Bononia University Press

Composition of Magna Charta Observatory

As of 30th September 2010

Council
Prof. Üstün Ergüder, President, Sabanci *University, Istanbul*
Prof. Aleksa Bjeliš, *University of Zagreb*
Prof. Ivano Dionigi, *University of Bologna*
Prof. Roberto Grandi, *University of Bologna*
Prof. Georges Haddad, *UNESCO, Paris*
Mr. Jens Jungblut, *Germany*
Prof. Hélène Lamicq, *University of Paris XII*
Prof. Andrei Marga, *University "Babes-Bolyai" Cluj*
Prof. André Oosterlinck, *University of Leuven*
Prof. Robert Quinn, *Scholars at Risk Network, New York*
Prof. Marius Rubiralta, *Ministry of Science and Innovation, Madrid*
Prof. Christina Ullenius, *University of Karlstad*
Dr. Martina Vukasovic, *Centre for Education Policy, Belgrade*

Prof. Fabio Roversi-Monaco, Honorary President of the Magna Charta Observatory, *University of Bologna*

Secretariat
Mr. Bastian Baumann, *Secretary General*
Ms. Carla Pazzaglia, *Administrator*

Contact address
Observatory of the Magna Charta
Via Zamboni 25
40126 Bologna, Italy
Tel. +39.051.2098709
Fax +39.051.2098710
e-mail: magnacharta@unibo.it
www.magna-charta.org

Observatory for Fundamental University Values and Rights

Making the Magna Charta Values Operational

Theory and Practice

Proceedings of the Conference of the Magna Charta Observatory 16-17 September 2010

Bastian Baumann
Carlos Alberto Braumann
Boaventura de Sousa Santos
Ivano Dionigi
Üstün Ergüder
Mohamed Farghaly
Konstantin K. Khudoley
Peter Rathjen
Jorge Enrique Silva Duarte

Bononia University Press

Bononia University Press
Via Farini 37 – 40124 Bologna
tel.: (+39) 051 232 882
fax: (+39) 051 221 019

ISBN 978-88-7395-615-0

www.buponline.com
e-mail: info@buponline.com

Printed on recycled paper 

Printed by: Labanti e Nanni (Crespellano, Bologna)

First printed in March 2011

Free copy - Not for sale

Contents

Foreword

Ivano Dionigi, Rector
University of Bologna

Many of you, as representatives of different Universities from all over the world, were here yesterday for the debate dedicated to the European Higher Education Area, a new setting that deeply involves the Universities of Europe, wider Europe, the Europe of culture and knowledge that goes well beyond the European Union, that includes Russia, Ukraine and a significant area from Turkey to Kazakhstan, which is the object of growing interest by global actors.

I am very grateful for your participation and I am also grateful to the Board of the Observatory that accepted to combine these two events, thus giving a broader scope to the considerations on Europe and on Europe's capacity to interact with the rest of the world.

The Magna Charta is the moral foundation of European convergence. It was conceived as a synthesis of the main values shared by the most ancient European Universities but since the very beginning it has been

part of a wider, global perspective focused on cultural exchange and sensibility for different backgrounds and traditions. This foresight, together with the simplicity and substance of the values, is the strength of this text that, every year, arouses the interest of new signing institutions.

The yearly celebration of the anniversary can be considered as a reminder for the universities that signed in the past, so that we keep reflecting on the meaning of this document in our days. This year, in particular, we are invited to discuss how to make Magna Charta values operational in different contexts.

Institutional autonomy, academic freedom, intercultural dialogue, linking of teaching and research, international cooperation can sound as abstract words, elements that are given for granted in our daily work. For this reason it is necessary to agree today on how to guarantee mutual engagement, open dialogue and specific investments in order to communicate within our institutions and to the society the real meaning of the mentioned values, so that they can become actual, operational and enable the change and the evolution of our universities.

Opening Address

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

Why did we decide to have "Making Magna Charta Value Operational?" as a theme for this year's event?

Peter Scott in volume he edited (*The Globalization of Higher Education*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press, 1988) estimates that of the 1,854 universities founded between 1200 and 1985, three quarters were established since 1900, and 1,101 were founded between 1950 and 1985.

According to International *Journal of Scientometrics, infometrics and bibliometrics*, total number of universities in the world is now estimated to be17,036. (The information can be found on www.webometrics.info/methodology.html).

This figure may be debatable according to how one defines a "university." I don't want go into fine-tuning of definition and into problems of how we count and measure. Yet, it is an indicator that we are faced with a completely new paradigm where the number of

universities has dramatically gone up in the world.

Clark Kerr (*The Uses of the University*. Harvard University Press, Boston, 1963, p. 115) makes a very interesting observation. He states: *"about eighty-five institutions in the Western world established by 1520 still exist in recognizable forms, with similar functions and with unbroken histories, including the Catholic church, the Parliaments of the Isle of Man, of Iceland, and of Great Britain, several Swiss Cantons, and seventy universities. Kings that rule, feudal lords with vassals, and guilds with monopolies are all gone. These seventy universities, however, 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 ways*."

The concept of university Clark implies is very much associated with how we do things in our institutions. Values internalized over ages are terribly important in determining how we carry on with our missions.

We are seeking institutional autonomy (from politics, society and now the market) for our institutions and academic freedom for our scholars in order for them to perform their tasks.

The 70 institutions that are still with us that Kerr is talking about are most likely to have the wisdom of history and accumulation of ethical values related to our profession behind them.

Moreover, their experiences have pioneered the values that we today uphold and guard.

The new institutions that emerge all over the world and lay claims to being a university do not have the benefit of such a history behind them.

Furthermore, we have a great diversity of institutions.

To mention a few:

- Public versus private
- Teaching versus research
- Universities of specialization
- For profit institutions

We strongly believe that it is about time to put institutional autonomy and academic freedom on the agenda of our universities so that we can enhance and protect these values in these times of great change and growth.

A very important question has to do with decreasing state funds for higher education.We are more and more being forced to generate funds. In other words our sources of funding are becoming more diversified. Some scholars of higher education like Burton Clark think that this is an important opportunity to secure institutional autonomy. Other scholars, mainly from Europe, see a great danger in this rush for funds for institutional autonomy, academic freedom. They see the market place, private funds, and income generation as potentially corruptive of the values that we stand for. Both arguments have merits. The question, for us, is how do we take advantage of diverse funding systems while we do not compromise our autonomy and academic freedom. How are these values related to linking teaching and research? Or are they related? How is institutional autonomy and academic freedom related to innovation in curriculum and program design? Or is it related? What is the relationship between the type of funding and institutional mission setting and strategic planning?

The Observatory designed this Conference to help find some answers, or at least, to start thinking about

these problems. You will be dividing into working groups to knit and pick on these issues. I am sure you will not come up with answers. More questions will most probably be the order of the day. After all our profession is about raising questions, critically thinking and debating about problems we all face.

To come up with solutions for implementation, since most of you are academic leaders groping to solve problems, will be a concern for each one of you and your universities. Sharing ideas and experiences within the framework of our universal values is the function of meetings like this.

We strongly believe that with increasing autonomy and greater sphere of academic freedom our universities will be in a better position of responding to the challenges that both higher education and societies face today.

Molly Corbett Broad, reporting in Inside Higher Education ("We All Could Lose in the UVA Case," July 29, 2010) states:

The stakes are high. Academic freedom protects scholars of every stripe from government repression or retaliation, especially when they take on controversial topics and espouse unpopular theories. Throughout history, nations that protect academic freedom have strong institutions of higher education. Where academic freedom is weak, governmental power goes unchecked. The matter concerns not just the academy but all of us as citizens. We know that a thriving, independent, intellectually diverse higher education sector is best able to produce the scientific discoveries and advances in knowledge that make society better.

I agree with her completely.

Highlights of the Observatory Activities

Bastian Baumann, Secretary General
Magna Charta Observatory, Bologna

During the last academic year the Magna Charta Observatory has undertaken various activities, upon which I would like to reflect at this occasion.

Another year has passed since the last gathering here in Bologna. Last year the number of signatory universities increased to 660 and we are very happy again have a large number of universities that will be signing the Magna Charta Universitatum this year. After this conference, we will have a total of 722 universities, which have declared their commitment to adhere to, promote, uphold and defend the values and principles that make a university the unique institution we all know.

Again, we can proudly say that the significance of the Magna Charta Universitatum as well as that of the Magna Charta Observatory does not cease to exist. It is rather the opposite. The Observatory is receiving more and more requests by individual universities

and international organisations to remind about the fundamentals of the University in the debates currently taking place.

What we can witness all around the world are major reforms in the area of higher education. Those reforms more often than not have a direct or an indirect impact on questions of autonomy and/or academic freedom. Hence, one of the major tasks of the Observatory was to stay vigilant with regard to those reforms and to be of help to the universities, the community of shared purpose and thereby also to society.

However, staying vigilant about all the changes requires a very high level of awareness of what is happening all around the globe. That is a task where we require also the active support by the signatory universities. We need the signatory universities to inform us about any proposals that could be of concern to the academic community. We need the advice of signatory universities about the specific context, in which reforms are taking place.

And indeed, some of the signatory universities have been in frequent contact with us about the systems they are based in. We have therefore also given the highest priority to any request coming from a signatory universities to be of direct help. When we were asked to do so, whenever possible we also visited institutions and other actors in their respective countries in order to put our voice into the debates. Obviously, the possibility to do so depended on both financial and human resources, but most of the time the signatory universities were able to offer the support to enable us to take on our responsibilities.

In the same light, we are very glad and thankful

for all the general support we have received from universities. Quite some of the universities have started to support the Magna Charta Observatory financially. Especially in times of financial hardship these efforts cannot be valued high enough. This support enabled us to undertake more activities and we indeed immensely appreciate even the smallest of contributions.

Those contributions have often been donations, but also a number of universities have offered in-kind contributions and for example offered to host meetings of the Magna Charta Observatory Council. We have been very lucky that in February we were hosted by Süleyman Demirel University in Isparta and in May by the Odessa National University. Both of these opportunities we also used to organise national seminars about the principles and values of the Magna Charta Universitatum in the respective countries.

But the Observatory has also increased its cooperation with international organisations. We have embarked on a larger scale project with the Council of Europe on the role of public authorities in relation to autonomy and academic freedom that will be officially started this November. We have had extensive talks with the International Association of Universities about a common project. Together with the European Association of Quality Assurance Agencies (ENQA) we have jointly organised a conference that addressed the triangular relation and tensions between autonomy, quality assurance and rankings.

We have also further intensified our cooperation with the European Students' Union. We are very happy that the tradition of having the chairperson of ESU as an active contributor to our annual conference

is continuing. Currently, we are investigating the possibility of launching a joint project on the question of academic freedom as a student right.

With the generous support of the Ionian University, we have managed to organise the 8th edition of the Observatory's Summer School in Corfu. This year we have focused on the specific achievements and challenges of universities in South-East Europe in the current reforms in higher education and research. Again, it was a highly beneficial event with very good feedback from participants. Therefore, we do hope to be able to continue this tradition also in the years to come despite the economic problems that Greek institutions are facing.

We have also further intensified our work in Central Asia. In this context, we have to say that the continuous interest of Kazakh universities in the Magna Charta Observatory is a development we highly appreciate. Kazakhstan has now officially become part of the European Higher Education Area and we continue to provide our advice in relation to the necessary changes of their higher education system, fostering greater institutional autonomy and academic freedom.

But also in other parts of the world we have been active. This is also exemplified that we have participants from all continents at this conference. The origins of the Magna Charta Universitatum are European, but it addresses values and principles globally accepted and we are very happy about the growing importance in Africa, Asia, Latin America and the Arab World.

We have received a range of requests to also fulfil our role as mediator in cases of conflicts within universities or between universities and national authorities. This

is one of the tasks of the Observatory to provide an unbiased point of view and to try solving cases that have the potential to seriously and systematically harm the idea of what a university is and how it should be operating. Hence, we would like to stress again that every university can approach the Observatory and ask for our assistance.

One of the next topics, we will be addressing is the potential conflicts that arise between institutional autonomy and academic freedom. This is an aspect that has not been adequately addressed by anybody yet and we will make a publication on this following an in-depth working meeting with external experts. In this context, I would like to mention again that we as the Observatory also understand our role as being to the service of the signatory universities. Therefore, if signatory universities have requests or proposals for common research, joint conferences or other activities, we are more than happy to follow this up within the remits of the mandate derived from the Magna Charta Universitatum. Similarly, whenever the Observatory can be of assistance at conferences or meetings that signatory universities or organising, we will always try to make sure to positively respond to those requests.

The Magna Charta Observatory is a lively organisation as the Magna Charta Universitatum is a living document. But most of all that is due to signatory universities being active interlocutors with the organisation. If you have any wishes, needs, concerns or suggestions, do not hesitate to contact us at any time!

The Role of Universities as Promoters of Values

Boaventura de Sousa Santos, Professor
University of Coimbra, Portugal

When we consider the European university, or indeed the university worldwide, this is a moment in which it is as important to look back as to look forward. In the case of Europe, we are now right in the middle of the Bologna process. It is a period prone to intense fluctuations between positive and negative evaluations, between a sense that it is either too late or too early to achieve the results aimed at. In my view, such intense fluctuations in analysis and evaluation are a sign that everything remains open, that failure and success loom equally on the horizon, and that is up to us to make one or the other happen. The great philosopher Ernst Bloch wrote that by each hope there is always a coffin: *Heil* and *Unheil*.

Though it is our main objective to focus on the European University it would be foolish not to think that the challenges facing the European University today are to be found in all continents, however different the

reasons, the arguments, the proposed solutions may be.

In general we can assert that the university is undergoing – as much as the rest of contemporary societies – a period of paradigmatic transition. This transition can be characterized in the following way: we face modern problems for which there are no modern solutions. Very succinctly, our modern problems are the fulfilment of the ideals of the French Revolution: *liberté, egalité, fraternité*. In the past two hundred years we have not been able to fulfil such objectives in Europe, let alone elsewhere. The solutions designed to fulfil them have not been able to deliver the objectives so strenuously struggled for: I mean scientific and technological progress, formal and instrumental rationality, the modern bureaucratic state, the recognition of class, race and gender divisions and discriminations and the institutionalization of social conflict raised by them through democratic processes, development of national cultures and national identities, secularism and laicism, and so on and so forth. The modern university, particularly from midnineteenth century onwards, has been a key component of such solutions. It was actually in light of them that institutional autonomy, academic freedom and social responsibility were originally designed.

The generalized crisis of modern solutions has brought with it the crisis of the university. In the past forty years, for different but convergent reasons, in different parts of the world the university has become, rather than a solution for societal problems, an additional problem. After the Second World War, the early 1970s was a period of intense reformist impulses worldwide. In most cases, the student movements of the late 1960s early 1970s were the motive behind them.

As far as the university is concerned, the problem may be formulated in this way: the university is being confronted with strong questions for which it has so far provided only weak answers. Strong questions are those questions that go to the roots of the historical identity and vocation of the university in order to question not so much the details of the future of the university but rather whether the university, as we know it, has indeed a future. They are, therefore, questions that arouse a particular kind of perplexity. Weak answers take the future of the university for granted.

The reforms they call for end up being an invitation to immobilism.

They fail to abate the perplexity caused by the strong questions and may, in fact, even increase it. Indeed, they assume that the perplexity is pointless.

I submit that we must take up the strong questions and transform the perplexity they cause into a positive energy both to deepen and reorient the reformist movement. The perplexity results from the fact that we are before an open field of contradictions in which there is an unfinished and unregulated competition among different possibilities. Such possibilities open space for political and institutional innovation by showing the magnitude of what is at stake.

Let me give some examples of the strong questions facing the university at the beginning of the twenty-first century. Without claiming to be exhaustive, I select eleven such questions.

First strong question: given the fact that the university was part and parcel of the building of the modern nation-state – by training its elites and bureaucracy, by providing the knowledge and ideology

underlying the national project – how is the mission of the university to be refounded in a globalized world, a world in which state sovereignty is increasingly shared sovereignty or simply a choice among different kinds of interdependence, and in which the very idea of a national project has become an obstacle to dominant conceptions of global development? Is the global university a possible answer? In which case, how many such global universities are viable? What happens to the large number of the remaining ones? If global elites are to be trained in global universities, where to find in society the allies and the social base for the non-global universities? Which kinds of relationships between global and no global universities will there be? Will the focus on ranking contribute to the cohesion of the European higher education area or, on the contrary, to its segmentation through unfair competition and the rise of commercial internationalism?

A second strong question may be formulated as follows: The idea of a knowledge society implies that knowledge is everywhere; what is the impact of this idea on a modern university which was created on the premise that it was an island of knowledge in a society of ignorance? What is the place or the specificity of the university as a centre of knowledge production and diffusion in a society with many other centres of production and diffusion of knowledge?

Third strong question: At its best, the modern university has been a locus of free and independent thinking and of celebration of diversity, even if subjected to the narrow boundaries of the disciplines, whether in the sciences or the humanities. Bearing in mind that for the past thirty years the tendency to

transform the truth value of knowledge into the market truth value of knowledge has become increasingly strong, could there be any future for nonconformist, critical, heterodox, non-marketable knowledge, and for professors, researchers and students pursuing it? If yes, what will be its impact upon the criteria of excellence and inter-university competitiveness? If not, can we still call university an institution that only produces competent conformists and never competent rebels, and that only regards knowledge as a commodity and never as a public good?

Fourth strong question: The modern university has been from the beginning a transnational institution at the service of national societies. At its best, the modern university is an early model for international flows of ideas, teachers, students and books. We live in a globalized world but not in a homogeneously globalized world. Not only are there different logics moving globalized flows but also different power relations behind the distribution of the costs and benefits of globalization. There is transnational greed as there is transnational solidarity. Which side will the university be on? Will it become a transnational corporation or a transnational cooperative or non-profit organization? Is there a contradiction between our emphasis on cultural and social development and the emphasis of some European politicians and powerful think-tanks on economic development and the university's contribution to the global competitiveness of European businesses? Why have some major reform efforts outside Europe chosen the slogan: "Neither Bologna nor Harvard"?

Fifth strong question: In the long run, the idea of Europe is only sustainable as the Europe of ideas. Now,

the university has historically been one of the main pillars of the Europe of ideas, however questionable such ideas may have been. This has been possible by granting to the university a degree of institutional autonomy unimaginable in any other state institution. The dark side of this autonomy has been social isolationism, lack of transparency, organizational inefficiency, social prestige disconnected from scholarly achievement. In its original design, the Bologna process was to put an end to this dark side without significantly affecting the university's autonomy. Is this design being carried out without perverse results? Is the Bologna process a break with the negative aspects of the traditional university, or is it a brilliant exercise in reshuffling inertias and recycling old vices? Is it possible to standardize procedures and criteria across such different university cultures without killing diversity and innovation? Is it possible to develop transparency, mobility and reciprocal recognition while preserving institutional and cultural diversity? Why are bureaucrats taking control of the good ideas and noble ideals so easily?

Sixth strong question: Job prestige goes together with job qualification and scarcity. The modern university has been at the core of the social production of high-powered job qualifications.

If rankings manage to fragment the European and the future global university system, which jobs and which qualifications will be generated by which universities? The world system is built on an integrated hierarchy of core, peripheral and semi-peripheral countries. The current financial and economic crisis has shown that the same hierarchy holds in Europe and, as such, social cohesion is showing its dark side: it exists on the

condition that the structural hierarchy be not affected, that countries remain as core, peripheral or semi peripheral, without either moving up or down in the hierarchy.

Not necessarily coincident with location in the hierarchy of the countries in which they are located are we going to have peripheral, semi-peripheral and central universities? Will the Bologna process rigidify or liquefy such hierarchies? Depending on the geopolitical distribution of rankings, will hierarchy among universities contribute to accentuate or rather to attenuate the hierarchies among European countries?

Seventh strong question: As the university diversifies the degrees of qualification – first, second, third cycle and postdoctoral degrees – social illiteracy increases in the lower degrees, thus justifying the greater value of higher degrees. This is in fact a spiral movement. Has it exhausted its development potential? How many more cycles are we going to have in the future? Are we creating endless illiteracy in the same process that we create endless knowledge? Will peripheral and semi-peripheral universities be charged with solving the illiteracy problem, while the core universities will have the monopoly of highly qualified knowledge?

Eighth strong question: Can the university retain its specificity and relative autonomy while being governed by market imperatives and employment demands? Given the highly problematic validity of cost benefit analysis in the field of research and development, will the university be allowed to assume certain costs in the expectation of uncertain benefits, as it has always done in the past? What will happen to knowledge that has not and should not have market value? Regarding

marketable knowledge which impact on it is to be expected if such knowledge is going to be valued exclusively according to its market value? What is the future of social responsibility if extension is reduced to an expedient or burden to raise financial resources? What will happen to the imperative of making the university relevant to the needs of society, taking for granted that such needs are not reducible to market needs and may actually contradict them?

Ninth strong question: The university (or at least the public university) has historically been embedded in the three pillars of modern social regulation – the state, the market and civil society; however, the balance of their presence in the structure and functioning of the university has varied in the course of time. Indeed, the modern European university started here in Bologna as a civil society initiative. Later on, the state strengthened its presence which became dominant from mid-nineteenth century onwards, and in the colonies particularly after they became independent. In the last thirty years the market took the lead in structuring the university life. In a few decades the university went from producing knowledge and professionals for the market, to becoming itself a market, the market of tertiary education, and finally, at least according to powerful visionaries, to being run like a market organization, a business organization. Since then, civil society concerns have been easily confused with market imperatives or subordinated to them, and the state has very often used its coercive power to impose market imperatives to the reluctant universities. Is the Bologna process a creative response to neoliberal, one-dimensional demands or, on the contrary, a way of imposing them through a

transnational European process that neutralizes national resistance?

Tenth strong question: The European universities and many other universities around the world that followed their model were instrumental in disseminating a Eurocentric view of the world, a view powerful enough (in both intellectual and military terms) to claim universal validity. This claim did not involve ignoring the cultural, social and spiritual differences of the non-European world. On the contrary, it entailed knowing such differences, even though subjected to Eurocentric purposes, whether the romantic celebration of the Other or the colonial subjugation and destruction of the Other. In both cases, knowing the Other was at the service of showing the superiority and therefore the universality of European culture; a detailed, colonial or imperial knowledge of the Other was required.

My university, for instance, the University of Coimbra, founded in 1290, contributed immensely to the development of knowledge committed to the colonial enterprise. The quality and intensity of the homework done by the missionaries before embarking overseas is astounding, all the more astounding when we compare it with the homework done by WB and IMF executives when they go around evangelizing the world with the neoliberal orthodoxy in their heads and pockets. Of their knowledge claims it cannot be said what the great leader of the African Liberation movements, Amilcar Cabral, said about colonial knowledge: "The search for such knowledge, in spite of its unilateral, subjective and very often unfair character, does contribute to enriching the human and social sciences in general" (Cabral, 1978b: 314, my translation).

The tenth question is this: Is the university prepared to recognize that the understanding of the world by far exceeds the western understanding of the world? Is the university prepared to refound the idea of universalism on a new, intercultural basis? We live in a world of norms in conflict and many of them are resulting in war and violence. Cultural differences, new and old collective identities, antagonistic political, religious and moral conceptions and convictions are today more visible than ever, both outside and inside Europe. There is no alternative to violence other than readiness to accept the incompleteness of all cultures and identities, including our own, arduous negotiation, and credible intercultural dialogue. If Europe, against its own past, is to become a beacon of peace, respect for diversity and intercultural dialogue, the university will certainly have a central role to play. Are the European universities being reformed having such role in mind as a strategic objective of their future?

The eleventh question, probably the strongest of them all, is the following: Modern universities have been both a product and a producer of specific models of development. When the Bologna process started there were more certainties about the European project of development than there are today. The compound effect of multiple crises – the financial and economic crisis, the environmental and energetic crisis, the crisis of the European social model, the migration crisis, the security crisis – points to a civilizatory crisis or paradigmatic change. The question is: In such a tumultuous time, is the university's serenity possible? And, if possible, is it desirable? Is the Bologna process equipping the university to enter the debate on models of development

and civilizatory paradigms, or rather to serve as acritically and as efficiently as possible the dominant model decided by the powers that be and evaluated by the new supervisors of the university output at their service? At the international level, given the conflict between local conceptions of autonomous development and the global development model imposed by the rules of the WTO, and given the fact that the European states are donor states, will the European university contribute to a dialogue among different models of development? Or will it rather provide intellectual legitimacy to unilateral impositions by the donor states, as in the colonial period?

The present as the future's past

In my view, one decade after the beginning of the Bologna process, we have been so far providing only weak answers to these strong questions. The weakest of them all are the no answers, the silences, the taken for grantedness of the new common sense about the mission of the university. This is a situation that we should overcome as soon as possible. The danger is to convert really mediocre achievements into brilliant leaps forward, to disguise resignation under the mask of consensus, to orient the university towards a future in which there is no future for the university. To my mind, we are at a juncture which our complexity scientists would characterize as a situation of bifurcation. Minimal movements in one or other direction may produce major and irreversible changes. Such is the magnitude of our responsibility. We all know that we never act upon the future; we act upon the present in light of our anticipations or visions of how the future will look like. The strong

questions indicate that there is no single, consensual anticipation or vision to be taken for granted, and that is why the questions invite deep reflection. I suggest that we are before two alternative visions and that their copresence is the source of the tensions running through our university system today. They both invite two opposing imaginary visions of a retrospective evaluation of the reforms under way. That is, they look from the future at our present.

According to one of them, our reform efforts were indeed a true reform, as they succeeded in preparing the university to confront the challenges of the twenty-first century effectively – by diversifying its mission without giving away its authenticity, by strengthening institutional autonomy, academic freedom and social responsibility under the new and very complex conditions of Europe and of the world at large. Thus, the European university was able to rebuild its humanistic ideal in a new internationalist, solidary and intercultural way. According to the other, imaginary, retrospective vision, the Bologna process was, on the contrary, a counterreformation, as it blocked the reforms that the universities in different European countries were undertaking individually, and each one according to its specific conditions to face the above-mentioned challenges; furthermore, the Bologna process forced a convergence beyond a reasonable level. It did this with the purpose of disabling the university from the mechanisms that would allow it to resist against the business and market imperatives in the same manner as it resisted in the past against the imperatives of religion and later of the state.

In order not to end this talk on a pessimistic note, I will start by briefly detailing the second retrospective

vision and then turning to the first one. The second vision, the vision of the counterreformation, displays before us a dystopic scenario with the following features.

As we realize that the financial crisis has unveiled the dangers of creating a single currency without putting together public and fiscal policies and state budgets, it may well happen that, in the long run, the Bologna Process turn out to be the euro of European universities. Here are the foreseeable consequences: the principles of solidary university internationalism and respect for cultural diversity will be discarded in the name of the efficiency of the European university market and competition; the weaker universities (gathered in the weaker countries) will be dumped by the university rating agencies into the ranking garbage bin. Though claiming to be rigorous, university ranking will be, in a great measure, arbitrary and subjective. Most universities will suffer the consequences of fast decrease of public funding; many universities will be forced to close down. As is happening in other levels of education, the wealthy students and their parents will search throughout many countries for the best quality/price ratio, as they are already doing in the commercial malls which universities are also becoming, while the poor students and their parents will be confined to the poor universities existing in their poor countries or neighbourhoods.

The internal impact will be overwhelming: the relation between research and teaching, highly advertised by Bologna, will be a very paradise for the universities at the top of the ranking (a scarce minority) and perfect hell for the large majority of the universities and their scholars. The commodification criteria will reduce the value of the different areas of knowledge to their mar-

ket price. Latin, poetry or philosophy will be kept only if some informatic macdonald recognizes in them any measure of usefulness. University administrators will be the first ones to internalize the classifying orgy, an orgy of objective maniacs and indicators maniacs; they will excel in creating income by expropriating the students' families or robbing the faculty of their personal lives and leisure. They will exert all their creativity to destroy university creativity and diversity, to standardize all that is standardizeable and to discredit or discard all that is not.

The faculty will be proletarianized by the very means of educational production of which they are supposedly owners – that is, teaching, assessment, research. They will end up being zombies of forms, objectives, evaluations that are impeccable as to formal rigor but necessarily fraudulent in substance, *workpackages, deliverables, milestones,* bargains of mutual citation to improve the indices, evaluations of *where*-you-publish-*what*-I-couldn't-care-less, careers conceived of as exhilarating but flattened at the low positions in most situations. For the younger faculty the academic freedom will be a cruel joke. The students will be as masters of their learning as they will be slaves of their indebtedness for the rest of their lives.

They will enjoy autonomy and free choice in curricular matters with no idea of the logic and limits of the choices presented to them, and will be guided, in personalized fashion, toward a mass alternative of professional employment or of professional unemployment. Tertiary education will be finally liberalized according to the rules of the World Trade Organization.

As I said, none of the above has to happen. There is

another retrospective vision, and in our hearts and minds we very much hope that it will prevail. But for it to happen, we should start by recognizing and denouncing that the supposed new normalcy of the state of affairs in the above description is in fact a moral aberration and will entail the end of the university as we know it.

Let us consider now the other retrospective vision, the vision which, looking from the future into our present, evaluates the Bologna process as a true reform that changed the European university deeply and for the better. Such vision will emphasize the following features of our current undertakings.

First, the Bologna process was able to identify and solve most of the problems that the pre-Bologna university was suffering and unable to confront, such as: established inertias that paralysed any reformist effort; endogamic preferences that created aversion to innovation and challenge; institutional authoritarianism under the guise of scholarly authority; nepotism under the guise of merit; elitism under the guise of excellence; political control under the guise of democratic participation; neo-feudalism under the guise of department or school autonomy; fear of being evaluated under the guise of academic freedom; low scientific production justified as an heroic resistance to stupid terms of reference or comments by referees; generalized administrative inefficiency under the guise of respect for tradition.

Second, in so doing the Bologna process, rather than discrediting and throwing overboard the self-evaluation and reformist efforts that were being undertaken by the most dedicated and innovative professors and administrators, provided them with a new framework and powerful institutional support, to the extent that the

Bologna process could become an endogenous energy rather than an outside imposition. In order to succeed in this, the Bologna process managed to combine convergence with diversity and difference, and developed mechanisms of positive discrimination to allow for the different national university systems to cooperate and compete among themselves in fair terms.

Third, the Bologna process never let itself be taken over by the so-called international tertiary education experts with the capacity of transforming subjective, arbitrary preferences into self-evident truths and inevitable public policies. It kept in sight two powerful intellectual views of the mission of the university produced in the early years of the past century and unequivocally took sides between the two. One was formulated by Ortega y Gasset and Bertrand Russel, two intellectuals with very different political ideas, but who converged in denouncing the political instrumentalisation of the university; the other, formulated by Martin Heidegger in his inaugural lecture as rector of Freiburg university in 1933, in which he invited the university to contribute to the preservation of the German strengths of soil and blood. The Bologna process unequivocally adopted the first and refused the second.

Forth, the reformists never confused the market with civil society or the community and urged the universities to keep a broad conception of social responsibility, encouraging action research as well as extension projects aimed at bettering the lives of the more vulnerable social groups trapped in systemic social inequality and discrimination, be they women, the unemployed, young and elderly people, migrant workers, ethnic and religious minorities, and so on.

Fifth, the reform process made it very clear that the universities are centres of production of knowledge in the broadest possible sense. Accordingly, it promoted interculturality, heterodoxy and critical engagement in the best liberal tradition which the pre-Bologna university had abandoned in the name of political or economic correctness. In the same vein, it encouraged internal scientific pluralism and, most importantly, granted equal dignity and importance to knowledge with market value and knowledge with no possible market value. Moreover, the reformists had it very clear all along that in the field of research and development the cost/benefit analysis is a very crude instrument and may kill innovation instead of promoting it. In fact, the history of technology amply shows that the innovations with highest instrumental value were made possible with no attention to cost/benefit calculations.

Sixth, the Bologna process managed to strengthen the relationship between teaching and research, and, while rewarding excellence, it made sure that the community of university teachers would not be divided between two stratified segments: a small group of first class university citizens with abundant money, light teaching loads and other good conditions to carry out research, on the one hand, and, on the other, a large group of second class university citizens enslaved by long hours of teaching and tutoring with little access to research funds only because they were employed by the wrong universities or were interested in supposedly wrong topics. It managed to combine higher selectivity in recruitment and strict accountability in the use of teaching time and research funds with a concern for really equal opportunities. It conceived of the rankings as

the salt in food: too little makes it unpalatable; too much kills all the flavors. Moreover, at a given point it decided that what had happened in international rankings elsewhere could be applied to the university system as well. Accordingly, as the GDP index exists today side by side with the index of human development of the UNDP, the Bologna process managed to insert internal plurality in the ranking systems.

Seventh, the Bologna process ended up abandoning the once fashionable concept of human capital after concluding that the universities should form full human beings and full citizens and not just human capital subjected to market fluctuations like any other capital. This had a decisive impact on the curricula and on the evaluation of performances. Furthermore, the Bologna process managed to convince the European Union and the European states that they should be financially more generous with the public universities not because of corporatist pressures but rather because the investment in an excellent public university system is probably the best way of investing in the future of a Europe of ideas, the only way for Europe to remain truly European.

Finally, the Bologna process expanded exponentially the internationalization of the European university but took good care in promoting other forms of internationalism other than commercial internationalism. In this way, the European area of higher education ceased to be a threat to the academic freedom and intellectual autonomy of universities throughout the world to become a loyal and powerful ally in keeping the ideas of academic freedom, institutional autonomy and knowledge diversity well and alive in a world threatened by the *pensée unique* of market imperatives.

I have presented you with two alternative visions of our future.

There is no doubt in my mind that all of us here wish that our future be molded by the second retrospective vision I just described. It is in our hands to make that happen.

Conclusions from the Working Groups

In different working groups, participants of the conference discussed in depth some of the aspects linked to the values and principles of the Magna Charta Universitatum in their institutional routines and realities. The working groups followed the same pattern. Each of them started with an introduction to the respective topic and then provided room for an interactive discussion with the person giving the input and amongst participants themselves.

The working groups benefited from the fact that participants came from a variety of countries and contexts. It became obvious that they agreed on the importance of the issues contained in the Magna Charta Universitatum, but that at the same time, their interpretation depended on the institutional and national context. In this sense, the rapporteurs of the working groups made clear that the values and principles of the Magna Charta Universitatum are globally accepted, but

need to be interpreted in the respective context and also face challenges that differ vastly.

There were five working groups, which addressed the following topics:

- Linking teaching and research (input by Aleksa Bjeliš)
- The significance of funding for institutional mission setting (input by Christina Ullenius)
- The value of institutional autonomy and academic freedom for innovation in curriculum and programme design and delivery (input by Bert Vandenkendelaere)
- Negotiating with public authorities: state and private universities (input by André Oosterlinck)
- Strategic planning and institutional autonomy (input by Hélène Lamicq)

The discussions in the working groups ranged from concrete questions and challenges to more conceptual and philosophic ones. In all of the groups it became clear that there is a difference in declaring a university's commitment to adhere to the Magna Charta Universitatum and to work on this basis in the daily routines. Often, universities face the challenge of linking questions that appear in the framework of reforms or other changes with the guiding rationales of institutional autonomy and academic freedom. The concepts may not get blurred, however, they might be overshadowed by the institutional realities and stay in the background as abstract phrases.

The challenge for universities therefore is to develop policies, strategies and arguments that would facilitate the operationalisation of the values and principles of the Magna Charta Universitatum both in internal

discussions and in discussions with external partners and stakeholders as well as in the decision-making processes.

Difficult questions arise, taking account the past and current changes in the higher education landscape. The diversification of institutions and of missions places challenges on the concept of the "true university" mentioned in the Magna Charta Universitatum as does for example the fact that research is no longer the monopoly of universities, but is also carried out in other types of institutions and private companies.

The increasing pressure on universities to be competitive and the strive for excellence whilst catering for mass or universal higher education provision sometimes lets institutional leadership forget about the long-term implications of safeguarding the university as an autonomous institution, fostering creativity through challenging perceived wisdoms and allowing for innovative thinking by creating an atmosphere that stimulates discussions and generates new questions.

The diversification of funding streams has been considered as both vital for the development of universities and higher education systems, but at the same time puts pressures on institutions that now need to cater for a more diverse range of interests. However, reducing the dependency of the interests of a single funder might also turn out to be beneficial for the institution by augmenting its autonomy. However, the speed of reforms, especially related to funding, puts universities under pressure in terms of their institutional mission setting. Funding priorities might collide with the missions, as they often are not embracing the wide diversity that universities need and wish to cater for.

In the framework of academic freedom it is an item of discussion whether and to which extent this concept also applies to students in the sense of the German notion of Lernfreiheit in addition to Lehrfreiheit. The individualisation of learning paths is not always easy for universities to implement, but was deemed as a necessary element in current reforms. Also the participation of students in curriculum design or more generally in governance is despite being acknowledged as crucial in practice facing more and more limitations, especially in connection with a change in governance that gives more powers to structures outside universities, often reducing autonomy of institutions. Also in this area, the diversification of the student body is posing additional challenges to universities that have to address more specific needs due to the variety of social, economic and cultural backgrounds of students as well as the variation in terms of their preparation from secondary education. This has been considered especially problematic in systems that are still in a centralistic manner.

Again funding is of great importance and has manifold impacts, as universities are more and more asked to concentrate on what is considered economically viable or relevant – very often with a short-term view, neglecting the more general contribution of higher education to society. Furthermore, the different pressure groups inside universities might also have a limiting impact in so far as they lead to the necessity to make compromises in order to maintain the institutional balance. The growing importance of buffer bodies like quality assurance agencies might depending on their nature and policies provide for greater possibilities of institutions to decide about their curricula as could

an increase in international cooperation, as often the authorities are more hesitant to influence institutional decisions in these circumstances.

Institutional autonomy in connection to strategic planning, but also regarding other decisions should not be understood as being entirely independent from any outside actors or stakeholders and in particular society at large. It is more to be understood as self-governance. The political, economic and also legal context in which a university is operating has certain implications for the strategic planning of universities even if a university is able to govern its own structures. Transparency of mission setting and strategic planning is paramount both as a confidence enhancing measure as well as for accountability purposes. Also, it is necessary that all groups within a university are adequately involved in the decisions about the strategies. If this was not the case, it would automatically lead to tensions. This involvement should be ensured in all the stages of strategic management, starting from defining the aims and objectives to be reached, to the methods used, decisions about resources, the timeline and the evaluation of results. This approach was deemed crucial despite of or rather because of the diversification and massification of universities and higher education systems generally in order to guarantee long-term planning and security.

The Magna Charta Principles and Values in the Daily Routines of a University

Carlos A. Braumann, Rector
University of Évora, Portugal

Let me start by saluting all Universities present here, with a special word to the Rectors or representatives of those like us that are joining the group of signers of the *Magna Charta Universitatum*. I am sure that we all agree this is a moment of great importance to the institutions we represent. Under the inspiration of the *Alma Mater* of the Universities and the long standing tradition of teaching, study and research the University of Bologna has embodied since medieval times, we assume the responsibility to contribute to and defend the university ideals of freedom and independence in research and teaching, of mutual interchange of ideas and of permanent dialog among peoples and cultures.

These are big challenges which are at the core of the Universities endeavour to achieve excellence as centres of production, teaching and dissemination of knowledge and of education of the future generations. These challenges are present in the developmental targets and

the daily life of the University I am representing here.

The University of Évora is the second oldest Portuguese University. Founded in 1559, it stood out for two centuries for its role in the education of the elites and the training of missionaries. Restored as public University in 1973, it is now devoted to the education of the future elites of the country, those that wish to conquer that position by their own merit and their commitment to serve the community, sustained in a high quality learning environment and in perennial values such as mutual respect, desire for knowledge, intellectual honesty and freedom of thought.

In our Schools (School of Arts, School of Sciences and Technology, School of Social and Human Sciences, School of Nursing) and the Institute for Advance Research and Teaching (combining research centres, doctoral programmes and *Erasmus Mundus* programmes), we have currently about 8000 students in the three cycles (licenciatura or 1st degree, master degree and doctoral degree). Other students, in increasing numbers, are following shorter duration programmes or are engaged in lifelong learning.

In 2007 we have deeply remodelled our teaching programmes, adapting them to the guiding principles of the Bologna Declaration. In so doing, we have created the conditions for the implementation of a new learning model, more centred in the individual work and responsibility of the students and in a greater autonomy in their choices of learning paths.

We put great care in increasing the mobility of teachers and students (within and outside Europe) and in strengthening the connection between the research and the service to the community pursued by our teachers

and researchers and the student's learning environment in all three cycles. Particularly in the 2nd and 3rd cycles, we actively pursue the integration of the students in national and international research teams. Our Schools and our Research Centres have embraced that policy, which resulted in a substantial increase in the number of doctoral students.

We faced and still face some difficulties, particularly in the training of teaching staff to a paradigm more centred on learning than on teaching and in making the students take proper charge of their increased responsibility. A big difficulty was that our previous 1st degree programmes consisted of 4 or 5 curricular years instead of the 3 years that most of them have now. The adaptation of the curricula was hard, trying to fight the tendency to just squeeze the previous 4-5 year curricula into a 3 year period (imposing a much faster pace to the students) and the tendency to sacrifice the basic and supporting sciences component of the programmes.

In Portugal, public universities, like the University of Évora, have great autonomy granted by the constitution and by the law and embodied in their own bylaws. However, their decisions are quite conditioned, as I shall explain.

The programmes used to be approved by the Ministry that would verify compliance to some rules. Recently, an accreditation agency was created for that purpose, where panels of experts examine thoroughly the programmes and make recommendations to a Board. This is in principle an improvement but judgment became much more subjective and sometimes even biased by individual interests of the panel members or of their institutions. Somebody else is deciding for us what

gets approved or not, based on somewhat unpredictable criteria.

University's autonomy is now more conditioned.

According to strict rules, the University proposes every year which of the approved programmes are to accept new students, and how many and the Ministry approves. This has some advantages in regulating supply and demand and in making better use of national resources, but strongly limits the University's ability to develop new directions and to adapt to new needs in the society.

Another conditioning factor of the public universities autonomy comes from the laws that strictly regulate academic careers and salaries (although those that participate in services to the community can have supplementary income provided by the corresponding budget). That makes it hard to attract or to distinguish the merit of the more prestigious professors. Also, the University cannot promote someone with merit to a higher position in the academic rank, but rather open a new position to which everyone in the world satisfying the conditions can apply. But that requires having a budget that can accommodate an additional salary, even if the University does not require an additional teacher in that area. In times of shrinking budgets, the result is an almost freeze in promotion opportunities, with the detrimental effects anyone can anticipate. Also, we cannot adjust the composition of the staff according to the changing needs of the University, since ceasing someone's contract can only be done in case of bad performance. That means that, under a limited budget, there are areas with a shrinking student body in which we have an excess of teachers, while in others we have

an increasing number of students but cannot hire new teachers.

Budgets are, of course, a limiting factor. Research money comes basically from projects financed by national and international agencies on a competitive basis. Teaching money in public universities depends mainly on the public allowance, although tuitions (strictly ruled and limited) pay a part of the costs. Public allowances were supposed to be based on the number of students, of course giving higher allowances for students of more costly programmes. Although there are important distortions with some discretionary decisions, the most compromising factor of the institution's autonomy is the unpredictability of the rules, which vary quite often, and of the amounts per student, which have been shrinking. So, long or midterm planning, an essential item in the determination of the future of an institution, becomes extremely difficult, to say the least.

Obviously, things could change for the better if the laws would change in the right direction in the academic careers and in the predictability of the budget. The law on academic careers has been revised recently and it is not likely to be changed in the near future. In these times of financial crisis, it is difficult to convince governments to have predictable rules for teaching budgets of public universities. On program accreditation by the new agency, however, there is room for progress since the agency's Board is making an effort to listen to the concerns of the universities.

Despite some limitations, though, the Portuguese public Universities have a substantial autonomy, particularly in the choice of their Boards and Rector, in the use of their budget, and in many aspects of daily life.

This will certainly help us facing a new challenge: to considerably increment the training of new generations while attracting new publics to the University and providing the lifelong learning that allows the society to adjust to an ever (and fast) changing reality. That demanding task under ordinary circumstances becomes formidable in the context of the current economic crisis. But Universities have repeatedly, along their history, lived moments of crisis, facing, as living organisms of society, the environment in which they are immersed, learning and innovating as a result of those experiences. We shall and, I am sure, we will dare facing the new challenges.

The Magna Charta Principles and Values in the Daily Routines of a University

Konstantin K. Khudoley, Vice-Rector
Saint-Petersburg State University, Russia

The Magna Charter Universitatum was signed 22 years ago. Since then we have witnessed some dramatic changes that are going to continue to affect the future of humanity for a very long time. Those were truly the years of tectonic shifts. The world has moved away from a bipolar system to a more complex one, while the Cold War although relapsing from time to time has now become part of our history. Europe is very different today. Back in 1988, the Berlin Wall was separating nations, having been a symbol of division and confrontation for several decades. Despite many difficulties and challenges, collaboration and cooperation are the predominant trends in Europe of the XXI century. The collapse of the totalitarian regime in the Soviet Union made it possible for a group of newly independent states to emerge. Since then new Russia has been building its policy on entirely different values. These events have changed the face of our city as well!

It regained its historic name – St. Petersburg, and it even acquired a more European look similar to other major western cities.

To what extent did those radical changes influence the daily routines at St. Petersburg State University? The answer is far from being straightforward and simple.

First, it should be emphasized that in recent years bringing the system of education up-to-date is an increasingly prominent issue on the political agenda of the Russian leaders. The Russian export oriented economy (like that of the former Soviet Union) is largely dependent on oil and gas prices. Any fluctuations in the energy markets have the greatest impact on the economy of Russia. This tendency has long been a cause of anxiety among some part of political circles. However, only recently some concrete steps have been taken to pave the path for innovative development. In 2005 the Government initiated several "National Projects" one of which being "Education." As part of that national project, the University received a government grant of 1 billion roubles for bringing innovation into the academic learning. At the 2006 G-8 Summit, Russia, as the presiding country, brought up education as a priority issue.

The recent financial and economic crisis has created a tremendous impetus for change. The drop in Russia's GDP by about 8% in 2009 (the most significant decline among all the economies of the G-20) caused concern with the Russian leaders. The slogan of "modernization" has become one of the most resonant with the public of the country. Thus, further reforms have been undertaken in the area of higher education. Russia's leadership identified three types of universities:

– *Unique* (this includes St. Petersburg State and Moscow State Universities only. A law adopted in 2009 determines their exclusive status)

– *Federal* (these are some universities in different regions of the country to become the locomotives of development in those regions)

– *Research* (this type includes mainly those universities that make major advances in the field of science).

It is expected that particular attention will be paid to the development of these three types of universities.

The adoption of the new law on the special status of St. Petersburg State and Moscow State Universities was truly a turning point in the evolution of higher education in Russia. This document has already had a great affect on the operations of our University.

The key provisions of the Act are as follows:

First, the University gained nearly full academic autonomy. The University Academic Council now solely determines the educational standards for all specializations and areas of concentration. Curricula are now developed by the Faculty Academic Councils and endorsed by the University Rector. The State standards and regulations of the Ministry of Education and Science on the management and content of the educational programmes are no longer binding. The only requirement remaining is that the level of standards imposed on graduating students should be higher than that of the State.

It took less that a year following the adoption of the new law for the Academic Council of St. Petersburg State University to take advantage of its prerogative. New educational standards have been applied to a third of specializations and areas of concentration administered by the University.

It is really a major step for Russia. Such university privileges in the academic field had been previously unknown during the times of either the Russian Empire or the Soviet Union. It should be emphasized that this unprecedented practice is expected to be extended to the Federal and Research types of universities as well.

Secondly, St. Petersburg State and Moscow State Universities now have the right to issue diplomas of their own standard. This should confirm their independent academic status, the high quality of educational standards and level of training of their graduates. Up until very recently, all graduates had been receiving diplomas of the State standard. In 2010, St. Petersburg State University made use of its privilege and all graduates received diplomas of a particular university standard. I should note that the major difference is that the new diploma uses two languages – Russian and English.

Thirdly, the two Universities have been entitled to administer an additional entrance examination to high school graduates seeking admission. This issue is one of the most controversial at both the university level and society as a whole. As of now, admission to universities in Russia is primarily based on the results of the unified state examination that all high school graduates have to take. The proponents of this system argue that it is an effective way to combat corruption, which was widespread when administering entrance examinations. The opponents, on the other hand, argue that the system of unified state exam is making one size fit all students, which makes it impossible to identify the most talented. There is a difference of approach to the dilemma by St. Petersburg and Moscow State Universities. Moscow State has kept the entrance exams for all programmes,

while St. Petersburg State – just for a few. Moreover, this year our University posted on its website the letters from some senior officials and State Duma Representatives requesting admission for their protégées. This move provoked a positive reaction among general public and became a clear manifestation of our desire to make university operations more transparent.

Fourthly, the law defined the basic features of the internal structure of the two Universities. The President of the Russian Federation now appoints the Rectors of Moscow and St. Petersburg State Universities.

Among other important recent changes in the university daily routines, I would like to mention the increasing role of scientific research. During the Soviet and early post-Soviet years the government funded research primarily at the Academy of Sciences, while universities received minimum funding. Now the situation is changing. The role of universities in conducting scientific research and the level of government funding are steadily rising. This largely involves nanotechnology, biomedicine, and other industries that spur scientific and technological progress.

Summing up we can say that the daily routines at our University over the last 22 years have changed. The role of the Magna Charter Universitatum is beyond doubt. The Magna Charter Universitatum of course is no mandatory regulation for our daily activities, but it is certainly a guideline, an ideal, so to say, to which we should like to come to as close as possible.

The Magna Charta Principles and Values in the Daily Routines of a University

Mohamed Farghaly, President Arab Academy for Science and Technology and Maritime Transport, Egypt

It gives me a great pleasure to be here today and to join such a great host of a worldwide community of universities sharing the same ideals and principles embodied in the Magna Charta Universitatum – as proposed by the University of Bologna in 1986 – even though many of these universities are operating in different countries and various circumstances.

Towards this noble cause, it is my pleasure – on behalf of the Arab Academy for Science, Technology and Maritime Transport (AASTMT) – to sign this important document. By doing so, we look to cherish the deepest values of university traditions; to enhance strong and rewarding cooperation bonds between North and South of the Mediterranean in the field of University liberal education and research; and to establish more effective and far-reaching intellectual, cultural, social, scientific and technological links among university institutes in the world at large.

In essence, the Magna Charta of universities evolves around two main pillars: autonomy and academic freedom. Institutional Autonomy is widely perceived as the freedom of the Institution to carry out its mission in answering the societal needs through Teaching, Research and Engaging with the community, whilst academic freedom refers to individual academics and their freedom to teach, research and publish. These two pillars form the driving framework of the role of universities in development and progress; as well as the cultural, social, intellectual, scientific and technological impacts of these universities on all levels: national, regional and international.

Within this context, I would like to brief you on how the Arab Academy for Science, Technology and Maritime Transport is affected on a daily basis by the values that the Magna Charta stands for.

The Academy:

The Arab Academy is a specialized agency of the Arab league of states, engaged in teaching, training, research, community service and projects. Established in 1972, it is now a multifaceted institution with a diversity of functions serving a multinational body of students and researchers coming mainly from Arab and African countries.

Formally, the President of the Academy is elected democratically by 22 Arab countries. He reports to the highest governing body of the Academy which is the Ministerial Council of Education and Transport which monitors, evaluates and draws future plans for the Academy's activities.

This unique institutional setting implies a range of challenges but it also offers many advantages. The

Academy is not under the direct control and supervision of one ministry. This in fact means that there is almost no interference by public authorities into the operations of the institution like can be found in many other universities around the world. This free and democratic atmosphere allows the Academy to function and move up from one success to another, where all future plans and decisions are made within the Academy's internal councils, forums and committees, in a way which is strongly advocated by the Magna Charta Universitatum's fundamental values.

It has been the Arab Academy's deliberate decision to expand and develop through the years, and to move from its regional focus to embracing globalisation. One of the crucial elements for fostering this move has been the constant promotion of academic freedom for both professors and students at large.

The Academy as an Autonomous Institution

In response to the pressures of political impacts when the number of students from Arab countries declined in 1990, the Academy started to function as a self-financing institution, thus further enhancing the independence from economic, political and religious powers.

The self-financing policy and autonomy adopted by the Academy as from 1990 resulted in having more flexibility and freedom in teaching, research and supporting the community. This required providing members of the Arab Academy community with the resources necessary to serve societal needs, to decide freely on it is Teaching and Research. The Academy has the possibility, unlike other universities in the region, to decide on its budget strictly according to its own mission, vision and development plans. An example of this:

In Teaching. The Academy has been able to develop and introduce innovative methods of teaching, learning and assessment, without the need to gain approval by public authorities. This also allows for stronger involvement of students through the use of – real life – problem based learning, which is undertaken in the project Incubator's centre.

This centre offers the projects' market different service lines including Marketing, Human resources, Financial, and Administration services either through its resources or through outsourcing if required, and then it releases the project to incubate the next one. Students participate in this process and it enhances their learning experience.

In Research. The Academy established the *"Scientific Research and Projects Fund"* which finances projects of paramount importance to local, regional and Global needs.

The autonomy that the Academy enjoys also allows for making investments according to institutional decisions. This for example allowed for the installment of huge modern planetarium and in research projects of high significance to the society, examples to this are:

• The *Micro Algal Bio-Reactors* which targets the Production of micro algae to be used in both human and livestock feeding as well as in medical and cosmetic industries.

• The *Aquaculture Research Centre (ARC)* which help current and establishing new investment projects in the field of aquaculture. This research includes farming of the halophytic plants (salt tolerant plants) as Salicornia spp. which is irrigated mainly by sea-water and cultivated in sandy soil.

Also in the area of *Community Services Projects and Activities*, the Academy has the possibility to engage to a much greater extend than it is common in the area. This freedom allowed the Academy to engage in activities that often require a more long-term vision. The Academy is able to withstand the political or economic powers that often tend to favour activities that promise short-term returns. This independence is crucial in order to allow researchers as well as students to operate freely in the interest of academia and the search for truth and innovation.

It was those activities that allowed the Academy to become a prominent institution, respected by, and connected to, the UN, UNDP, IMO and the World Bank and many other global organisations, especially in the field of disaster reduction and even leading to H.E. Mr. Pan ki Moon, United Nations Secretary General commending and praising the role and activities exerted by the Arab Academy in reducing disasters in the Arab Region, North Africa and West Asia in his two annual reports submitted to UN General Assembly in September 2008, and September 2009.

In the opinion of the Arab Academy the strive for excellence can only be appropriately exerted in the framework of large scale autonomy and academic freedom. This also implies the necessity to interconnect our teaching and research work as closely as possible. Successful Cooperation with World Organisations such as the United Nations and the World Bank have been enabled through this. – and I quote

Quote" … "Overall, the Arab Academy's faculties, curricula, facilities, and atmospheres are quite modern and impressive…" Unquote

Quote "…Abu–kir campus is a large well-equipped and maintained campus giving every sign of a healthy academic environment. All classes at abu-kir are taught in English" Unquote

In a second document issued by the World Bank in August 2010, the Bank stated the following:-

Quote" "I would like to thank the Arab Academy for Science, Technology and Maritime Transport (AASTMT) and its team for its leadership in advancing the disaster risk reduction and management agenda in the Arab region. Since 2008, our collaboration (with the Academy) has enabled joint –risk reduction related activities to succeed with proposed next steps for additional areas of collaboration". Unquote

Since 2008, the Arab Academy has been closely collaborating with the "Global Facility for Disaster Risk Reduction and Recovery (GFDRR); and with the "World Bank Middle East and North Africa Disaster Risk Management (MNADRM) team. Such collaboration enabled the Academy to become a leading regional and global disaster risk reduction advocate.

In 2011, in partnership with GFDRR and the World Bank MNA DRM team, AASTMT will bolster its regional risk management and reduction role by establishing an Arab Disaster, Reserve Fund; and by launching an Academy Branch in Aden (Yemen).

In view of all that, and with respect to AASTMT leading role in the region on all academic, scientific, social and technological levels, and in recognition of the importance of education and educational cooperation in the development and strengthening of stable and peaceful societies, we in the Arab Academy for Science, Technology and Maritime Transport are

honoured to join forces with Universities of the world to face the challenges of the new millennium with the awareness of shared values and belonging to common social and cultural values for our prospective graduates, towards a world of peace, development, prosperity and a better quality of life for humanity at large.This is our commitment and mission towards which, we need to join forces together and work hard to achieve and sustain.

The Magna Charta Principles and Values in the Daily Routines of a University

Jorge Enrique Silva Duarte, Rector
EAN University, Colombia

I would like to give you important highlights about my country, my city and my University.

Colombia is bordered to the east by Venezuela and Brazil; to the west by Pacific Ocean; to the south by Ecuador and Peru; to the North by Panama and the Caribbean Sea.

The Government of Colombia takes place within the framework of a Presidential Representative Democratic Republic.

Colombia is divided into 32 departments and one capital district.

With an estimated 45.6 million people in 2008, Colombia is the third most populous country in Latin America, after Brazil and Mexico.

Colombia has 126 Universities

GDP 4.4% growth

Bogota. Formally called Santa Fé de Bogotá, is the Capital City of Colombia, as well as the most populous

city in the country, with an estimated 7.304.384 inhabitants.

Bogota is the third-highest capital city in the world.

With is many universities and libraries, Bogotá has become known as the "Athens of South America"

The EAN University is a Colombian Higher Education Institution located in Bogota, where the students can find many opportunities for their professional development.

The EAN University has 260 part time teachers and 85 Full time teachers.

The EAN University has 20.760 Alumni

The EAN University was honored as the first higher Education Institution in Colombia and the second one in Latin America Accredited by the Accreditation Council for Business Schools and Programs ACBSP of the United States.

The Mission of the EAN University is Contribute to the integral formation and entrepreneurial spirit of an individual in such a way that his achievements improve the economic and social conditions of the people.

Our Vision is to be an educational leader in the formation of professionals recognized by their entrepreneurial spirit.

Taking into a count all this information, now I can tell you about our vision and experience about Autonomy and Academic Freedom. Our Political Constitution becomes a paradigm change for the development of public and private actions in the context of university autonomy. As a result of important cultural, political, social and economic transformations of the main western world democracies, especially the European, our Colombian Constitution changed philosophical and ideological issues of the government, regarding its foundations,

principles and goals, as well as its rights and freedom – promoted and protected by it, through a combination of its freedom and social responsibility, and those of the Colombian companies; this could be clearly seen from the university vision and heteronomy.

Colombia by means of its 1991 Constitution, proclaimed itself as a Social State based on the rule of law which is a democratic state ruled by the law; there the university autonomy concept is closely related to what Kant named "Legal Freedom", understood as legitimate power of an academic community to collectively self-govern and self-legislate, linking the concepts of freedom and autonomy. This concept of autonomy which is the faculty of doing lawful actions without being against the essential obligation of the person or the institution (in the case of university education focused on professions or disciplines), underlies our legal system. The university autonomy is understood as the self determination capacity of a group, which coincides with the exercise of a fundamental task for the state, without losing its identity and resulting diversity.

In the same way, many articles of our Constitution, there are other principles, rights, duties, and guarantees that make part of the new constitutional dogmatic content that gives new direction to the public and private tasks of the State, and out of which, it could be inferred that the family, the school, and the company play a fundamental role in the social, political and economic dynamics of the State. From this perspective, there is a direct impact of the university mission and vision on the development of the individual and the community.

The sense of the university autonomy aims at offering universities the necessary discernment to develop their

academic content according to the multiple creative capacities of them, with the limit that this autonomy meets in public order, general interest and common welfare. The autonomy is then naturally proper of the university from its beginnings in Bologna, at the end of the XI century, but they should always be ruled by rationale criteria which do not allow the university to release from the fair social context, even though, it should implement its initiative as a great contribution to society. In concrete legal terms, autonomy is materialized through the possibility of being ruled by their own and independent authorities, and principally, to be given, within the academic environment, its own norms to develop the scientific independence mentioned above.

From the university autonomy perspective, it is necessary to state the individual and organizational decision-making in three different fields: moral responsibility, legal responsibility and political responsibility. They are all involved in the process of societal and human maturity and heteronomy, by means of the law and the actions in the entrepreneurial context. Current universities focus on a global system as a consequence of the participation that nourishes each individual's life, and therefore the life of the different community members, having a social and pluralist focus, leading to what we know as an exploration of identities diversity, which also leads to autonomy management.

According to this point of view, there are norms and values to be developed as a systemic process of the individuals, in what we currently know as moral community, in which EAN University has been working based on the parameters of dignity, leadership, entrepreneurship, mission, vision, principles, educational

model, institutional planning and transversal nature of its academic programs.

The development of university autonomy emerges from medieval times as the development of the individual in a social context that is currently derived from the constitutional authority that educational institutions have. Based on this, EAN University defines its university autonomy as its integral educational policy, which is therefore the institutional corporative government out of various components:

- Integral vision of individuals, communities and companies.
- Strategic planning and management based on values.
- Responsible competitiveness.
- Power transparency (P, D, V, A).
- Financial, social and environmental bases.

Finally some conclusions

The EAN University is a successful case of how the concept of Autonomy and Academic Freedom has been applied and because of it is able to develop in the students their entrepreneurial spirit. The 24% of our graduates are Entrepreneurs and have their own companies.

Our country is a very good example of how the universities have made own the concept of Autonomy and Academic Freedom. This is so real, that our Educational Project as University believes that developing the autonomy individually and collectively, it much easier to promote entrepreneurial leaders that make the autonomy as part o their integral life.

Our university absolutely shares the fundamental

principles that inspired the declaration of the Magna Charta Universitatum. I will let myself give some examples of how we live this philosophy in the EAN University.

• The EAN University since its creation in 1967 has been a supporter of the free company and the formation of a entrepreneurial spirit in all its 43 programs, creating the culture of the Entrepreneurship in our developing society

ACADEMIC PROGRAMS	YEAR 2010
Programs	7
Programs (E- learning)	4
Post graduate Studies	19
Post graduate Studies (E-learning)	9
Masters (All of them with Double titulation with International Universities)	4
TOTAL	43

• We develop an Educational Project where the functions of the teaching, research and social extension are articulated with the companies and the organizations that make part of the social, economic and political bases of our country.

• The freedom in research and teaching in our university develops integral and competent human beings characterized for their entrepreneur spirit and to be completes employers, relational, multicultural and socio – emotional.

• The EAN University is developing an international

project that motivates the mobility of teachers and students, not only in Latin America, but in Asia, Europe and North America, as a mechanism to make of our people multicultural and global, able to understand that their actions transcends geographical and political frontiers.

Values and Principles Down Under

Peter Rathjen, Deputy Vice-Chancellor
University of Melbourne, Australia

It is a great honour for me to be present to add the name of Australia's second oldest education institution, the University of Melbourne, founded in 1851, to the Magna Charta Observatory of Fundamental University Values and Rights. The Council of the University unanimously declared its intent to abide by the goals of the Magna Charta and authorised the Vice-Chancellor, whom I represent today. I am also delighted to acknowledge that the signature of the University of Melbourne joins that of six other Australian Universities: Adelaide, Sydney, Western Australia, Deakin, Flinders and La Trobe and 80 other new signatories from many parts of the world, greatly expanding the 660 existing signatories from 78 countries.

It is my purpose today to describe some of the reasons why the University of Melbourne, located on the other side of the planet, decided on 27 April 2009 to apply to sign the Magna Charta Universitatum. The simple

answer is that we wholeheartedly endorse the values, spirit and purpose of the Magna Charta and its defence of academic autonomy and institutional independence.

These principles are fundamental to the proper operation of universities and deserve to be defended in societies which generally respect them, such as Australia, and publicly proclaimed in societies which wish to abrogate them. In this respect therefore the Magna Charta offers a unique instrument for the defence of academic liberty providing an international, public and collaborative method for affirming the core ideas which are indispensible for universities to pursue their public mission.

The impressive number of institutions and the wide geographic spread of their locations tell a story about the Magna Charta itself. This story concerns the role of knowledge and ideas, research and scholarship, in a rapidly changing world of globalisation, technological revolution and population mobility. Rapid social change is not unique to our time (Hopkins, 2002) but never before has the pace and depth of transformation of the economic, scientific, intellectual, technological and climatic circumstances of humanity coincided with globalisation, i.e. the conjunction of international interdependence and an explosion of new knowledge. And yet, as universities all over the world today are ranked in a single metric of performance, despite the national, cultural and linguistic differences of their setting, we can see that at its origins the University of Bologna was actually an international institution, drawing students and professors from many lands.

Indeed the origins of the Magna Charta itself can be traced precisely to this internationalism. Knowledge

cannot easily be confined behind barriers of nation, culture, language, tradition or ideology, certainly not today and not even in 1155 or 1158 (Rüegg, 2003: p. 12) when the Constitutio Habita, Bologna's academic constitution, was adopted. This constitution enshrines early ideas about scholastic privilege and has since come to be respected as the documentary origin of the idea of academic freedom. As so often occurs, that which comes to have symbolic and high purpose in the present often originates in resolutions of very practical problems in the past. Therefore the need to recognise safe passage to study or teach at ancient Bologna can symbolise the need today for the free movement of ideas, technologies and science.

Symbolic importance here derives from a principled solution to a very practical problem.

Today in universities, like our predecessors in other times and like our present contemporaries in other places, the critical importance of knowledge in contentious areas such as environmental science, reproductive technology, energy generation, to name only a few, potentially exposes academics to undue pressure and even interference, because new knowledge can challenge received wisdom and powerful vested interests, and new knowledge can sometimes threaten commercial and ideological interests. The process for generation of new knowledge, which is the ultimate purpose for the existence of higher education, must be safeguarded.

The Magna Charta therefore is an ancient solution to an enduring challenge. So when on September 1988, marking the 900th anniversary of the foundation of the University of Bologna, 388 university rectors gathered

here to sign a version of this ancient text they were publicly affirming the timeless relevance of the principle of academic freedom. Just as its ancient predecessor aimed to guarantee physical safe passage for visiting students and lecturers, so too its contemporary version must guarantee safe passage for ideas across all the media at our disposal, print, electronic, multi-modal and of course in freedom to engage in public debate and discourse.

The majority of the original signatories were located in Europe, including many of the continent's most distinguished institutions. Since that time increasing numbers of Asian, American and African adherents have followed, demonstrating its widespread application and relevance. The University of Melbourne is located in the southern hemisphere, between the Indian, Pacific and Southern Oceans.

Today challenges posed by environmental degradation, technological change, gross economic and educational inequality and vast population movements require of institutions and individual scholars that they can pursue knowledge disinterestedly and across borders. The means that beyond its character as a declaration of human rights in academic life we recognise in the Magna Charta a principle that can offer human society the best efforts of the mental labour of intellectuals freed from interference or restriction.

As in all societies the knowledge generated by university research can enter public debate and consciousness very slowly, or not at all, and then suddenly become central to public policy, media discussion, political dispute, or general interest. Attached to the adoption of the Magna Charta by universities there

must be public education among citizens and officials, among politicians and the media, as to the critical need for society to acknowledge the benefits of academic freedom.

Australia's geographic location means that we are directly implicated in the vast transfer of economic and political power towards the new and emerging economic powerhouses of Asia.

This historic shift in the world's economic centre of gravity from Europe and North America to South and North Asia has implications for Australia that are deeper and more direct than for many other societies, as a western society located at the edge of the vast Asian landmass. One third of the students of the University of Melbourne are international students and internationalisation is a key element of the fundamental re-conceptualisation of the academic curriculum of the University of Melbourne of the past five years.

We encourage the Observatory to continue its efforts to foster support for the Magna Charta across all parts of the world, ensuring that its universal application is recognised, and in the process strengthening the vital role of independent research and knowledge generation. The ideals of the Magna Charta can support scholars and institutions everywhere, and especially those vulnerable to external pressure, and in all social and economic conditions because fidelity to the ideals of academic freedom and institutional autonomy should be independent of setting and time.

The University of Melbourne traces its ultimate origins to the European universities of the Middle Ages. The oldest continuously operating degree-awarding autonomous institution is widely recognised to be our

host today, the University of Bologna where teaching Roman law, and legal rhetoric, is documented from 1088.

Today the word Bologna has additional semantic element. It has become shorthand for another expression of internationalism and higher education reform: The Bologna Declaration. Signed on 19 June 1999 the Bologna Declaration ushered in a process of standardisation of degree structures, accreditation and certification and other processes, in turn exercising global influence. In a similar fashion the University of Melbourne has undergone rapid changes in recent years.

The principle of internationalism is becoming more and more deeply embedded within the new vision for the University of Melbourne. The ancient precedent for this lies within the very purposes of universities as shown by Bologna's ancient experience with internationalism, one common to practically all ancient schools of learning across the world, in India, North Africa, and in China, and across Europe. Essentially this has to do with the non-confineability of knowledge, that is that knowledge cannot easily be contained within borders of national states, institutional walls, disciplinary boundaries or cultural traditions. Just as Latin served the purpose of linked international learning in the European past, English increasingly facilitates publication and dissemination of knowledge today.

One of the central aims of the deep reforms we have implemented at the University of Melbourne in recent years has been to recognise internationalisation in a growing number of our operations. Like other universities global connections are a vital and inevitable

part of our mainstream operations of scholarly work.

In teaching where we continually adapt to the fact that more than one third of our students, and large numbers of our lecturers, are not from Australia and most not from English speaking backgrounds.

In research we increasingly rely on collegial partnerships and collaborations which shape the way research is performed and disseminated.

In the growing field of knowledge exchange, in which as a duty of service and public engagement the University of Melbourne is dedicated to applying research knowledge to benefit people in health, law, education and environmental care, we are more and more enmeshed with other institutions.

The unprecedented and complex social change in which we are all engaged today due to internationalisation gives the Magna Charta its character of timeless universalism and this makes what we are here to do today, to publicly sign the documents and affirm their sentiment, and act of both pragmatic and symbolic importance. In signing we declare open support for this large international endeavour to buttress the vital role of knowledge in bringing about social benefits from scientific exploration and independent teaching.

We have decided to publicly adhere to the principles and values of the Magna Charta because we endorse its critical meaning as the internationally recognised charter of the fundamental values of one of human society's most important and civilising creations: the autonomous university.

The University of Melbourne is in fact a proud custodian of all the values and principles enshrined in the Magna Charta Universitatum. We recognise it as

an instrument sanctioned by an ancient and venerable history, of importance not only for ourselves in universities as scientists and humanists, but also for society. The long historic struggle for institutional autonomy and academic freedom ultimately serve the cause of human civilisation and enlightenment, artistic expression, humanistic exploration and scientific investigation.

The extraordinary success the Magna Charta Universitatum has achieved since its first signing indicates that it has tapped into a deeper and wider meaning and so the Observatory and all associated with it deserve our sincerest congratulations.

REFERENCES

Hopkins, A.G. (2002), *Globalization in World History*. Pimlico.

Malagola, C. (1888), *Statuti delle Università e dei Collegi dello Studio Bolognese*. Bologna: Zanichelli.

Rüegg, W. (2003), *Mythologies and Historiogaphy of the Beginnings*, pp. 4-34 in H. De Ridder-Symoens (ed.), *A History of the University in Europe*; Vol. 1, Universities in the Middle Ages. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Concluding Remarks

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

The Magna Charta Observatory is defender and promoter of values – institutional autonomy and academic freedom – that make universities very distinctive organizations.

Our task is difficult. Many, in our societies – and even some among ourselves – look at universities as mere transmitters of accumulated knowledge and expertise or as centres where students are trained to acquire vocations.

States in many places universities are seen as mere transmitters of ideology and as instruments of nation building.

A university, however, is beyond all those things. The universities for us are there to challenge and ever expand the frontiers of knowledge. Collectively they have to think, if you will, the unthinkable. And; institutional autonomy and academic freedom are the values that distinguish and make universities distinct from any other organization in the society. They are

also very instrumental to ever expand the frontiers of knowledge.

The promotion and defence of those universal values at a universal and within a very diverse context requires persistence and patience and unwavering belief in the strength of those values.

The demonstration of your commitment to those values today by signing the Universitatum is very heartening for us.

How can we protect and further the values enshrined in the Magna Charta Universitatum? I believe there are three levels of analysis or action:

First, is the university itself.

The second has to do with the local context and the institution.

The third level of action is the international level.

At the institutional level, that is the university, internalization of the values that make our institutions very distinctive by leaders, academic and administrative staff and students is critically important in the operationalization of these values.

This is one of the reasons why we ask our signatories to post on their websites a symbol or a statement that they have signed the Magna Charta Universitatum. We believe that this will be a small but an important step towards the internalization of the values enshrined in the Universitatum. It will also help universities shield themselves from pressures coming from outside the institution.

I know that there are good practices on this count. Sabancı University, a signatory, has developed its own academic freedom statement drawing from and referring to the Universitatum. It is posted on their website for all

to see and I have personally witnessed that the statement has acted as an important reference point and a guideline in helping the university position itself when faced with threats to academic freedom[1].

Take the case of Virginia Attorney General Ken Cuccinelli's "fraud investigation" involving the climate-change research of the former University of Virginia assistant professor Michael Mann. The University of Virginia resisted and challenged the subpoena issued by Mr. Cucinelli on grounds of academic freedom and institutional autonomy. Mr. Cuccinelli argued that he is trying to protect Virginia taxpayers from fraud.[2]

Second level of action is the local, or if you will, the national context. A whole and interrelated series of cultural, political, social and legal factors determine the environment within which each university function. All or some of these factors may be supportive of the values of universities thus enhancing and complementing efforts to promote the integrity of universities. They may also be a threat and often are. Simplest such framework is the local higher education legislation which sets guidelines for institutions to follow by students, faculty and executive and administrative personnel.

The state often asks us to teach more students and perform better on research. The state, however, often tries to secure these outcomes through a regulatory framework based on input controls, which, more often than not threatens institutional autonomy.

[1] Please see: http://www.sabanciuniv.edu/eng/?genel_bilgi/felsefemiz/akademik_ozgurluk_anlayisimiz.html

[2] See Inside Higher Education ("We All Could Lose in the UVA Case," July 29, 2010).

One way of resisting this trend is to ask the state to measure outcomes and outputs both in research and teaching and reward or punishes universities accordingly.

First question to ask ourselves are we ready for such a system of accountability and responsibility based on outcomes. This we believe is the cost, if you will, of increased autonomy.

The universities we believe have an important role to play in leading to a paradigm change in their national contexts from input controls with decreased autonomy to a system of increased autonomy based on a system of accountability and output controls.

Another dimension that might be a threat institutional autonomy is the rising incidence of corruption and mal-practice in research and teaching that is likely to invite intrusion, especially by the state, from outside the university, which in turn would threaten institutional autonomy. I strongly believe that the universities themselves should play a leading role in fighting mal-practice through codes of ethics developed internally to ward off outside intervention.

A few words on the international dimension is also appropriate. Given increasing mobility of students and faculty across borders, international intergovernmental regulatory framework is bound to flourish as well. The Bologna process is case in point. This may both be a threat and an opportunity. It will be a threat if the international regulatory framework becomes too intrusive. It will be an opportunity if it helps sustain universal values related to out profession.

Yesterday Prof. Boaventura de Sousa Santos, in his most interesting keynote address, gave us pessimistic

and optimistic scenarios. He warned us that Bologna process may end diversity, *"kill different flavours"* and that our institutions might become prey to international bureaucrats, accreditation agencies, and ranking experts. On the optimistic side, he argued that the Bologna process might help deal with academic conservatism, misuse of power by authorities, and use of academic freedom as a shield against change.

I place great hope on international non-governmental networking between universities and international non-governmental organizations to disseminate and keep the universal values of good practice and higher education on the agenda of our institutions. Conferences such as these, works of organizations such as Scholars at Risk, EUA, IUA, Magna Charta Observatory and other organizations promoting transparency are terribly important. Development of international codes of ethics and values and their dissemination is critical for the development of institutional autonomy based on responsible governance. The Magna Charta Universitatum is a case in point.

We at the Magna Charta Observatory believe that universities cannot function without academic freedom to further their goals of research and teaching. Furthermore, institutional autonomy is what makes that linkage between research and teaching possible under the roof of a true university. In fact academic freedom and institutional autonomy are values that distinguish universities from any other organization that one can think of. Upholding them and guarding against threats to the integrity of our institutions is critically important for the generation of knowledge and the pursuit of truth.

I would like to stress at this point that Magna Charta

Observatory and the values it upholds is a significant and global effort that should not be taken lightly. The Observatory, by organizing conferences, through its publications, inviting rectors from all over the world to sign the Magna Charta Universitatum, by cooperating with other international non-governmental organizations of higher education tries to keep the issues of academic freedom and institutional autonomy on the agendas of universities. This has to be a persistent, patient, insistent effort not to be discouraged by periodic reversals and threats to those values to see to it that Prof. de Sousa Santos' pessimistic scenario does not materialize.

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.

BRAUMANN Carlos Alberto is Rector of the University of Évora, Portugal, since 2010, where he also obtained his habilitation and has been Professor since 1989. He studied Mathematics and Statistics at the University of Luanda and the State University New York where he obtained his PhD. Currently, he is President of the Portuguese Statistical Society as well as President of the European Society for Mathematical and Theoretical Biology. He has been the President of the Council of the Department of Mathematics. Amongst others, he also held the positions of President of the Scientific Council, Director of the Research Centre for Mathematics and Applications. From 1987 until 1994 he also acted as Vice-Rector of the University of Evora. Furthermore, he is an elected member of the International Statistical Institute. He also had several functions at national level and as Portuguese representative to European and international organisations.

DE SOUSA SANTOS Boaventura is Professor of Sociology at the School of Economics, University of Coimbra, Portugal, Distinguished Legal Scholar at the University of Wisconsin-Madison Law School and Global Legal Scholar at the University of Warwick. He is Director of the Centre for Social Studies of the University of Coimbra and Director of the Centre of Documentation on the Revolution of 1974, at the same University. He has published widely on globalization,

sociology of law and the state, epistemology, democracy, and human rights in Portuguese, Spanish, English, Italian, French and German. He is one of the main people behind the World Social Forum and has received many prices and honours in Latin America and Europe.

DIONIGI Ivano is Rector of the University of Bologna since 2009. He obtained his education at the same university and continued as a researcher and lecturer until 1990. He then became Professor at the University Ca' Foscari in Venice and came back to the University of Bologna as Professor of Latin literature. He is a member of the Centre for the Studies of Cicero as well as of the Academy of Science in Bologna. He was a member of the Administrative Council and the Senate of the University of Bologna and also Director of the Department of Classical Philology. He was a member of the Council of the Bologna Commune between 1990 and 2004 and is President of the Don Gaudiano di Pesaro Foundation.

ERGÜDER Üstün is currently an Emeritus Professor at Sabanci University and the Director of the Education Reform Initiative. He studied in the UK (Manchester), the United States (Syracuse, New York) and Turkey. He holds a PhD in Political Science from the Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs at Syracuse University. He joined the academic staff of Bogazici University in 1970. Between August 1992 and August 2000 he served as the Rector of Bogazici 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 is currently a member of the Board of Trustees of Ozyegin University. In terms of international involvement he sits on the Board of Trustees of Robert College and is a member of the Governing Council of the European Foundation Centre. Since 2009 he is the President of the Council of the Magna Charta Observatory.

FARGHALY Mohamed is President of the Arab Academy for Science, Technology and Maritime Transport. Prior to this, he assumed several high-level positions including Executive Vice-President of the Arab Academy, Dean of the Integrated Simulators Complex, and Dean of the College of Maritime Transport and Technology. Dr. Farghaly graduated from the Egyptian Naval College in Alexandria, in 1973, where he gained his Bachelors of Science in Nautical Studies with Honours. In 1979, he obtained his Master Mariner. He then undertook his postgraduate studies at Nottingham Trent University in the United Kingdom, and received his PhD in 1996. Since 2008, Dr. Farghaly articulated and currently leading the Arab Academy role to assist Arab and Islamic countries in integrating disaster risk reduction in its development plans and policies. In recognition by the international community of his leading and pioneering role in the Arab and Islamic regions, he was selected as member in the Results Management Council of the Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery of the World Bank and the Scientific and Technical Committee of

the United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction, both being the policy-making constituents of GFDRR and UNISDR. He is associated to several professional associations, most important of which is the National Committee for Disaster Management in Egypt. He has also contributed to several journals and supervised a number of Masters and Doctorate dissertations, in addition to an Arabic reference book entitled: "Electronic Maritime Navigation", published by Monshaat Al Maaref, Alexandria, in 1979.

KHUDOLEY Konstantin K. graduated from the Leningrad (St.Petersburg)University in 1973 and after that have taken the various positions at the same University. In 1994-2010 he was the Founding Dean of School of International Relations, now Prof. Khudoley holds the post of the Vice-President of University Council and Senate, Vice-Rector for International Affairs, Head of the Department of European Studies. Konstantin Khudoley is the author of 80 research papers which were published in Russia, USA, Britain, Italy, Germany and a number of other countries. The main topics of his research are the modern history and modern development of international relations, foreign policy of Russia. Prof. Khudoley is the member of many professional associations in various countries. He takes part in St.Petersburg International Economic Forum, Baltic Development Forum, «St.Petersburg Dialogue» between Russia and Germany, Dialogue «Russia-Republic of Korea». State Award for International Cooperation (Orden of Friendship) and medal «Merits to Fatherland» II degree.

RATHJEN Peter is the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) at the University of Melbourne. Prior to this position, he was Dean of the Faculty of Science at the University of Melbourne from 2006 – 2008. He has a longstanding involvement in Embryonic Stem (ES) Cell research dating from postdoctoral research at the University of Oxford in the late 1980s. On his return to the University of Adelaide in 1990, he established a research programme directed towards understanding the processes by which stem cells differentiate into functional cell types during embryo development. Intellectual Property from this work was commercialized with BresaGen Limited. The work continues within the Department of Zoology at the University of Melbourne. He was appointed to the Chair of Biochemistry at the University of Adelaide in 1995, became foundation Head of the Department of Molecular Biosciences in 2000, and in 2002 was appointed Executive Dean of the Faculty of Sciences. In 2005, he was the recipient of the inaugural Premier's Award for Scientific Excellence (Research Leadership) in South Australia. He was a founding member of the Australian Research Council (ARC) Special Research Centre for the Molecular Genetics of Development, and the Australian Stem Cell Centre (ASCC).

SILVA DUARTE Jorge Enrique is Rector of EAN University, Colombia, since 2005. Prior to that he served as Vice-Rector for Academic Affairs and Director for Postgraduate Studies. He received his education at Universities in Canada, the UK, Spain, Mexico and Colombia. He held several senior management positions in different companies in Colombia and worked as a

consultant for numerous private companies and public institutions. He was visiting Professor in Universities in Colombia as well as at the Technological Institute of Monterrey in Mexico. He is also a member of the Accreditation Council for Business Schools and Programs.

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 Out of print

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 of the Magna Charta Observatory
18-20 September 2008

Crisis, Cuts, Contemplations
How Academia May Help Rescuing Society
Proceedings of the Conference of the Magna Charta Observatory
17-18 September 2009

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
2008

Essay

The Interpretation of the Magna Charta Universitatum and its Principles
Stephen Lay
2004 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 Tale 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

Finito di stampare nel mese di marzo 2011
presso Labanti e Nanni (Crespellano, Bologna)