

**Executive Summary
of the
Final Report of the
Universities as Sites of Citizenship Project**

Introduction and Organization of the Project

This report summarizes the findings of fifteen monographs constituting the site reports of European universities selected for the research project, “Universities as Sites of Citizenship and Civic Responsibility,” (hereafter, “Universities as Sites”) titled “Compendium” and cited elsewhere as Council of Europe document DGIV/EDU/HE (2000) 36. It focuses on the European site’s reports which together with the companion summary findings of the United States’ sites constitutes the Final Report of an international comparative research project featuring the collaboration of researchers at 28 universities in Europe and the United States.¹

The concept of sites of citizenship originates with the Council of Europe project on Education for Democratic Citizenship (EDC). The project, the operational phase of which ended in 2000 was launched in 1996 and was adapted in the light of the Council of Europe Second Summit of Heads of State and Governments (1997). It was expected that the Sites’ network of the EDC project would continue after the formal completion of the EDC project. This network would also have a higher education input.

The concept of Education for Democratic Citizenship was taken a considerable step further through the Budapest Declaration for a Greater Europe Without Dividing Lines, adopted on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the Council of Europe (May 1999), and in particular through the Declaration and Programme on Education for Democratic Citizenship, based on the Rights and Responsibilities of Citizens.

The Declaration and Programme adopted in Budapest underline, among other things, the fundamental role of education in promoting the active participation of all individuals in democratic life at all levels, the importance of learning about democracy in school and university life, including participation in the decision-making process and the associated structures of students and teachers.

As a follow-up to one of its preliminary contributions to the definition of the concept of citizenship, the CC-HER adopted, at its 6th plenary session on 16-18 March 1999, an outline project called “Universities as Sites of Citizenship,” and instructed its Bureau and its Secretariat to develop the project further.

¹ I wish to thank Dr. Henry Teune, the Principle Investigator of the National Science Foundation grant which funded the U.S. research, Dr. Ira Harkavy, Co-Chair of the International Consortium for Higher Education, Civic Responsibility and Democracy, and my research assistant, Margaret Watt for their help in producing and editing this report. However, I am responsible for the content of this report. A summary of the U.S. study is attached in Appendix Five. The introduction of this report addresses in more detail the conceptual issues pertaining to democracy and civil society, the role of the university in these issues as well as in political socialization in general, and the significance of this research.

At the same time academic circles in the United States of America became involved in the development of projects concerning citizenship within higher education institutions. The CC-HER Bureau established close links of cooperation with those circles. In addition to the importance of such cooperation, it is worth underlining the fact that the United States now has general observer status with the Council of Europe, including observer status with the CC-HER.

What is the Challenge?

Why is “globalization” such a hot topic? From a policy perspective, universities and governments are not addressing the changes and pressures that globalization dynamics has engendered for society. Consequently, protesters have put globalization on the policy agenda through direct action and increasing demands on political structures to alleviate those strains.

People get excited and motivated by issues they have a stake in. The rise in political cynicism, apathy and decline in voting and other forms of civic engagement suggests that an increasing proportion of individuals believe that they have little stake in politics or in institutional structures that shapes their lives. A key concern of the Universities As Sites of Citizenship project is with understanding the difference between existing institutional and societal processes vs. what these processes are meant to produce or have as outcomes. In this case the distinction is between democratic processes and what democratic processes address.² Most discussions of democratic and civic education address the content of such educational programs. There is not as much attention devoted to institutional processes and their effect on individual’s experience and interactions with universities as bureaucratic and authoritative structures.

The challenge of advancing universities as sites of citizenship comes from the tension between the fundamental mission of developing expertise and human capital while attempting to devote the time and resources to the development of attitudes, dispositions, and functionality of democratic citizenship. These educational aims are often treated as something mutually exclusive or conceived in zero-sum terms in decisions pertaining to the allocation of resources and in the reward structures of universities. Small wonder that students leave universities conditioned to treat their personal welfare, career endeavors and financial success as something apart from their perception of their place in society as a citizen. We can push universities to create new courses or to formalize democratic education, but such changes will remain nominal and in fact increase political cynicism and apathy if there are no changes in institutional and educational processes as well. A university that is a site of citizenship will be a place where all individuals that interact in the context of its environment will have their interactions structured by processes that are characterized by the democratic attributes of openness, accountability, transparency, communication and feedback, critique and debate, dispute resolution, and the absence of idiosyncrasy, arbitrariness, and privilege.

² This view was expressed by Dr. Robin Simpson, during a discussion of the Final Report.

This project provides a framework for posing relevant questions of universities on matters such as conditions for diversity; for comparing institutions with each other; and for providing an empirical basis for education policy and reform. “Universities as Sites of Citizenship” provides a dialogue for understanding these things. It facilitates discussion and debate over what may be termed a “more precise glossary” of terms for talking about democratic education, civic responsibility, universities, and their processes. As such it is central the Council’s mission of advancing social welfare and the civil and human rights of Europeans regardless of nationality and place of residence.

The Design and Purpose of the Project

The research was designed as a pilot study to test the research protocols;³ the interview and survey instruments;⁴ and to formulate key analytical concepts for the classification and analysis of universities as democratic and civic institutions. The pilot study also served as a preliminary inventory of both the actual practices of universities in the teaching and research of democracy and civic responsibility. It also examined the degree to which the internal organization of the university’s administration and management of the university’s relationships between administration, faculty and students corresponds to norms and expectations of accountability, transparency and participation in democratic communities. It studied the relationships between the university and the community in which it resides and with the wider society and how it fosters and encourages civic engagement, democratic participation and the development of the foundations of a civil society. It identified relevant similarities and differences among universities, facilitating a better understanding of the universal dimensions and characteristics of democratic and civic practices that transcend unique national and cultural differences. This study provides an empirical basis for policy recommendations and action, and for a discussion and examination of the normative and prescriptive dimensions of democratic engagement.

The *Universities as Sites of Citizenship* project advances the education policy agenda set forth in the European-focused *Budapest Declaration* and in the higher education reform initiatives in the United States represented by *The Wingspread Declaration* and *The President’s Fourth of July Declaration*.⁵ This research also contributes to the Bologna Process for the democratic transformation of higher education in Europe in its beginning to identify good or “best” practices in university governance and administration and the teaching of democracy and civic responsibility. The findings and recommendations presented provide a basis for discussion and debate about next steps in the higher education reform processes by examining the dimensions of the problem that had previously been identified in the *Magna Charta of the European Universities*.⁶ These include issues of accountability in a democratic state, the relationship of universities to

³ See DECS/EDU/HE (00) 3 revised 2.1, “Guidelines and Research Protocols for Collaborating Researchers—Pilot Project”, January 10, 2000 original, revised February 10, 2000.

⁴ See Appendix 3, Student Questionnaire, Preliminary Draft No. 6 and Appendix 4, Faculty Questionnaire, Preliminary Draft No. 4.

⁵ See [add cite]

⁶ CC-HER (2001) 28, “Autonomy and Participation in Higher Education: towards a European standard,” a discussion paper for the plenary session, p. 4.

local and national governments, and “the expression of democratic principles” and “...in particular the participation of internal and external stakeholders.”⁷

Why the Project is Needed

Much higher education research is directed towards the examination of the impact on college on students, on society, on markets, etc., often in term of some set of indicators used to measure changes in some dimension or characteristic of the subject of study, such as academic achievement, human capital development, earning differentials, and international economic competitiveness. The Sites project addresses the deficit of work on process issues of how to make universities a greater and more integrated part of civil society. Much of the attention of the civil society movement internationally has been driven by concerns for student learning and engagement of the duties of citizenship. The Sites project elevates the role of universities and focuses attention on institutional duties and responsibilities as being as important as the focus on students.

This study postulates the notion that universities can become key institutions for the transmission of democratic values through direct engagement in democratic activities, democratic education on campus.

In the future, need to incorporate three conceptual items to the fundamental notion of universities as *sites* of citizenship.⁸ The first of these pertains to “republicanism,” not in term of American-style representative system, but in terms of the conviction that people are the “owners” of their society’s institutions. Universities are linked to the ownership question in its role as one of the key socializing agents of society, especially of elite’s and future leaders in politics and business whose experience in democratic processes and the value of civic engagement is shaped by their university experiences.

Trends in higher education are increasingly shaped by diachronic developmental dynamics in the globalization of higher education. Internal and external influences on developments in higher education are increasingly interrelated and must be considered in tandem. For example, reform debates in European higher education are shaped both by national education policy and societal demands as well as by trends in the larger European community and initiatives out of Brussels and Strasbourg. These debates in turn are occurring within the context of global debates, such that within the World Trade Organization over whether or not higher education should be classified as part of the service sector and the activities traditionally associated with international education as trade in services.

Finally, with the Sites project and what we’ve learned from it thus far, we are able to assess in-depth whether notions democratic citizenship and participation will have an impact on the environment of higher education and on the reform of governance structures, missions of universities, and in teaching and research.

⁷ Ibid, p. 4.

⁸ I am expanding on the insights of Dr. Michael Daxner, member of the Directorate of School, Out of School, and Higher Education, Higher Education and Research Division, on these issues.

The *Universities as Sites of Citizenship and Civic Responsibility* project is an important step in realizing these aims. It is focused on institutions of higher education as strategic institutions in democratic political development.

This is also the first Trans-Atlantic empirical study of its kind. Most of the research on education for democracy and civic engagement are largely descriptive and rest on their normative and prescriptive propositions.⁹ This research will make general academic contributions to a better understanding of many issues and dynamics in democracy education. In focusing on universities as *sites* of citizenship, it makes a serious examination of a core social institution shaping democratic development.

Aims of the Project

The project was established:

- to consider the actual activities of institutions of higher education in Europe and the USA, that support democratic values and practices;
- to assess their capabilities and dispositions to promote democratic political developments;
- to make recommendations and dissemination of resources in order to improve the contribution of higher education to democracy on the campus, and to the local community, and the society.

Fifteen European Universities were selected among new and old democracies and 15 collaborating researchers (making up a Contact Group) were appointed who were responsible for conducting the case studies. They reported their findings through monographs to the General Rapporteur who was responsible for producing the final report.¹⁰

Highlights of Findings

The Final Report recognizes that any attempt to summarize the disparate findings of so many institutions, chosen to capture the diversity in higher education in Europe, poses special challenges. Because of the vast differences in size, demographic composition, financial basis and legal incorporation, each site report confirmed the unique aspects of civic engagement on each campus. These reports present an amalgam of findings, the differences and similarities of which are outlined in the report that follows. A few generalizations can be made however, with the caveat that the applicability and relevance of each point varies by institution.

⁹ A major transnational empirical study at the elementary and secondary education levels was recently completed. See Judith Torney-Porta, [add cite]

¹⁰ See Council of Europe document DGIV/EDUHE (2002) 11, original English, Strasbourg, 11 March 2002-03-11 by the Directorate General IV: Education, Culture and Heritage, Youth and Sport (Directorate of School, Out-of-School and Higher Education, Higher Education and Research Division).

Salient points of the Final Report

- ◆ While national political and ethnic context is important to the development of new approaches to the teaching of citizenship and democracy, these contexts can also be barriers to change where cultural and historical relativism postulate that each national situation is unique.
- ◆ Universities as cultural institutions are embedded in society and, therefore, reforms intended to promote democratic values or greater civic engagement can conflict with the traditional role of universities as providers of “useful” education.
- ◆ The legal and statutory framework of universities determine the parameters that universities must work in when attempting reforms or implementing new policies or means to promote a greater degree of civic engagement. In turn, the leadership of universities affect the mechanisms for change, and also determine the amount of latitude they can claim in advancing new initiatives based on their interpretation and enforcement of these statutes.
- ◆ Formal and statutory provisions for shared governance, transparency of decision-making and protection of faculty and student rights are often at odds with reality and actual practices.
- ◆ Traditional social and professional relationships between administration, faculty and students rooted in cultural expectations, create inertia against change even when statutory provisions are made for greater participation and inclusion.
- ◆ Sustainability of initiatives for change are affected by the availability of resources, the larger national economic conditions, and the onset of intellectual fatigue for political action.
- ◆ Formal institutional structures and arrangements are a necessary, but not sufficient condition affecting,
 1. greater democratic participation in both university politics and governance and in the community and society by students;
 2. the promotion of aims and objectives of instilling notions of civic responsibility within students;
 3. understanding the nature and extent of a university’s interaction with its surrounding community; and
 4. curricular change and altering the management functions within the university.
- ◆ Despite provision for formal organizational roles and rights for both faculty and students at most institutions in the study, participation in governance processes was affected by general misunderstanding or lack of knowledge among respondents of organizational and administrative processes of universities.
- ◆ Informal personal networks and peer-learning play a major role in what students know about their rights.
- ◆ Most university administrators and many faculty considered many aspects of citizenship and democracy (such as decisions to vote, volunteer in the community, participate in campus organizations, or engage in political debate) to be entirely a personal matter, not within their ken nor responsibilities as teachers and scholars.
- ◆ As a corollary, most university administrators and faculty considered institutional responses to promoting democratic values and civic engagement as a distraction and dilution of the university’s primary educational mission.

- ◆ Any attempts to better understand the problems of democratic and civic education must come to grips with the problem of fragmentation. Students and faculty have “separate lives” outside the university and often segregate their social roles and actions between life within and without the university.
- ◆ Segregation of roles and responsibilities also affects the role of the university vis-à-vis the community and/or the nation. How the university conceives its role vis-à-vis society and the local community affects its response to social and political trends. It also determines how these issues and policies are engaged by the university.
- ◆ Ironically, stability on campuses often fostered problems of democratic participation due to a status quo based on complacency, comfort, indifference and inefficacy.
- ◆ Student participation in university governance and in asserting or understanding their rights as students are characterized by a pervasive passivity bordering on indifference. This was true across almost every case in the study.

Additional Conclusions and Considerations:

One of the main issues in the reform of European higher education is how to resolve the problem of increasing and maintaining university autonomy while promoting changes to accommodate the European desires for greater mobility of students and staff, reform of degree structures, and promotion of greater inter-university cooperation and collaboration. “Structural convergence” – the harmonization of national and institutional policies and practices with pan-European initiatives seems to be both a logical necessity and outcome in addition to serving as a guidepost for policy.¹¹

As a pilot study, the Universities as Sites of Citizenship project does not seek to draw too many overarching conclusions. The data and information gathered from the surveys and reported in the monographs have begun the process of identifying appropriate indicators of civic engagement. It contributes to new ways of thinking about pedagogical responses to the problems of democracy and civic responsibility. However, one significant finding was that the act of administering the survey stimulated thinking and debate in the university regarding the issues raised in the study.

Another unexpected finding was that faculty surveyed constantly contested the idea that universities must stimulate democracy among students. This will pose unique challenges to implementing new programs or pedagogies pertaining to democracy and civic education. There was repeated emphasis by respondents and researchers for the notion that it was the individual’s own responsibility and initiatives for greater involvement in democratic participation.

Broader Philosophical Issues and Reflections

Is the university merely a reflection of the larger society? As one researcher noted, “it seems that the more democratic the society, the lower the participation rate.” The question this poses is whether this is true only in the specific or isolated cases, or if it is

¹¹ Is there a danger in this if “structural convergence” also becomes a test of a university’s progress toward reform?

true in a broader, more generalized, cross-national context. What is in the developmental dynamic of democracies that produces this? Does it represent collective psychological and attitudinal atrophy—a societal-level “hardening of the arteries” in older democracies?

Each country represented in this study is at a different developmental level characterized by different levels of maturity of democratic institutions and processes and the maturity of reinforcing social norms and democratic political institutions. Experience, beliefs, and socialization processes will be different in each society--not only for idiosyncratic cultural and historical reasons, but because of the quality of and access to democratic institutions and processes.

There is also an absence of awareness among students of belonging to a larger community. Could purposeful, integrated educational programs for civic engagement accelerate the developmental dynamic of democracy?

There is also the matter of **salience**. Barring a crisis, what is the motivation of students and faculty to demand greater participation in governance and in accepting the demands of democratic responsibility and greater civic engagement? Does satisfaction produce as much apathy and non-involvement as cynicism? This could be a major obstacle to teaching democracy and citizenship, because of the overwhelming need to meet the vocational interests of students and ensure employment and relevant work. How can one inculcate democracy, civic values without some foundation of stability in sound social and political structures and reasonable expectations?

It may be that in certain countries, the socialization of students to a new set of expectations regarding democracy and civic responsibility may be easier to execute than real changes in existing faculty, staff and administrative attitudes.

Authoritarian management styles create additional inertia inhibiting changes in organizational structures, curricula and teaching that would foster or create democratic values and practices. This suggests that the promotion of democratic values and civil responsibility is not merely a pedagogical question, but must also be addressed structurally in terms of the organization and practice of university governance.

How do we address the problem of “passivity” among students? Apathy, disinterest and passiveness can come from many sources: conflicting life priorities; general satisfaction with life; a lack of knowledge; a sense of inefficacy—all in spite of the existence of formal channels for participation and numerous organizations to facilitate it.

What has been achieved?

Beyond the findings presented in the site monographs and the Final Report, the project accomplished several other objectives that will shape future research, policy-making and dissemination of good practices. These include:

- A set of case studies that highlights examples of good practices, and in addition, calls attention to the challenges of design and implementation of programs and activities, curricula, and organizational processes that foster and promote civic engagement, democratic practices and the relationship between concepts of democracy and the university experience.
- Pre-test of research protocols and survey instruments that allow for assessing particular institutional practices on an array of indicators of administrative, faculty, and student orientations and experiences pertaining to democratic education and processes and civic engagement.
- Development of a network of European and American collaborators and expertise in civic education and in the place and function of higher education in advancing civil society. This network, born out of the Sites project, has expanded to Asia and Africa through replication of the Sites research protocols and use of the pilot study instruments, and has also attracted the attention of scholars in other parts of North America and Latin America wishing to join the Sites community of scholars.

“Sites” Global Impact

It is especially important to note that the Council of Europe’s initiative in examining the role of universities as sites of citizenship has triggered a global movement to address the issues taken up in the Universities as Sites of Citizenship project. These include:

- Creation of the International Consortium for Higher Education, Civic Responsibility and Democracy in the United States to coordinate complementary comparative research using the research protocols from the project (see the Forward and Appendix IV of the General Report for details).
- Replication of the Universities as Sites of Citizenship project in South Africa by the CHESP of the Joint Education Trust,¹² a NGO made up of government, business, education and community leaders dedicated to the reform of higher education and the advancement of civil society. Project leader: Dr. Jo Lazerus, University of Witwatersrand.
- Replication of the Sites project in the Republic of Korea during the summer 2002 under the leadership of Dr. Yong-Lin Moon, former Minister of Education and Professor of Educational Psychology, Seoul National University. This project is being funded by the Ministry of Education.
- Replication of the project in the Philippines at St. Aquinas University in Manila, led by Dr. Pedro Bernaldez during spring/summer, 2002 and with a second site soon to be underway.

¹² Monographs of the Sites reports for the University of Witwatersrand and the University of Natal are available on request to the General Rapporteur, Frank Plantan at fplantan@sas.upenn.edu and have been filed with the Council’s Secretariat of the Directorate of School, Out-of-School and Higher Education, Higher Education and Research Division.

- Proposal is now before the Vice-Chancellor's committee of the "Sandstone" Universities¹³ in Australia for replication of the Site project. Led by Mr. Bruce Muirhead of the University of Queensland, they will be sponsoring an international conference on community engagement and civic education, "Inside-Out" in 2003 and seeks European, U.S., and other international participation.
- Mr. Muirhead of Australia, Frank Plantan, General Rapporteur of the Sites project and Executive Secretary of the International Consortium for Higher Education, Civic Responsibility and Democracy, and South Africa's Jo Lazerus presented their work in connection with the Sites project and related research at the American Association of Higher Education Conference in Phoenix, Arizona in January, 2002.
- Six of the American collaborating researchers and monograph authors of the companion Sites project in the United States presented their findings at the American Political Science Association annual conference in San Francisco, September, 2001.
- U.S. collaborating researchers have published a spin-off article from the Sites project in The Political Psychologist.¹⁴ A subsequent article is now being submitted to the journal, PS: Political Science and Politics.
- The General Rapporteur has coordinated the joint application by three American and three European Sites project researchers of a grant proposal to the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education, U.S. Department of Education. Forthcoming.
- Pending research connected with the Sites project is currently being negotiated with scholars in Canada, Mexico and the West Indies.
- Reporting of the Universities of Sites of Citizenship project in the Civic Education Bulletin by Dr. Harry Boyte, University of Minnesota.
- Cooperation with Dr. Otto Feinstien, Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan on advancing related work and of the Civic Education Conference in Dubrovnik, Croatia, May, 2002. Several participants in the Sites project and of the U.S. International Consortium are signatories of the Tallin Declaration **[add complete cite]** on the Role of Universities in Advancing Civil Society

The Way Forward

Comparative research like that in the Universities as Sites of Citizenship project provides a basis for clarifying the context in which universities operate. Cross-national research clearly shows the differences between countries with many private universities and those that are entirely publicly funded and governed. Such research provides the opportunity to discover new findings and to learn what works and what does not work from the experience of others.

¹³ The Sandstone schools are Australia's equivalent of America's Ivy League and represent some of the top research universities in the country.

¹⁴ **[add citation]**

In terms of the political socialization of students these findings give a good indication that universities have a significant impact on what students are doing with regard to democratic participation and perceptions. There is strong preliminary evidence that suggests that universities can be differentiated on the several dimensions identified by the data. Universities' policies and practices do make a difference and are evident in the perceptions of students and faculty. The results show that we can design efficient and informed instruments that can give a fairly accurate portrayal of how universities perform on various dimensions of what constitutes the civil and democratic university.

The issues addressed in the project are not new and have been addressed by educators and policy-makers previously. What Universities as Sites has done is to help bring them into focus with a systematic treatment structured for comparative analysis. What it seeks to do on a transnational level is raise the visibility of these issues and provide the mechanisms for systematically addressing them simultaneously at the individual, institutional and societal levels.

As a result of this research we now have:

1. a means of introducing a dialogue with policy-makers to discuss the issues covered in this report;
2. an efficient, cross-national way to measure with some confidence universities commitments to democratic practices, democracy and civic education and student participation in these activities¹⁵;
3. a means for extending the research globally.

Next steps?

The next steps for this work could include distribution of these findings, as well as findings of the U.S. study, to appropriate policymaking bodies of the Council and related organizations. Distribution of this report and the U.S. findings could be presented jointly to a wide audience, including the U.S. higher education NGOs sponsoring the U.S. study and other related organizations. In the United States, this had already begun, in several presentations at national academic conferences, and the preparation of at least two distinct publications. Distribution to higher education organizations across the globe that have expressed interest in the study might also be considered. The findings of the European and U.S. studies could serve as a centerpiece of a widely-distributed monograph on Universities and Democracy that would include findings from other studies from the U.S., Europe, and perhaps other areas of the world.

There is a need to keep collaborating researchers engaged. The possibilities of a continuation and extension of the Sites work into a second project will build upon the acquired expertise of the collaborating researchers in the Sites project and will serve as a base for expansion of the Universities as Sites research and to further international cooperation on the civil society and civic engagement agenda of the Site project.

¹⁵ It appears that 35 – 40 questions will configure universities along the dimensions discussed in this study, which will allow a profile of the place of democracy in these institutions.

The Universities as Sites project serves as a pilot study for the testing of research protocols and survey instruments in anticipation of a larger comparative study on a larger scale with improved methodological approaches and tools.

A global conference sponsored by the Council and U.S. NGOs on Universities as Sites of Citizenship and Democracy could be a possible step to pursue. The conference would discuss the results of the study and their implications for higher education and democracy over the next decade. The conference could focus on developing plans for future cooperation, including the sharing of information on best practices and developing strategies for promoting civic engagement and on-going educational reform.

Improvement of the survey instrument and expansion of the study to a larger pool of universities across Europe and the United States (and perhaps to other areas of the world) might be worth pursuing. A wider and deeper pool of participating universities would not only strengthen the findings, it would also extend the impact of the work to additional universities and societies. Recommendations based on an extensive study of this kind would have powerful impacts, helping higher education institutions and governmental organizations and NGOs to discuss and determine their responsibilities for civic education and democracy.

As noted, this project points to both similarities and differences between universities among different countries. Those that argue that the differences and cultural uniqueness of the environmental context universities exist in makes comparisons meaningless and discussions of democratic education completely relativistic, ignore a grave moral responsibility for ensuring that the persecution of minority interests does not erupt into civil and international warfare. Universities have been the locus of peaceful protest and positive change, and they have also been the birthplace of social unrest and revolution. Universities can be the lynchpin for creating mechanisms for peaceful resolution of disputes and for the socialization of young people, elites, and future leaders to values that will enhance and ensure a civil society. This project, and any successors, can not specify mandatory policies, specific curricula, or organizational structures that would be more “democratic.” It does point the way, however, to criteria that suggest what an informed citizen should know and what universities can do to promote civil society.