly differentiated modern society, **the choice of values** is inevitable also within a university. One may say that, even tacitly, a university or a system of higher education, no matter how rigorously organized they might be, from the legal, administrative or technical point of view, request values and imply options among values. Values are unique, in a precise meaning. Therefore, the practical problem is not that of the existence of values within universities as institutions and within the systems of higher education, as this existence is certain and does not form a topic of discussion. The problem is another: having in view the mission and functions of the university and of the higher education system, **what values does a university have to assume?**

Universities are complex institutions involved in multiple tasks such as professional formation and education of the personality, scientific research and community services, the promotion of knowledge and the high intellectual approach, the function of which is based on rules, legislation, internal regulation, strategies, operational planning etc. A related question can be posed if reference only to its own rules enough for the institution to function according to them? The answer is "no" because, in fact, anywhere in the world, in the case of any institution, not only does *the implementation of rules depend on the values* assumed by those involved, but those values open the horizon where the rules themselves are applied. Values represent conditions for the possibility and efficiency of rules.

It is therefore appropriate to argue about the university in the context of the arguments about the need for the functional democracy to be nurtured by **cultural ideals**<sup>37</sup>. The ideals intervene in the rules of democracy in two decisive moments. First of all, ideals intervene in the genesis itself of the rules and, afterwards, they intervene when rules are applied and when rules cannot become common laws without having the individuals animated by the ideals that made rules possible. In the case of

democracy, one may speak of ideals such as tolerance, non-violence, gradual modernization of society, fraternity, which have turned the rules of democracy into reality and support their implementation. Therefore it is right to say that the university is not separated from ideals [in this case of the democratic society] which also intervene in at least two moments: in the genesis of rules and in the support of their implementation. For instance, the rules of the seminar have been possible only under the condition of assuming **the ideal of the cooperative pursuit of truth** and the rules for the knowledge exam cannot be successfully implemented unless all the persons involved are nurtured by **the ideal of knowledge increase** and of **the maximization of their own competences**. The university has appeared and optimally functions only under circumstances in which those who bring it to life are animated by certain ideals.

The reverse relation cannot be eliminated in which “values” represent condition for the possibility of the rules, but **values themselves can only be promoted under the conditions of certain adequate rules**. Let’s take as an example the current debate on equity related to the access to universities. It is well known that the university is an institution open to any citizen that accomplishes certain requirements as to the amount of knowledge and skills they possess. The social achievement of an academic system consists exactly in being accessible to social categories as diverse and wide as possible of the population in society. In fact, each person must have the chance to attend courses of higher education according to his/her personal life project. In other words, *equity* represents one of the founding values of the university. But this value does not actually become real if the system of higher education is so differentiated that those persons with uncompetitive incomes occupy most of the places in permissive universities that lack achievements. Equity does not allow its separation from *quality*, so that university practices affect it from this point of view as well.

Another dimension of this problematique is how “values” can condition the obtaining of achievements within institutions. For instance, if one takes into consideration the preliminary situation of activities, what we call “good work”, then one may say that professional skills and abilities, which imply scientific knowledge, are definitely of crucial importance. Are these skills and abilities, as well as the scientific knowledge that uphold them, enough in order to obtain “good work”? In fact, as Howard Gardner observes, there is always a difference between “being a member of a profession” and “acting like a professional”, and from many reasons “the individual must be able to step back from daily life and to conceptualize the nature of work and the nature of community”<sup>38</sup>. Current pedagogies confirm, once again, that “science can never constitute a sufficient education” and that “science – even with engineering, technology and mathematics thrown in – is not the only important area of knowledge. Other vast areas of understanding – the social sciences, the humanities, civics, civility, ethics, health, safety, training of one's body – deserve their day in the sun, and, equally, their hours in the curriculum”<sup>39</sup>. Achievements, therefore beginning with “good work”, depend not only on professionalism, but also on the action of other involved.

One may ask the question: why is there in fact a need for society to recognize certain values for higher education, such as academic freedom and university autonomy, which head the list of university values? Obviously, invoking tradition cannot be a decisive argument. On the other hand, the two above-mentioned values cannot be directly derived from the pluralism recognized by the constitutions of the democratic states, for academic freedom and university autonomy are indissolubly connected to the social responsibility for achievements. Certainly, tradition is very important for the university and the pluralism of approaches and political forces in democratic societies is the favorable environment for the academic freedom and the university autonomy. Society recognizes these values, or, at least, has to recognize them, because, in their absence, achievements cannot be reached: any type of creation, innovation in knowledge, in technological development, organization of an education capable of connecting the present to the future are being

ensured in a society by acknowledging the academic freedom and the university autonomy. These values are not instrumental, but they are set up by observing the achievements that make them possible and as such are condition necessary for long-lasting achievements.

Values are a necessary condition not only for the productive functioning of the political, legal, economic and cultural systems. The way in which this exercise is made allows us to make a distinction among the “boss” [one who acquires authority only in the name of his/her appointment or election], the “manager” [one who gains authority based on the ability to lead a system in order to reach an established achievement], and the “leader” [one who has authority due to his/her ability to establish goals, which have to be reached by the system, and alternatives of direction and action]<sup>40</sup>. Thus the issue of university leadership needs to be also looked at from the point of view of values.

It clear that there are different ways of exercising leadership, and evaluate those who lead not only according to the delimitation of the terms of boss, manager and leader, but also by considering the different types of leaders. More detailed survey of this issue distinguishes the following principal types of academic leaders: the focused visionary, the focused performer, the prioritiser, the dreamer, the implementer, the maintainer, and the most desirable one – the integrator. The latter one is able to be effective in integrating vision, focus and implementation and in this way is also truly visionary, strategic and transformational leader<sup>41</sup>.

Today the university of the developed world are confronted with variety of **challenges specific to the new century**, among them; extending education by continuing education; massification of traditional academic training and increasing the importance of postgraduate studies; response to globalization of the qualification market; internationalization of training; multiplication of higher education providers; setting up a comprehensive electronic world library; expansion of the long distance higher education system; profiling of “constructive learning”; transition from the formation of “individuals” to the formation of “persons”<sup>42</sup>. Evidently, present financial and economic crisis adds to the above list also other “challenges” such as; ensuring an institution’s own sustainability; articulation of new knowledge and identification of means to overcome the crisis existing in late modernity; and coping with the risks existing in the globalised society.

It is the general context in which the discussion is held in the academic circles around the following arguments about the university:

- Should it continue the tradition or should push for the reorganization?
- Should it continue classicism or should it embrace functionalism?
- Should it promote humanities and reflexive sciences or should it be oriented towards technologies?
- Should it be selective or should it be transformed into a mass-university?
- Should it concentrate on scientific research or education?
- Should it push for elitism or accessibility therefore is able to promote equity or cope with competitiveness?
- Should it be financed only from public resources or multiplication of the financing resources [in this context the issue of tuition fee comes in the forefront]?
- Should its graduates be capable of doing or persons capable also to undertake an active role in society?

The list is a sample of challenge to today’s academic leaders. In this context the values to which the leadership of the particular university adheres individually and/or collectively is particularly relevant.

One may say that the **educational profile of the university** must be clarified and, in some cases, radically redesigned. One may notice that the development of civic skills which implies the ability to

systematically formulate and test hypotheses, to argue, to comprehensively approach an issue, to take up civic initiatives, has to become an important priority. On the other hand, one cannot provide competitive training without foreign languages and without participating, with original projects, in the innovation process. The existing teaching methodology and pedagogy must be reconstructed, book reading should be revived, and formation must accompany professional training.

However of no lesser importance is the issue of **the cultural profile of universities**. Taking into consideration that students need to be trained so that, at the end of the very first cycle, they possess the abilities, skills and competences enabling them to embrace and solve concrete problems. Their training must be oriented towards the concrete demands of technology, economy, administration, and culture. Universities can reach a high level of performance by building upon their students' training in the solving of concrete problems, upon their knowledge of the technical, economic and administrative environment and upon a certain institutional culture. Entrepreneurial training has become part of general education so that he/she is capable of assuming professional responsibilities. However no less relevant should be his/her capacity to play an active role in society. In such context importance of values-related education becomes evident.

It is also observed that confusion is made between the study of social sciences and ideological indoctrination which resulted in a generalized elimination of the relevant disciplines from their curriculum. Evidently, social sciences that need to be cultivated are radically different from those we used to have prior the historical changes in the world, and the professors called upon to teach them are different. Above all, however, a performant university is that where the students can integrate their specialized knowledge into a conception that enables them to systematically approach problems, to formulate hypotheses and put them to the test, to examine conflicting points of view and to argue their opinions, to bring in new perspectives and solutions.

In a society undergoing globalization and differentiation, from many points of view, social integration and cohesion have become issues belonging to education. **Social cohesion** cannot be attained in democracy without approaching compulsory education and its duration, confidence in the democratic institutions, equality of education opportunities, education quality, the capacity of bringing up the young generation to become mature citizens, learning how to learn. No institution is more appropriate and ready to assume the issue of social cohesion in the context of the today's complex societies than the university.

### **Current issues and new developments**

Which are the crucial problems that have to be solved today? Which are the major decisional alternatives, **in relation to the values**, that current universities face?

In a forefront of the list is “**university autonomy**”. It has gained recognition in most national legislations, and universities benefit from freedom in establishing their leadership and the major orientations in education and research. Meanwhile, in current societies, new concentrations of economic, political and media-related power are produced, and the decisions of academic policy are conditioned by them to a larger extent. The problem that appears now is that of promoting university autonomy – which remains a prerequisite for academic achievements – in an economic, administrative and media-related environment, which is rather oriented towards institution determination than towards encouraging autonomy. Nowadays, neither the parochial exercise of the autonomy nor the mere adaptation to contexts gives results, while a new solution has become indispensable.

The universities in general, including the public one, are financed from different sources. Under these circumstances, many universities carry out activities that are somewhat non-traditional, such as the attraction of a larger number of students that pay fees, community services etc. These activities increase the impact of universities in society, but they affect the quality of the studies and the relevance of their own scientific research, due to the diminution of the financing from the state or communities' budget. This does not diminish under any circumstances the need to defend and promote the core values of the university in an environment that claims at least flexibility, competence and initiative.

Taking into consideration the student numbers, we definitely reached a stage of **mass higher education**. In all countries, the number of students in higher education is still increasing, and the generations considered being older start to go back to school. The professional validity of academic diplomas is no longer unlimited, as it was in the past. However, in many universities, the rapid increase in the number of students has found academic administrations insufficiently prepared particularly with regard to lack of highly qualified teaching personnel. On the other hand, the increase in the number of students, the passage from distance learning to e-learning [and in particular its absorption into traditional forms of study] have claimed the need for development of adequate pedagogy and methodology.

The new reality also brought major change in the way “quality assurance” is being organized and implemented at the national, institutional and growingly also on international level. Imperceptibly, universities have entered **the competition** for the recruitment of competitive professors, student attraction, accession of research grants, and obtaining financial resources.

Indirectly but poignantly this competition is reflected in the context of “university rankings”. Since some countries had tried to establish which universities were better placed in such competition, the authorities and institutions themselves were started to compare which universities were the most performant as to the scientific research, prestige, etc. even criteria for such comparisons still need to be elaborated in such a way that they reflect the complexity and diversity of the functions performed by the university. Rankings cannot be avoided, but their elaboration has to become reflexive. **The most fertile basis to obtain rankings that are publicly trustworthy is to take into consideration the university's values, synthesized in its mission and functions**<sup>43</sup>.

One of the cherished values associated with the academe is “**academic solidarity**”. It seems that it is no longer in such high regard as in the past. But even more worrying development is increase of the academic malpractices and its most visible forms such as corruption of exams, diploma commercialization, plagiarism, nepotism etc. became subject of public debate. The academic collegiality and the praised academic ethics are submitted to unprecedented pressures. Avoiding the mercantilism of the services provided by universities, under the conditions set by the competitions on the globalised markets, becomes the main preoccupation and requires explicit and elaborated policies in which importance of values must be underlined.

Already from the above-mentioned observations, one can notice different factors and options are determining **the values of the university** and **values inside the university**. Only through respect of the principles of academic freedom and university autonomy combined with response to opportunities of the “knowledge society” we can achieve what Paolo Blasi described as a “wisdom society” by arguing that: “Knowledge is a conscious utilization of information; ‘wisdom’ means to choose one’s behavior based on knowledge and shared values, in order to enhance the well-being of all and awareness that personal actions have social consequences”<sup>44</sup>.

In no lesser way to “institutional autonomy” is important another pillar on which stand the university values is “**academic freedom**” which is eloquently reaffirmed in the *Magna Charta*

*Universitatum*. If these are harmed, the status of an institution changes, or, at least, is affected. This affection is direct under dictatorship, but it can be indirect as well, through politicization - from “political correctness” to the “politicization of the university disciplines”, through the excessive corporatism in which “paymaster” plays a decisive role in the decision-making processes, through excessive managerialism and technocratic organizations of the university, and through the legal restriction on institutional autonomy and academic freedom.

In higher education administration the emphasis on the inner connection between academic freedom and the responsibility for the activity’s results is always of interest. Without academic freedom, no achievements are possible in higher education, in learning, in scientific research. The tacit assumption of academic freedom is that one who benefits from it has been appointed as a result of certain rigorous selections, dedicates himself/herself, with all his/her energies, to the maximization of the professional achievements, promotes values in relation to adapting interests and is capable of objective evaluations. When this assumption is not satisfied, academic freedom weakens its meaning, and universities have to intervene, at the same time, in favor of the respect for academic freedom and for the promotion of academic integrity, the separation of the two being counterproductive. The intervention has become more necessary as the pressures on the academic have intensified, under the conditions of the competition among universities, where a situation is created according to which values would not count in relation to the directly useful values that bring immediate profit.

It should be pointed out that “academic values” combined with the “cultural heritage” which is embodied with most of the universities and other higher education institutions can contribute to enhancement of attractiveness for students and scholars. In other words, they can be one of the ways of dealing with challenges of competitiveness. This was well demonstrated at the Bologna Process Official Seminar on “The Culture Heritage and Academic Values of the European University and the Attractiveness of the European Higher Education Area” which took place in 2006 in Vatican City”<sup>45</sup>.

The values of university are multiple – academic freedom, university autonomy, the pursuit and promotion of truth, integrity, equity, argumentative cooperation, social responsibility etc. – and have to be taken together. These values condition one another, therefore factual research dedicated to higher education in the last decade offer us many pieces of evidence. The reciprocal conditioning of the different values of higher education does not conclude, under any circumstances, that values are necessarily convergent. There are many examples of **divergence or even the conflict of values**: a university’s achievement in scientific research can be in conflict with academic freedom understood individualistically; university autonomy and the qualifications framework established by the authorities can be in contradiction; wide participation in decision-making and decision efficiency can be divergent etc. Faced with a conflict of values, neither refuge into formalism nor passivity is the solution, but the continuous finding of a superior and integrative point of view where the personality of the person involved what matters. It is the same situation for disagreements or even for the conflict of approaches between higher education institutions and the agents in the environment or even the university’s stakeholders. Neither the appeal to the counterfactual postulation of convergences nor the disarming of will under the saying “there is nothing else to be done now” gives any results. In any situation, personalities change the condition of things, so that nowadays there is, first of all, a need for people who honestly, competently and courageously propose to untie the problems of a complex world, things that otherwise would drag us in directions that are harder and harder to control. Where there are personalities that manifest themselves, new horizons are open and, in fact, solutions are found.

As rightly observes Peter Scott, universities are value-laden institutions as they: “not only express intellectual and scientific values directly through their teaching and research; they are also embody

powerful organizational values notably in terms of collegial governance, institutional autonomy and academic freedom) and equally influential instrumental values (because of the increasingly potent role they play within the knowledge society); finally, universities contribute crucially to the formation of wider social and cultural values”<sup>46</sup>.

The university [or higher education in more inclusive terms] has its own values, which have become norms consecrated by constitutions, laws, regulations and statutes. The norm system delineates, on the one hand, higher education from other domains of a given society and also places it, on the other hand, in relation to society. At the same time the new developments which took place in last decades call for reaffirmation as well as modernization of the number of ways academic values are conceived, introduced and applied. In fact, they always remain just the frame and the basis for activities, at most. Nowadays there is a need to consider the values of the university from the following perspectives – the understanding of values as foundations, the enlargement of communication, and the assuming of communication in order to maximize achievements while at the same time being able to respond to collective and individual expectations.

### **Conclusion and policy consequences**

The major conclusions and policy implications arising from above presented analysis are:

- a) higher education is *the engine of the technological, institutional and cultural development of local, national and global communities*;
- b) higher education has a favorable position, within the complex societies of our time, *to transform the era’s “challenges” and crisis into projects* and to contribute to their promotion;
- c) the current financial and economic crisis is *the crisis of a development pattern*, in relation to which universities – through their ability of cutting edge knowledge, through their orientation towards the connection of inclusiveness and quality, through values and the non-instrumental character of their own values, through a respect for the past, the present and the future – can prepare improved alternatives, based on adequate regulations and clear answers;
- d) higher education institutions, especially universities, *have to establish their mission and functions*, taking into consideration the reality of present society and in line with the stipulations of *The Bucharest Declaration concerning Ethical Values and Principles for Higher Education in the Europe Region*”<sup>47</sup> ;
- e) after the higher education institutions of Central and Eastern Europe implemented, after the historical changes in 1989, *reforms to recover* the traditions of democratic openness, academic freedom and institutional autonomy, and after *reforms* have been implemented in several countries *to synchronize* the practices of the developed countries, a new generation of reforms – the *reforms to confront the conditions of globalization* – enter the agenda of higher education, and the universities have the duty to prepare and promote these reforms;
- f) higher education remains, even under the conditions of the diversification of financing sources, *a public good that society has equally the right to be interested in and the duty to adequately support from a financial point of view, as well as from the legal regulations point of view*;
- g) *a constellation of multiple values – academic freedom, university autonomy, protection of truth, social responsibility, integrity, argumentative cooperation, equity, creativity* – result from the well understood mission and functions of the university, and these values *have to be assumed together* in new and variable contexts of the individuals’ life development;
- h) the values of the university can be legitimated by considering them as performant conditions, but they do not reduce their content to the use of instruments, as they have a richer meaning, and *the programmatic preoccupation of the university for the formation of a creative and responsible personalities is of present acuteness, in a new era of modernity*;

- i) the knowledge society needs *to complement knowledge with wisdom and elaborated visions*, so that it is the universities' duty to work on the elaboration of visions that are appropriate for the new era of history;
- j) *values are crucial to overcome the financial and economic crisis started in 2008*; new organizations and governance and management solutions, a new language to lead beyond the positivist-utilitarian, functionalist or traditionalistic approaches are indispensable in universities and in their economic, administrative and cultural environment;
- k) virtue of their mission and functions, but also in order to face the "challenges" and defiance of the new era in world history, *universities act wisely, proactively manifesting* in relation to themselves and to the world around and engaging changes within them and outside them: the proactive university today is inclusive, being open to larger categories of population, under circumstances of education quality; it values its function of a research institution; it develops "interactions" with the internal and external environment, under conditions of the efficiency of its activities; and it assumes the values of higher education based on and enhancing the intellectual and moral integrity of the scholars, and the academic freedom and university autonomy as well as other values of the university.

## REFERENCES

- 
- <sup>1</sup> Marcelo M. Suarez-Orozco, Desirée Baolian Qin-Hilliard (eds.), Globalization, Culture and Education in the New Millennium, University of California Press, Berkley, Los Angeles, London, The Ross Institute, 2004, p. 2.
- <sup>2</sup> Howard Garden, Five Minds for the Future, Harvard Business Press, Boston, Mass, 2008, pp. 1-19.
- <sup>3</sup> Wilhelm von Humboldt, “Über die innere und äußere Organisation der höheren wissenschaftlichen Anstalten in Berlin (1810)”, in: Engel, Erhard, Wolf, Fichte, Schleiermacher, Savigny, v. Humboldt, Hegel, Gelegentliche Gedanken über Universitäten, Reclam, Leipzig, 1990, p. 273.
- <sup>4</sup> John Henry Newman, “Christianity and Scientific Investigation (1855)” in: John Henry Newman, The Idea of a University, Yale University Press, New Haven & London, 1996, p. 219.
- <sup>5</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 220.
- <sup>6</sup> Walter Ruegg (ed.), A History of the University in Europe, Volume III, Universities in the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries (1800-1945), Cambridge University Press, 2004, p. 44-45.
- <sup>7</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 53.
- <sup>8</sup> Allan Bloom, The Closing of the American Mind, Simon and Schuster, New York, 1987, p. 311.
- <sup>9</sup> Martin Heidegger, Die Selbstbehauptung der deutschen Universität, Das Rektorat 1933/1934, Vittorio Klosterman, Frankfurt am Main, 1983, p. 15.
- <sup>10</sup> Carl Schmitt, La tirania dei valori, Adelphi, Milano, 2008, pp. 52-53.
- <sup>11</sup> See Oskar Negt, “Marxismus als Legitimationswissenschaft. Zur Genese der stalinistischen Philosophie”, in: Nikolay Bucharin, Abram Deborin, Kontroversen über dialektischen und mechanistischen Materialismus, Suhrkamp, Frankfurt am Main, 1974, pp. 2-48.
- <sup>12</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 17.
- <sup>13</sup> Martin Gilbert, A History of the Twentieth Century, Volume Three: 1852-1999, Prentice Hall, New York, 1999, pp. 373-393.
- <sup>14</sup> Philip G. Altbach, Comparative Higher Education: Knowledge, the University and Development, The University of Hong Kong, 1998, pp. 13-14.
- <sup>15</sup> Hermann Lübbe, “Die Universität im Geltungswandel der Wissenschaft”, in: Die Idee der Universität. Versuch einer Standortbestimmung, Springer, Berlin, 1989, pp. 113-137.
- <sup>16</sup> Magna Charta Universitatum
- <sup>17</sup> Philip Spies, “University Traditions and the Challenge of Global Transformation”, in: Sohail Inayatullah and Jennifer Gidley (eds.), The University in Transformation. Global Perspectives on the Futures of the University, pp. 19-28; Theodor Berchem, “Die Universität zwischen Tradition und Fortschritt”, in: Wilfried Böhm and Martin Lindauer (eds.), Die Universität in der Gesellschaft. Verantwortung und Chancen für die Zukunft, Ernst Klett, Stuttgart, Düsseldorf, Leipzig, 2003, pp. 23-33.
- <sup>18</sup> Bonaventura de Souza Santos, “The University in the 21st Century: Towards a Democratic and Emancipatory University Reform”, in: Robert A. Rhoads and Carlos Alberto Torres (eds.), The University, State, and Market in the Americas, Stanford University Press, 2006, pp. 60-100; Roland Barnett, Realizing the University in an Age of Supercomplexity, The Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press, Buckingham and Philadelphia, 2000, pp. 59-97; and Werner Z. Hirsch (eds.), As the Walls of Academia Are Trembling Down, Economics, London, Paris, Genève, 2002, pp. 13-30, 107-119, 130-145.
- <sup>19</sup> See Jacques Attali, La crise, et après ?, Fayard, Paris, 2008; Paul Krugman, The Return of Depression Economics and the Crisis of 2008, W. W. Norton & Company, New York, London, 2008.
- <sup>20</sup> See Andrei Marga, Die kulturelle Wende. Philosophische Konsequenzen der Transformation, Cluj University Press, 2005, pp. 195-226; and Samuel P. Huntington and Lawrence E. Harrison (eds.), Streit um Werte. Wie Kulturen den Fortschritt prägen, Europa Verlag, Hamburg, Wien, 2002, pp. 13-34, 37-55, 75-89, 123-161.
- <sup>21</sup> See Michael Daxner, Ist die Universität noch zu retten?, Reinbeck bei Hamburg, 1996; Dominique Lacapra, “The University in Ruins? Academic Ideological Conflict”, in: “Critical Inquiry”, Autumn, 1998; Andrei Marga, “The Culture of Scholarship in Europe Today”, in Daedalus - Journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, Volume 123, No. 3, 1997, pp.171-184.
- <sup>22</sup> Karl Jaspers, Karl Rosemann, Die Idee der Universität, Springer, Berlin, 1961, p. 36.
- <sup>23</sup> Paul Mikat, Helmut Schelsky, Grundzüge einer neuen Universität, C. Bertelsmann, Gütersloh, 1966, pp. 37-70.

- 
- <sup>24</sup> James R. Perkins, The University in Transition, Princeton University Press, 1965. See also Nannert O. Keohane, "The Mission of the Research University", in Daedalus -, Cambridge Mass., Fall 1993, pp. 101-125.
- <sup>25</sup> Jean Francois Lyotard, La condition postmoderne. Rapport sur le savoir, Les Editions de Minuit, Paris, 1979, p. 65.
- <sup>26</sup> Jürgen Habermas, "Die Idee der Universität – Lernprozesse", in: Jürgen Habermas, Eine Art Schadensabwicklung, Suhrkamp, Frankfurt am Main, 1987, p. 74.
- <sup>27</sup> Dieter Henrich, "Die Krise der Universität in vereinigten Deutschland", in Deutsche Zeitschrift für Philosophie, Vol. II, 1992, pp. 124-125; Manfred Eigen, "Die deutsche Universität – Vielfalt der Formen, Einfalt der Reformen", in: Die deutsche Universität. Versuch einer Standortbestimmung, pp. 73-112.
- <sup>28</sup> John Searle, "Rationality and Realism. What is at stake?", in "Daedalus", Cambridge Mass., Fall 1993, pp. 59-68.
- <sup>29</sup> Burton R. Clark, Creating Entrepreneurial Universities. Organizational Pathways of Transformation, International Association of Universities Press and Pergamon Elsevier Science, 1998. See also Stefan Kwiatkowski and Jan Sadlak (eds.), Intellectual Entrepreneurship through Higher Education, Warsaw, 2003.
- <sup>30</sup> See Michael Crowe, Hope, Change, and Affirmation: New Values to Guide Institutional Innovation in American Higher Education, College Board Forum, Houston, Texas, November 6, 2008.
- <sup>31</sup> Katharine C. Lyall, Kathleen R. Sell, The True Genius of America at Risk. Are We Losing Our Public Universities to De Facto Privatization?, American Council on Education, Praeger, Westport, 2006, p. 148.
- <sup>32</sup> See Andrei Marga, "Die Mission und die Funktionen der Universität heute", in: Winfried Böhn und Martin Lindauer (eds.), Die Universität in der Gesellschaft. Verantwortung und Chancen für die Zukunft, pp. 183-207.
- <sup>33</sup> Talcott Parsons, G. M. Platt, The American University, Cambridge University Press, Mass., 1972.
- <sup>34</sup> See Magna Charta Universitatum
- <sup>35</sup> Stewart Sutherland, The Idea of a University, in Universities in the Twenty-first Century, Paul Hamley Foundation, National Commission on Education, London, 1994, p. 3.
- <sup>36</sup> Andrei Marga, "Öffentliche oder private Universitäten?", in: Andrei Marga, Bildung und Modernisierung, Cluj University Press, 2003, pp. 275-281.
- <sup>37</sup> Norberto Bobio, Le futur de la démocratie, Seuil, Paris, 2007, pp. 131-133.
- <sup>38</sup> Howard Gardner, Five Minds for the Future, Harvard Business Press, Boston, Mass., 2008, p. 129.
- <sup>39</sup> *Ibidem*, pp. 14-15.
- <sup>40</sup> See Andrei Marga, "Multiculturalism, Interculturality and Leadership", in: Higher Education in the World, 3, GUNI, Palgrave MacMillan, New York, 2008, pp. 114-118.
- <sup>41</sup> Neumann Y. and Neumann E., "The President and the College Bottom Line: The Role of Strategic Leadership Styles", Library Consortium Management, 2, 2000, pp. 97-112.
- <sup>42</sup> Andrei Marga, "The Reform of Education and the Challenges of the Next Century" in: Andrei Marga, University Reform Today, Cluj University Press, 2005, pp. 111-135. See also Andrei Marga, "Academic Consequences of Globalisation. Open markets, autonomous organizations, creative minds", in: Malcolm H. Field, James Figan (eds.), Education Across Borders: Philosophy, Policy, Pedagogy. New Paradigms and Challenges, Waseda University, Tokyo, 2005, pp. 17-28.
- <sup>43</sup> Sadlak, J. and Liu, N.C. (eds.), World-Class Universities: Aiming Beyond Status Bucharest/Cluj/Shanghai: UNESCO-CEPES, the Cluj University Press, and the Shanghai Jiao Tong University, 2007.
- <sup>44</sup> Paolo Blasi, "The European University – Towards a Wisdom-Based Society", Higher Education in Europe, 31, no. 4, 2006: 403-407.
- <sup>45</sup> See the special issue of Higher Education in Europe, 31, no. 4, 2006.
- <sup>46</sup> Peter Scott, "Ethics 'in and 'for' Higher Education", Higher Education in Europe, 29, no. 4, 2004: 439-450.
- <sup>47</sup> "The Bucharest Declaration concerning Ethical Values and Principles for Higher Education in the Europe Region", Higher Education in Europe, 29, no. 4, 2004: 503-507.