

General Report: European Sites Study
Universities as Sites of Citizenship and Civic Responsibility

General Rapporteur: Frank Plantan, Jr.

February, 2002

**UNIVERSITY AS SITE OF CITIZENSHIP
A COUNCIL OF EUROPE PILOT PROJECT
1999 – 2001**

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The Initiative – Background and Context

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 "University as site of citizenship" and instructed its Bureau and its Secretariat to develop the project further.

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.

The concern of the USA academic community on the matter of citizenship within higher education institutions has been expressed through the Wingspread Declaration on Renewing the Civic Mission of the American Research University (December 1998) and the Presidents' Fourth of July Declaration on the Civic Responsibility of Higher Education (Presidents' Leadership Colloquium convened by Campus Compact and the American Council on Education at the Aspen Institute on 29 June-1 July 1999).

As a result, two parallel projects were launched in Europe and in the United States under the responsibility of the Higher Education and Research Committee of the Council of Europe and a consortium of European and US researchers and institutional representatives (see list of members in Appendix).

The purpose of this document, and the preliminary version of the General Report of the pilot project drafted by Mr. Frank Plantan, is to underline the main areas of work carried out over the past two years and to serve, as a basis for discussion on possible further action.

2. 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.

3. Methodology

3.1 Establishing the project

Following the recommendations of the CC-HER and its Bureau, a Working Group was set up, responsible for outlining and carrying out the project.

The Working Group decided to launch a pilot project with the following objectives:

- to map current activities and problems in education for democratic citizenship within higher education institutions;
- to collect information from the target groups (students, faculty members, administrative staff) through pre-tested questionnaires and guidelines;
- to produce case study reports detailing the variety of problems and successes.

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.

The organization of the case studies was aided by the use of questionnaires and guidelines drawn up by the Working Group. An interesting quantity of information was collected during this exercise that took place in 13 of the 15 European institutions selected at the beginning of the project and 14 American institutions.

3.2 Time-scales

The pilot project covered the period from March 1999 to March 2001 and was carried out in the following stages:

- At its plenary session on 16-18 March 1999, the Higher Education and Research Committee (CC-HER) adopted the outline project and mandated its Bureau and the Secretariat to develop it further;
- In May 1999, the CC-HER received additional funding for follow up action to the Second Summit, making the financing of the project possible; in the USA National Science Foundation decided to finance the American part of the project;
- In September 1999, the CC-HER Bureau decided to appoint a Working Party for the project;
- On behalf of the Working Group, the chair of the CC-HER established contacts with US academic circles in June 1999;
- The Working Group met on 17 September 1999 to consider in detail the scope of the project and the modalities for financing it;
- The Working Group held a joint meeting on 22 October 1999 with collaborating researchers from six European universities in order to launch the case studies; US representatives attended the meeting;
- The Working Group held a joint meeting on 11 February 2000 with collaborating researchers from nine European universities; US representatives attended the meeting;
- Drafting of student/faculty questionnaires and guidelines by the Working Group from October 1999 to March 2000;
- At its 7th plenary session on 28-30 March 2000, the Higher Education and Research Committee (CC-HER) noted the progress report on the project and approved its further plans. It further noted that it would decide on a possible large scale follow-up project at its 2001 plenary session, on the basis of the outcomes of the pilot project;
- The case studies were launched in 15 European universities as well as in 15 US universities in March 2000. They were completed by the end of July 2000;
- The Working Group and the Contact Group held a joint meeting on 11-12 December 2000 to consider the final results of the European and American case studies; (US representatives attended the meeting);

- Drafting of the preliminary version of the General Report of the pilot project from January – March 2001;
- The final version of the General Report will be submitted to the Secretariat by the end of August 2001.

3.3 Organisation and approach to the research

The remit of this project was to determine the actual activities and capacities of universities in education for democracy. The project maps the variety of what was being done in universities to promote citizenship, and hence, democracy; and therefore, to assess the civic responsibility of institutions of higher education in contributing to these outcomes.

The collection of information about universities and their localities in relation to the aims of this project noted above was aided by the use of questionnaires and guidelines. The collaborating researchers responsibilities were quite broad, and included the gathering of official documents, conducting interviews, soliciting official statements and policies from relevant officials, and collecting survey data.

At the conclusion of these efforts each researcher was asked to write a narrative of about 15 pages highlighting the main features of democracy at the university and its locality. The focus of this monograph was on what is not present in the institution or revealed in the accumulated documentary evidence or survey data.

The format and substance of this narrative was up to the researcher, keeping in mind that this pilot project was designed to map the variety of democratic experiences, or their opposite, within universities and the place where they are located.

The information necessary to meet the demands of these guidelines was documentary, (in the form of records, publications, or official policy statements), and in the minds of the selected informants (their experience and knowledge). The guidelines were in three parts:

- The first involved interviews with individuals from targeted groups in the university and community. The interviews were designed as a source of information for the third part (summary).
- The second involved a group of interviews with 20 students and 20 academic staff.
- The third was a summary, evaluative narrative of what the university was doing in education on democracy not only within the university but also within its locality.

The questionnaires focused on three main discussion topics:

- Student participation in University governance
- University teaching
- Relations with community environment

Further Background to the Pilot Project

This report summarizes the findings of twelve 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 research was designed as a pilot study to test the research protocols;² the interview and survey instruments;³ 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*

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.

² 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.

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

Declaration and *The President's Fourth of July Declaration*.⁴ 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*.⁵ These include issues of accountability in a democratic state, the relationship of universities to local and national governments, and "the expression of democratic principles" and "...in particular the participation of internal and external stakeholders."⁶

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. Ivar Bleiklie, one of the participating researchers, expressed this argument as follows:

"First, students need to learn *how* democracy works – through participation in student organizations and university decision-making bodies, and by developing a conceptual understanding of democracy. Second, they need to learn *that* democracy works by experiencing that they can influence events and their own living conditions through participation."

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. It is a cross-national study, comparing universities in fifteen European countries, both new and established democracies, and fifteen colleges and universities in the United States. It addresses the actual activities of institutions of higher education that support democratic values and practices; an assessment of their capabilities and dispositions to promote democracy; and dissemination of resources to improve the contributions of higher education to democracy on the campus, and to the local community, and society. It seeks to provide a basis for an analysis and formulation of recommendations, and distribution of materials and approaches that can be used by institutions of higher education to discuss and decide their responsibilities for civic education and democracy.

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.⁷ 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

⁴ See [add cite]

⁵ CC-HER (2001) 28, "Autonomy and Participation in Higher Education: towards a European standard," a discussion paper for the plenary session, p. 4.

⁶ Ibid, p. 4.

⁷ A major transnational empirical study at the elementary and secondary education levels was recently completed. See Judith Torney-Porta, [add cite]

serious examination of a core social institution shaping democratic development. A by-product of this research will be the development of approaches, methodologies, and networks for advancing democratic and civic education on the basis of comparative research that goes beyond the mere sharing of examples of best practices.

Highlights of Findings

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 will vary by institution. A discussion of more institution-specific findings follows.

Salient points/summary

- ◆ 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.
- ◆ In addition to historical and cultural traditions, the legal and institutional framework universities operate in, and their effect on the larger issues embraced by this study (participation, civic responsibility, civic engagement, democratic education), are critical to understanding the degree of freedom an institution has in promoting these values.
- ◆ 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. Academic and administrative leadership of universities can choose not only the mechanisms for change, but also determine the amount of latitude they can take in effecting 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 and promotion of democracy and civic responsibility 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 for:
 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 is not what might be hoped for and expected. Many researchers noted the existence of misunderstanding or lack of knowledge among respondents of organizational and administrative processes within universities that further limited possibilities for greater participation.
- ◆ Informal personal networks and peer-learning play a major role in what students know about their rights. These interactions also shape their expectations regarding their rights, their understandings about what possibilities exist for them to participate in university governance or decision-making, and in the ways in which they learn and internalize notions of civic responsibility and democracy.
- ◆ Most sites reported that university administrators and many faculty considered many aspects of citizenship and democracy to be entirely a personal matter such as decisions to vote, to volunteer in the community, to participate in campus organizations, or to engage in political debate and, therefore, not within their ken nor responsibilities as teachers and scholars.
- ◆ As a corollary to the previous point, most university administrators and faculty considered institutional responses to promoting democratic values and civic engagement as an infringement upon or a dilution of the university's primary educational mission, such as the training of specialists and technicians and other professionals.
- ◆ 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.
- ◆ There is a problem of a status quo based on complacency, comfort, indifference and inefficacy. In stable situations where students are content with their life, they believe as one respondent reported, "what's point of using democracy through the university?"⁸

⁸ There is a certain tautology expressed here between this finding and the inferred hypotheses and motivations for this study. Are political stability (or certainty) and general comfort and well-being causally related to inefficacy and indifference, or are they intervening variables between socialization and

- ◆ 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.

SUMMARY OF SITE REPORTS

Characteristics of campuses

The universities selected for this pilot study, while not randomly selected, do represent a geographical diversity that has characterized the emergence and growth of European universities since the founding of the universities in Bologna and Paris. The universities in this study vary from prominent, old, established institutions to newly created schools growing along with the municipalities they reside in. Some are located in wealthy nations sheltered by the political stability of the European Union, and others are in what are commonly referred to as “transitional” countries, struggling with radical and rapid social, political and economic change. Still others pursue their educational mission in the context of civil strife, reconstruction from war, and the depravations that accompany conflict. Yet all share profound similarities, such as universal educational mission in the production of knowledge, human capital and technical expertise in service to the nation.

They also share similar difficulties. These difficulties differ only in scale between institutions. Universities face new and special difficulties in finance and budgeting; in their relationship to their surrounding community; in developing and maintaining the requisite infrastructure to meet their educational mission; and in reforming and adapting new institutional structures, processes, and programs in response to the changes in borders, governments, and the political-economy of Europe of the last decade.

A brief survey of the universities studied is illustrative of their differences and provides a backdrop for analysis and conclusions. Uniqueness does not mean they do not share experiences, or that common approaches in administrative policies, practices and reforms to promote democratic values and an enhanced sense of civil responsibility can not be achieved. Similarities in mission, faculty-student relationships, administrative organization, and relationships to government oversight and funding agencies provide much common ground for understanding and benefiting from comparative research. The location and distribution of a university’s physical plant is an important characteristic for understanding its relationship with the community. Together with the composition and size of the student body, and residential options available, it shapes both the internal and external environment of the university.

Many universities, particularly urban ones, are dispersed throughout the surrounding community, and therefore, defy traditional notions of the “campus.” The University of Tuzla, in Bosnia-Herzegovina is spread over the entire town in which it is

educational processes that political socialization research postulates shapes the predispositions and behavior of students in terms of their political participation and sense of civil responsibility?

located. It is one of main universities in the national system. About a third of its students are part-time or correspondence students. All of its students are local in origin with few foreign students to speak of. The government plays a major role in funding and regulating the affairs of the school. The University was reconstituted under a new higher education law in 1999.

Similarly, the University of Cergy-Pontoise, in France has its buildings spread throughout the community. It is a very young campus of 10 years. It is suburban, part of the Paris metropolitan area. What is distinctive is that the town has over thirty ethnic and foreign groups residing in it. Eighty percent of its students are from the local region. It has a small but growing number of foreign students. Its links with the local government are very strong—almost symbiotic. The closeness of this relationship and the dominance of the university in local affairs and culture makes it a quintessential university town.

The University of Tirana, in Albania, is located in the capital city, benefiting from the advantages of its location by enriching the life and opportunities of its students, faculty and staff. It is the national university and enjoys the privileges of being “the largest, the most consolidated, most complete and best quality university in Albania.”⁹

The University of Milano-Bicocca, in Italy is new—three years old. It has been part of the “hyperactive” growth and building in the old industrial district of this city of eight million people. It literally grew overnight and has a large population of 27,000 students. Though thought of as a “campus” university due to the clustering of its buildings, it has no residential facilities. Students are commuters and live in the city.

The University of Vytauti Magni—of Lithuania has ancient roots with its original incorporation traced back 423 years. It has been reorganized and reconstituted several times as a result of historical changes in the geopolitical situation of Lithuania, Most recently as Kaunas Lithuanian University. Most recently, it has been reconstituted under new statutes as part of the “national revival” campaign following the country’s independence.

The University of Samara in the Russian Federation is a maturing institution founded in 1969 in a large industrial city. Today, the city confronts the duality of deteriorating economy and infrastructure, though it has a “high market potential” (is a net donor to central government) because of oil enterprises and a strong agricultural base. Samara has a 2-1 female-male student ratio and is very homogeneous (all Russian), who are inhabitants of the region.

The University of Thessaly, in Greece, is also relatively new, taking its first students in 1989. It is characterized by a historically powerful Rector that is now elected by and accountable to the university Senate. Most of the university’s departments are located in the town of Volos, with others spread through other locations. Thessaly is an industrial region in Greece with a changing economic base. Many regard the establishment of the university as an imposition and relations with the community have been marked by strife and suspicion of the university and in the interactions between residents and students.

The University of Bergen, in Norway, was established following World War II. It is in largest city in Norway (but small relative to others on continent—with a population of 250,000). Changing national demographics and the standardization of the curriculum

⁹ DGIV/EDU/HE (2000), University of Tirana, Albania, p. 7

in Norwegian higher education has led to a large increase in the student population in recent years.

The University of Skopje, in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, is a large, urban, comprehensive research university. It too was reorganized following independence and creation of a new Constitution. It is now more autonomous and increasingly places emphasis on merit for access and participation in the management of the institution.

The University of Ankara, in Turkey, is a large, urban, secular university located in a capital city. As the flagship university of Turkey it works in close conjunction and partnership with the government and Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) to support local and national policies through teaching and research and joint outreach programs with the community.

The Tavrichesky National University of Ukraine is also a large institution and the main university of Crimea. Due to its mission of service to the Crimea and its population, its facilities are dispersed in 14 towns. It has a large number of correspondence course students.

The Queen's University of Belfast, in the United Kingdom (Northern Ireland), was founded as one of the three main universities of Ireland. Today it is a comprehensive research university. It is situated in the vibrant and popular south side of Belfast near the center of the city. It is surrounded by the major cultural institutions of Belfast. It is also located in a city that witnessed a quarter century of violent ethno-religious political conflict.

This is a large and diverse group of institutions, culturally and historically bound in their national context. How can we generalize or find commonalities among such diversity? Certainly there is no way to describe the "average" of these institutions. If we can not identify many common experiences, then what can be learned from the other's experience? We look not only for common experiences, but common difficulties, which is perhaps the more important task of a pilot study such as this. Developing inventories of democratic policies and practices and of what forms of civic engagement universities are currently pursuing provides the baseline for new initiatives. These inventories also provide the basis of comparing the diverse group of universities participating in the study. Can the Turkish example of educational reform in the context of its modernization drive help university officials and policy makers better understand the challenges for Bosnia, Albania, Lithuania, etc.? Can the size, stage of development, financial situation, or the cultural and historical constraints of an institution inform other universities on ways to address similar issues in their local context?

The practical necessity to find answers to these rhetorical questions rests in the development of shared concepts of citizenship and civic responsibility-- democracy and democratic values that facilitate a stronger European identity and prosperity while protecting and maintaining the rich intellectual and cultural traditions of each nation. Professor Alain Renault captured this ambition when he noted that "...if it were deemed a good idea to enrich the intellectual and cultural education systems specific to each country by adding a common element through which, as part of the learning process, a number of values and principles could be shared, universities would seem to be the most

apt institution to fulfil this function.”¹⁰ This study continues the exploration begun by others of how democratic citizenship can be made possible in an increasing multi-cultural context and differing national needs.

The Political Environment of Universities

The political context and environment of a country strongly relates to the delivery of higher education, and to the organization and activities of universities as sites of citizenship. In addition, the legal context defines the parameters of what universities can and can not do. For example, in what might appear to be ironic to more mature democracies, many newly independent and transitional countries place legal prohibitions on political activities within the university. This is especially the case in contexts shaped by conflict where maintenance of the peace and civil society takes precedence over the promotion of political debate. Many of the institutions studied also exhibited a primacy of culture and history over principles of political participation, political organization, and even the principle of pluralism.

In several institutions the majority of faculty considered the support of national goals as a primary mission of the university. This seemed even more apparent in the transitional countries and those having suffered war or violent civil unrest (Queens College is an exception in this regard). Human rights concerns in some countries also took primacy over the day-to-day processes and interactions of democratic life or the promotion of civic responsibility.

A university's ability to sustain initiatives for greater participation in the political life of the community and the decision-making and governance of the university is shaped by larger historical political and economic factors. For example, following the demise of the dictatorship in 1974, student activism reached its peak. Many changes resulted in the organization of universities and in the development of student rights. At the University of Thessaly today, students are regarded as being apathetic and not fully availing themselves of the rights won by earlier generations of students. More recently at the University of Vytauti Magni in Lithuania, during the “National Revival” period, there was very high political activity and civic engagement in effort to resurrect national traditions and increase student awareness. This has been followed by an extended period of less activeness as students become more preoccupied with their immediate living needs and future vocations. The site researcher reported on the need to refocus the university mission as the hardships of transition begin to lessen aspirations. Societal factors (ruling parties, corruption, unemployment, crime, etc.) increasingly impinge on the motivations and calculations of students and have cooled enthusiasm for change. Because of these factors young people have an incentive to emigrate, making it has made it all the more critical for those that stay to receive a quality education that is relevant to their needs. The university, in consequence, despite its new openness and promotion of democratic practices, must renew its concentration on its traditional and primary mission

¹⁰ Alain Renaut, “The Role of Universities in Developing a Democratic European Culture,” in Concepts of Democratic Citizenship, Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing, 2000, p. 99.

of training and education to meet the vocational needs of students and the human capital needs of society.

This phenomenon is being witnessed at several of the university sites. It could be a major obstacle to teaching democracy and citizenship, because of the overwhelming need to meet the vocational interests and demands of students, whose most salient concern appears to be to ensure employment and relevant work following graduation. External pressures are also put on universities to intensify their focus on meeting national needs and in the demand for specialists and technicians. At the University of Samara, for example, the Rector was chosen not only to help lead the university, but to help coordinate the use of university resources and personnel with city officials to facilitate the challenges of transition to a market-based economy. As a consequence, the university has become more deeply connected throughout the locale and region. Similarly, Tavrichesky National University in Ukraine was reorganized in 1999 under a new higher education law that implies an “internal logic” intending to facilitate the connection of the university to the problems of transition to a market economy.

In contrast, a more sustained, long term effort occurred at the University of Ankara suggesting that democracy and civic education do not have to be sacrificed to larger social and political pressures. According to the site researcher, Ankara has confronted the changes in organizational structure and academic programs to meet the demands for human rights and democratization through the nation’s process of modernization. The driving force in this effort has been reorganization of the education system in conjunction with the government’s efforts to expand its relationship with the European Union by putting tolerance, freedom and individual rights at the center of education. The University of Ankara is continuing to develop programs and initiatives, often in conjunction with international organizations and non-governmental organizations (NGOs), to meet international standards by facilitating the alignment of domestic laws and institutions with these standards.

The Ankara example is instructive in the connections it makes between the democratic and civil society agenda of universities with larger societal apolitical and economic purposes. This is an important residual macro social effect of teaching and research targeted at students and individuals in the university and surrounding community. Arguments that the pursuit of the twin agendas of democracy education and civic engagement is fundamental to larger social, political and economic transformations and gains is usually couched in theoretical terms. This case and others in the study such as the experiences of Queen’s University suggest concrete connections between a university’s democratic education mission and societal-level benefits.

Prohibition of Political Parties and Their Activities

Another structural characteristic of universities is the legal and administrative prescriptions regarding organized political activity within the university. Many institutions in this study, particularly those in transitional societies or who have recently experienced violent conflict are attempting to respond to new statutory and constitutional arrangements. They are struggling with redefining roles and responsibilities while

simultaneously dealing with basic issues of meeting their educational mission within tight fiscal and budgetary constraints.

At the universities of Tirana and Tuzla, university-affiliated persons may belong to political parties and organizations as long as their party work is outside the person's university functions—i.e., in their normal capacity as a citizen. At these institutions, any student participation in politics is a matter of personal choice and is not encouraged or discouraged by the university (“...life of students outside their normal activities is not a matter of interest to the University.”)¹¹ More specifically, at the University of Tirana political parties are restricted. Since the revolution, universities are considered to be depoliticized by statutory requirement. This is considered a “victory for democracy” because in the past the university was compelled to pursue the indoctrination of youth in communist ideology as part of its educational mission. Likewise, at the University Vytauti Magni no political parties are allowed. Students and faculty who engage in political party activities do so outside the university in their capacity as private citizens. At the University of Samara, Russian national constitutional law prohibits activities of political organizations on campus. In consequence, “...political life in the university is minimal.”¹²

Contrasting these situations with countries with no ban risks simplification of the social, cultural and historical differences of the universities—the age of the institution, the nation's experience with democracy, and general social stability. But the expectation that there would be greater political activity at institutions where there is no ban does not appear to be true in most cases. Even at institutions where political organizations are not prohibited, political activity among students is not much greater. In fact, student political activity could be characterized as somnambulant. At the University of Thessaly few students are involved in political parties. There is little political party activity on campus because, according to site researcher, students are simply apolitical in their general orientation and life. Across the Adriatic political parties are not restricted in the Italian context at Milano-Bicocca. Also, there is not much public debate on campus, even though there is some departmental activity that would encourage discussion of political issues. At Bicocca, both student activists and non-activists reported that groups that promote democratic participation do not have a large following among the student body. Most declare themselves as independent of political parties while faculty describe their political actions within the university as being independent of political party affiliation. This latter point hardly seems unusual and contrasts the distinction between party identification and party membership. Many individuals would describe themselves as having a party identification (“Social Democrat,” “Christian Democrat” or “Green”) but their political actions or advocacy may not be the result of party affiliation or party directed activity.

At Tavrichesky National University its educational mission includes “defending culture and education from political experiments.”¹³ While there are no restrictions on

¹¹ DGIV/EDU/HE (2000), University of Tirana, Albania, p. 14.

¹² DGIV/EDU/HE (2000), University of Samara, Russia report, p. 101

¹³ Ibid., Tavrichesky National University, Ukraine report, p. 149

political activity, none occurs. The atmosphere is stultified by constraints imposed by government and administration and reinforced by the vocational orientation of apolitical students. The University of Skopje does not have political organizations on campus, though it is not clear if they are banned. Students get involved in political organizations outside of campus through political party youth organizations. Also, students are very active in NGOs, for the promotion of democracy in the entire society.¹⁴

The increasing role played by NGOs at universities is increasingly recognized by universities as a means of pursuing or complementing their objectives. NGOs play a facilitating role in several institutions. At Ankara, NGOs work in partnership with the university for the promotion of human rights and democracy and work closely with universities to advance their agenda. At Tavrishesky National, NGOs can even be established in the university with material university support as long as their activities are in keeping with the university mission. Because the University of Tirana is located in the capital it is able to take advantage of all other activities, seminars, conferences, etc. available in the city and because of the presence of these resources the university is making more vigorous efforts to co-ordinate its efforts with other agencies and NGOs located in the city.

Administrative Practices and University Leadership

The range of options and parameters for change in a university is largely determined by the roles and responsibilities of the authorities that govern and manage universities including a university's central administration, local government officials, and the Ministry of Education. Statutory and legal arrangements provisions further delineate and constrain options and action. These factors together can also be a source of institutional inertia by protecting an institution's cultural traditions, or by establishing excessive or arbitrary bureaucratic impediments to change.

Generally, most administrators were supportive and cooperative with the project by providing catalogs, mission statements, program brochures and other materials to the Contact Group. In learning of the purpose of the project, some university administrators became very interested in how this pilot study might advance other related civic education projects they had started on their campuses. For example, some already have a civic education agenda and more interest in human rights and democracy education to help meet criteria for European Union admission. Also, many administrators reported interest in implementation problems and how to deal with legal changes and conflicts of laws.¹⁵

In transitional countries changes in administrative organization and practices, were generally acknowledged as improvements since independence, though as noted below, these changes have not completely altered many bureaucratic practices or

¹⁴ Ibid., University of Skopje, Macedonia report, p. 128.

¹⁵ This was reported during the Contact Group meeting in December, 2000, but not explicitly noted in reports.

authoritative styles of leadership. More importantly, many perceive that the social changes in society made and continue to make a difference in terms of restructuring of university management, the orientation of the university to its surrounding community, and the redefinition of its mission in service to society. However, many of these efforts at working with the community or serving the nation were based on the actions of faculty and administrators working as individuals, and less in terms of an organized institutional response to societal needs.

This can be seen, for example, in the University of Tirana report, which noted that the university still “lacks concept of management,” and where certain officials still exercise arbitrariness, particularly in employment practices. Few individuals continue to dominate the decision-making process. There is little public notice of decisions and less discussion and debate within the university community, hence, there is little accountability (in terms of challenging decisions or explaining the basis of decisions). Many institutions are still characterized by a rigid hierarchical structure, with a Rector appointed by the Ministry of Education and having significant authority to make decisions in the absence of shared governance traditions. The general perception among faculty and students throughout all the cases in this study was that power was concentrated at the top and most decisions in the university are made by a few individuals.

Students are rarely, if ever, consulted. The University of Bergen, for example, is marked by the administration’s failure to consult students. There are no public hearings on university decisions. Similar perceptions exist at the University of Thessaly where excessively bureaucratic approaches to student quality of life issues has created tension and resentment. There needs to be a stronger awareness that administrative style is as important as administrative structures as it affects students’ attitudes toward good citizenship due to poor modeling of behavior. This remains true at most institutions studied. Student participation in governance of universities is generally weak. Even where formal rights exist for inclusion of students in governing bodies, most students at nearly all institutions surveyed expressed disenchantment with the university’s practices and lack of communication. Most also do not feel they are consulted on matters of university governance. In many ways this comes as no surprise and may be endemic to the structure of university decision-making because of the relatively short academic lifespan of students. Students are transient and move through their academic programs and the institution with relative speed, whereas faculty and administrators endure at an institution through multiple academic generations. Faculty and administrators represent the institutional memory of a university, which is particularly important in the decision-making process where many issues are recurring and institutional history is important to establishing context. This may help to explain the apparent lack of input by students in university governance (further discussed below).

There is also a certain irony in contrasting participation opportunities for students with university administrator’s beliefs. Students claim they take little part in nor have much opportunity to participate in university decision-making while administrators tended to point to the existence of opportunities—usually highlighting formal legal

arrangements--and other efforts to be more inclusive. The perception remains, however, for most (Samara, Vytauti Magni, and Queens seem to be exceptions) of widespread student feelings of inefficacy. The example of Queens University shows that leadership matters. Both the chancellor and vice-chancellor have distinguished records of collegial leadership and in conflict resolution. This not only sets a 'tone' for proper democratic demand and problem solving, such leadership typically directs the university mission towards meeting the objectives of civic education and democracy in its education programs.

Changes in the external environment, such as changes in funding sources or amount of funding allocated to the university, impacts the administrative decision-making of universities. As pressures increase for more efficient management of universities, concerns are growing over how a more corporate model of the university might affect the promotion of democracy and civic education.

Formal Provisions vs. Actual Practice

One of the most consistent findings throughout the site reports was the disjunction between formal, constitutional and statutory provisions for participation and input by students and faculty into university decisions and governance, and the actual practices of universities. Perceptions among faculty and students were even more at odds with reality and are perhaps more important because they represent the institutional climate and mindsets that produce a heightened sense of disillusionment, and therefore, higher levels of political cynicism and personal inefficacy. These conclusions extend both to matters of university governance and decision-making, and to student organizations and self-government. The few exceptions to this generalization highlight the possibilities that exist for strengthening shared governance structures in universities in a way that facilitates the learning of democracy and acquiring norms of civic responsibility through practice and experience within the university itself.

A brief inventory of some details from the site reports illustrate these themes. In the most extreme instance of student distance from the governance process, in Ankara there is not even formal arrangements for student representation in university governance. There is indirect influence through the student union and its representatives. However, the students are poorly organized and not very representative of the wider student body. The university is not making any attempt to improve student governance bodies, or to expand their input into university governance.

At Tuzla, students have an equal vote in Council of Academic Staff and can propose agenda and vote. These privileges, however, appear to be only nominal either by virtue of the lack of voting strength or because students are marginalized or unable to exert any influence on decision-making. Students themselves report a high degree of inefficacy or cynicism about this process. As many as 75% of respondents indicated that students are not consulted in issues of university governance. However, the site researcher reported that they do not need to be consulted because they are included in the decision-making process that is "pluralistic." It was unclear what this meant in the context of the university's governance processes.

At Thessaly, the presence of students is generally considered simply a formality to fulfill statutory requirements. However, while not effective centrally, students have more input and impact at the departmental levels—perhaps due to closer relationships with professors. Students feel they are not consulted in governance issues and participation in governance of the university is weak. Such too was the case at Samara, which had formal arrangements for student participation but likewise found that students disagreed on their effectiveness.

At Biccoca, this is taken a step further with student representation (15% of total) mandated on departmental committees. However, despite this presence, students do not count towards a quorum for substantive votes and decisions, and are excluded from deliberations on professorial and research positions. Formal arrangements for student inclusion in university governance are clearly demarcated at various levels of administration at Biccoca. “Nearly all information to participate actively” in the University’s democratic life is available on its Internet website. However, despite these arrangements and considerable information made available to them, Biccoca students do not consider the election of their representatives an important event (less than 12% turnout to vote in student elections). Student representatives are well known among the students though perceived to have little influence. According to the site researcher, the university is more adept at gathering information on student attitudes and opinions than in including them in the deliberative process. At Biccoca, the Rector and University Senate, the main deliberative organ with a role in funding allocations and human resources, makes most decisions. The Senate includes student representation with incentives for students to vote because low voter turnout (less than 8%) results in decreasing the number of student seats. Also, there is a pervasive sense that there is a lack of mechanisms available for expression of the student viewpoint (despite representation on many committees). A lack of efficacy is widespread among students—yet also, there is no sense of great dissatisfaction either.

Similar results were reported at Bergen. Students there are aware of formal structures and the mechanisms of representation, but are seriously skeptical about the efficacy of their participation and influence. This attitude was surprising at an institution with a highly politicized student body where election of representatives to university governing bodies is organized around political groupings. These perceptions, however, were not shared with the faculty, who clearly disagreed that some groups are excluded from university life and governance. Here we see a significant gap between faculty and student attitudes. These differences between formal provisions for input and shared governance was described at Thessaly as a “democratic deficit,” despite a statutory structure that provided for student representation.¹⁶ The students do not take advantage of what is available to them, and the university does not consult with students. The researcher reported that students have full voting rights, yet a huge perception-reality gap exists between what statutes allow and what is practiced. At some point student roles became only a kind of nominal representation. The current trend is that students see the university as becoming less open and transparent in its decision-making. Where they do

¹⁶ DGIV/EDU/HE (2000), University of Thessaly, Greece report, p. 54

have input is usually on secondary issues. Formal administrative arrangements are nominally democratic, but practice reveals a different reality.

Some institutions have a greater degree of student influence on decision-making. At Vytauti Magni the President of the Student Union is a “full and equal member of the rectorate.”¹⁷ However, even with this level of input and influence, half of the students and faculty reporting thought student participation is not effective. The experience at Cergy-Pontoise suggests that voting rights are not the only means of participating in decisions and governance. Consultative capacities can have as much influence on decisions, if the administration truly values and solicits student input. On the major decision-making body at Cergy-Pontoise, (Conseil d’Administration (C.A.)) students only have consultative role. At lower levels as well, Conseil des Etudes et de la Vie Universitaire (CEVU) students have consultative role. Yet, students are perceived to have strong representation. The CA-CEVU link is seen as vital to developing the democratic experience. New doctoral organization at Cergy-Pontoise is expected to produce greater student involvement in direct decision-making, with its own governing body. Administrators however, reported that student involvement is only superficially democratic. There is dialogue, but no real demands. The site researcher suggests that this is perhaps attributable to lack of training, maturity or objective goals among students.

This is a key issue and not unlike the situation in universities in the United States. The effectiveness of student input often depends on the attitude of leadership. Simple consultation can have a greater impact on decision-making than voting rights, depending on institutional and leadership orientation and beliefs and faculty interests and attitudes towards including students in the teaching and learning process and decisions surrounding them.

At Skopje students took a more active position. Student representatives from the Student Union hold positions on University Senate and are demanding an even greater degree of representation. Still overall, most students view their participation in the management of the university as not effective and that the university’s governance as poor. While extensive legal provisions are made, there has not been a transference of legal provisions into norms. Such legal provisions therefore become an “alibi” for “real” democratization in the university.¹⁸ Student representation at Tirana included an allocation of ten percent of the membership in university governance bodies (“real” representation of student’s views claimed.) This was seen as necessary because there are no student governance bodies for student self-governance.

At Tuzla students were found to be generally dissatisfied with the governance of university and their lack of input into university decision-making. Moreover, it was reported that the administration is little concerned with the interests or demands of students. Several reports noted that students are mainly concerned with social and life matters outside the university, which may explain in part their lack of attention to or concern for participation in the governance of the university. At Samara students

¹⁷ Ibid., University of Vytauti Magni, Lithuania report, p. 82

¹⁸ Ibid., University of Skopje, Macedonia report, p. 126

historically focused mainly on social matters. This was of course also attributable to the rigid, authoritarian governance structure of the university at the time, which left students to focus on social and student life issues. With legal and statutory changes it was expected that Samara would become more open, but now contradictions exist as the administration espouses desire to include students in university governance, but there does not seem to be any substance to it. Faculty too do not perceive student involvement in governance as very high or effective. Traditional social and professional arrangements are difficult to change

At Skopje the climate is shaped by strong traditions that place the faculty at the center of the university. Professors are considered “sacrosanct.” There is a long tradition of faculty immunity and power over students. While the Skopje report was the only one to be this explicit about the organizational culture of the faculty in universities, one could infer that this tradition is pervasive throughout European higher education. This produces the classic “anticipated response” among students, resulting in self censorship and self-regulation or silencing of student complaints.

Even with statutory and other organizational changes, many institutions still retained an authoritarian style of management and strict hierarchies. Ankara has a hierarchical system that reaches up to the Ministry of Education. Transparency, though, is at least nominally guaranteed through formal processes and communication with departments at lower levels. It was not possible to judge the extent to which it is functionally transparent, especially since governance meetings are closed to the public. Likewise, Tavrichesky National also implemented a system of “self-governance” of the university due to changes in state law, but it has only resulted in nominal changes since most of the administrative and bureaucratic mechanisms for managing the university are unchanged since the Soviet era.

Government Role in University Administration

The government role in the management of universities remains very significant throughout Europe. In most places, government funding accounts for most of the current expense or regular budget. Even as some universities are being pressed by the government to identify and acquire new sources of funding and income, the funding formulas of government continues to constrain priority setting and in turn, the degree to which faculty and students could have input into the allocation of resources on campus.

In some countries (eg.,Bosnia), the intrusiveness of government control borders on micro-management at the institutional level. This includes its approval on any changes in university organization, but also impinges on faculty prerogatives with their oversight and approval of degree programs. This extends to Thessaly too, where the Ministry of Education has large impact due to control of budgets. At Skopje the national government appoints most board members. At Tavrichesky National, the government plays a large role through its legislation of education law and its approval of appointments. At Ankara government control is also extensive. New curriculum proposals go through a review at the Turkish Council of Higher Education for approval. But in terms of its ability to foster

democratization and civic responsibility, the Turkish case suggests that the nation's stage of social and economic development may require a stronger government role initially. In Turkey, a high degree of government involvement has stimulated change in higher education due to its interests in expanding its links with the European Union. This has led to mandatory new education and training programs in citizenship and human rights and on democracy. This may be an instance where "top-down" leadership accelerated changes to promote democracy and civic education.

A more moderate role for government was reported at Biccoca, where new governance structures have been implemented with the Education Ministry playing less of a role in administration. At Bergen, while the legal status of the university is controlled at the national level, a reform movement has produced recommendations for transferring more authority to universities by re-incorporating them as private or semi-private entities. Queens University's reliance on its government funding base is changing as it was mandated to begin fulfilling its requirements through new sources of revenues.

Decision-making and Accountability

Most institutions covered in this study reported that university administrations continued to maintain significant autonomy in decision-making—often in spite of provisions for public hearings, solicitation of input and public reporting of decisions. Throughout the cases studied, it was almost universally reported that custom and practice, rooted in cultural traditions regarding social roles, supercede formal provisions and other attempts at expanding participation in university governance. At Tirana, past practices determine current institutional inertia as the management of university continues to have a tendency to centralize and monopolize issues. Historically, the role of the government was pervasive and controlling through control of the budget. Now, Tirana and other universities are being granted increasing autonomy and have increasing discretion in the use of funds. As a result there are growing demands making transparency an increasingly important issue in university governance and decision-making. Decision-making at the top in many universities is generally not open to public scrutiny.

There is a strongly generalized perception among faculty and students across all institutions that a small group makes most decisions. Open systems, with full (voting) participation and procedures can have an indirect educational effect of promoting democratic practices and attitudes throughout the university.

Tuzla reported that a majority interviewed consider decision-making as much too concentrated. Meetings are rarely open to the public. When there are public meetings they are usually connected with ceremonial or commemorative activities. The university communicates its decisions through public channels in media. The representation of students on the University Council of Academic Staff is considered by the administration as sufficient input into university decision-making. At Ankara transparency and accountability are not really raised as issues as there is "an appearance of ...conformity between faculty, staff and students" to trust in decisions even though they do not participate in the process. At Tavrishesky self-censorship prevails with little discussion or debate of decisions. The tradition of hierarchical authority with no faculty

participation in governance shapes current practice. Only department heads participate in decisions.

Thessaly also reported a lack of transparency in university governance—especially regarding financial matters. The Ministry of Education determines not only the amount of financial support, but also the pace at which it is allocated, making planning difficult. The faculty were more generous than students in their assessment of transparency in university decision-making—a finding that was true on most issues across all the sites. However, a lack of knowledge affects the workings of formal structures too. The university community (faculty, staff and students) often do not have sufficient information or understanding of how governance works. For example, at Thessaly, faculty appointments, though occurring in a review process, are not transparent in its procedures.

One could also generalize from what was reported at Biccoca. Students tend to show indifference or ignorance of decision-making and do not concern themselves with university decision-making. Student representatives themselves do not make use of official communication mechanisms, but rely more on “informal talks with faculty, other students and staff” to gather information and communicate their interests. At the university level, communication of decisions is inefficient. While deliberative bodies record their actions in public documents, they are not easily accessible with delays in the publication of the documents following the decision.

Evaluation of the degree of openness in decision-making at Vytauti Magni is mixed. On the one hand, the perception is that few think the university decision-making has become more transparent in recent years. However, a majority also believes that there is “satisfactory means available within the campus community to hold decision-makers accountable for their actions.”¹⁹ There is also a perception of increasing openness of decision-making. However, a majority of faculty believe that the administration is generally restrictive in its sharing of information about its decision-making. This increases as decisions move away from academic matters to fiscal matters.

Samara appears to have changed enough in the past ten years that the perception of greater openness and transparency exists. More faculty sense that resource allocation decisions are also being done on a fair and equitable basis. Decision-making, however, is still concentrated in the hands of a few. “...student’s participation in university governance yields a contradictory picture. On the one hand, students take little part in decision-making or do not take part at all. On the other had, the university administration tries to improve their participation”²⁰ This seems to be fairly universal and is one of the ironies of participation in university governance throughout the reports.

An interesting contrast between formal arrangements to promote accountability and transparency and actual practice is highlighted by Queen’s University. A tradition of collegiality plays as much a role in fostering openness of decision-making and

¹⁹ Ibid., University of Vytauti Magni, Lithuania report, p. 85

²⁰ Ibid., University of Samara, Russian report, p. 99

accountability as does the organizational structure and statutory provisions. There is a long history of faculty and students having regular input into decision-making processes and consequently there is more of a consensus regarding transparency and accountability.

Surprisingly, given its long experience and democratic traditions, Bergen reported that most in the university community do not believe that the university has become more open and transparent in recent years. This raises some important questions. Is the degree to which the university community perceives decision-making to be open and transparent relative to the historical and current socio-political environment? Are “more democratic” nations more likely to hold a higher standard of openness and transparency than undemocratic or transitional societies? Also, are there limits to the amount of openness and transparency a university administration can have? How does an institution know when it is doing a good job in this regard? The issue turns on the classic trade-off between efficiency and equity. No university can be truly democratic because of organizational and management demands and because there are not unlimited resources to be applied to meet the needs of all faculty and students and the university mission. The goal must be the appropriate balance between the two. One of the special challenges to advancing the notion of universities as sites of citizenship will be to find ways to resolve the equity (democratic participation) versus efficiency (management requirements) tradeoff within the particular cultural and social circumstances in each national setting.

Tolerance, Dissent and Minority Viewpoints

It is difficult to generalize or compare the sites on the extent to which they exhibited tolerance for dissent and minority or unpopular views. Most left it to inference, or made reference to constitutional or statutory provisions as evidence for this. Again, a brief inventory reveals the range of sentiment expressed.

Tirana does not offer a public forum for debate or discussion of different political views and questions. This may seem a bit ironic following its revolution and the opening of the society. However, we should not be too quick to judge university performance on these issues without some reference as to time and circumstance. Is this position restricting political debate a backlash against former abuses and misuses of the university and the teaching function? Is it an immediate response to regulate or exclude political speech by elevating civil harmony over political debate? (Tirana is in the process of developing new courses and has attempted to introduce “proper” political studies to reflect more pluralism.) At the same time, no groups exist with the explicit purpose of promoting democracy. Also few in the university community are interested in engaging in political activities outside the university. There has also been more emphasis on social engagement over political engagement. According to the site researcher, this is a reflection of general weariness of the populace in engaging in politics. This may be the result of strenuous efforts to bring revolution and change. It could also be because in a period of post-democratic euphoria, attention is turning to practical needs—jobs, economy, training for such.

An over-riding question seems to emerge from site reports as a whole: Is there a danger of “democratic fatigue” in the newly independent countries and transitional societies?

The situation is different at many other sites. At Bicocca there is a good deal of conformity and low visibility of non-mainstream views. There are few student movements, and where there are, only a minority of students are involved in specific projects of interest to them. While “dissenting views can be expressed publicly” at the university and there is a “formal respect for processes,” there is a belief that these processes are not always employed.²¹

At Vytauti Magni most students are aware of the existence of procedural mechanisms for the expression of views, but do not take full advantage of these channels. Differing viewpoints are not widely supported, in part because it is a very homogeneous country. It does have significant Polish and Russian minorities, however, and the Poles are demanding instruction in Polish in certain universities. Historical circumstances, (once instruction was in Polish and the University renamed for a Pole) create the conditions for possible future conflicts.

Reticence of engaging in political debate was also reported at Samara. Students there go out of their way to avoid any discussion of ethnic and political conflict.

Community Relations

Campus Environments

How does this physical presence and infrastructure of the university affect its relationship with the community in which it resides? Does the dispersal of university buildings and structures throughout a city increase the autonomy of its units and inhibit interaction with other faculty and students? Do residential campuses have a different relationship with their community than non-residential campuses where students and faculty conduct lives separate from the university? What makes the existence of a university in a community an asset to some and a source of conflict and tension to others? Such considerations affect both the development of communities within the university itself, and also the wider university-community relations.

At Tuzla the buildings and faculties of the university, including the Student Center are scattered around the city. Likewise, at Cergy-Pontoise sites are scattered--each of them “cut-off” from each other. So ironically, at Cergy-Pontoise, there may be integration of each site with the community in which it resides rather than with other university units. There is no sense of a unified campus since “each site has a tendency to exist independently from each other.”²²

Student housing is often the most significant issue in university – community relations and the clearest point of contact in “non-campus based” universities that may be

²¹ Ibid., University of Milan-Bicocca, Italy report, p.73

²² DGIV/EDU/HE (2000), University de Cergy-Pontoise, France report, p. 41.

dispersed across a community or city (Tuzla, Cergy-Pontoise). Such environments produce dispersed student populations and result in a fragmentation of student activities that are not university-based, and inhibit the possibility of students coalescing around a particular set of issues. Such dispersal and fragmentation raise fundamental questions about how we are to define and understand “community.” Geography and local conditions are important to the number and nature of student associational activities and community engagement. Cergy-Pontoise and the local government all invest in the community in ways that are not directly apparent to the students who partake of services in the community.

At Biccoca there is no clear distinction between the university and the local community on most issues. “University and local community are not so distinct entities.”²³ [sic] The researcher could not sort out the distinctions and issues over which the community and university interact. The issue was seen as pervasive and complex.

Student – Community Relations

In Thessaly student-community relations have broken down to the point of hostility. It is unclear why, but the reports suggest that this is rooted in the government’s decision to locate the university there to “revive” the local economy, which has resulted in class tensions, in spite of the university’s efforts at joint projects with the community and community education initiatives for the local populace. Community leaders, however, considered the university’s involvement and investment in the town as vital to its future, and hoped that university traditions in democratic governance and civic engagement would “percolate down” to the local community.

In Tuzla, there is a strong political self-consciousness among students to work and interact in the community where they live. This may perhaps be part of survival strategy in the heightened nationalism following the war. Those interviewed believed that such participation in the community “advances civic consciousness, promotes democratic attitudes, [and] encourages political participation....”²⁴ On the other hand, it also gives evidence for the old adage, ‘familiarity breeds contempt’ because some reported that as a consequence of these experiences in the community and the social and political world outside the university, apathy and political cynicism have increased.

At Cergy-Pontoise students are not seen as students per se, but as members of the community they live in through their associations in the area they reside. There is a dichotomy between a student’s life as a member of the university and as a community resident. Students are very active in service with the community. However, the site researcher summarized these activities as “unfocused” and “sporadic”. In Thessaly, although opportunities exist for such activities, the majority of students are not interested in community service or work. Vocational interests dominate their thinking. Meanwhile, at Biccoca there is a reliance on formal structures. Student relations with the local community are managed through liaisons in government organs.

²³ Ibid., University of Milano-Biccoca, Italy report, p. 76.

²⁴ DGIV/EDU/HE (2000), University of Tuzla, Bosnia-Herzegovina report, p. 34.

This may reveal some problems with conceptualization; development and implementation of programs for democracy education and civic engagement and their evaluation. How are we to *discriminate* student and faculty *roles* as such from their role as citizens and residents of the community? If we are going to promote the notion that universities are, and can be enhanced to be sites of citizenship, we will need a proper understanding of how to discriminate these varied roles each individual brings to the university and the community in which they live.

Vytauti Magni presents a different case of a university town originally created to serve the university. Originally, a “Student Town” was formed in Soviet times that had included housing, clubs, sports venues, shops, post offices, etc. With independence and privatization reforms, these relationships with the students and university are now breaking up. This has created financial hardship on students and is beginning to affect their college going behavior and decisions on where to live. Because of this situation students are mixed in terms of their evaluation of the value of participation in community-based projects. They gain increased knowledge about real problems, but also produce higher levels of cynicism and apathy.

In contrast, in Samara students believe in voting in local elections but voting is seen as a personal duty, though many think the university should encourage it more. Students highly value their community-based projects. At Bergen, students are not encouraged to get involved in local politics or cooperate with the community on local problems. Queen’s University, in contrast, has long encouraged students to provide service to the community and has a Student Community Action that facilitates student volunteerism in the community.

University – Community Relations

The Kosovo crisis in 1999 stimulated greater university-community cooperation at Tirana. Research projects and field experiences are now the main mechanisms for students to interact with the local community. However, “strained finances” limit the amount of support the university can give to such interactions with the community. There are two significant projects dealing with civility and democracy for undergraduates and in teacher training that specifically address this need. Past access of the community to university resources were limited by the isolation of the university, lack of facilities and equipment and “fear of mismanagement.” Old animosities are in the process of being laid to rest so the university considers it important that it does nothing to exacerbate tensions in the community. Also, many previous relationships are tied up with conflicts associated with changes in 1990. Because some of University property had been put on land seized by the state, current resolution of claims for earlier era, along with privatization of state property has rendered some of the university property unusable. Until new legal arrangements are promulgated and understood, the university sees a need to maintain harmonious relations with the community.

Meanwhile, in Tuzla community residents have no access to university facilities. At Thessaly, however, part of its mission (as with Cergy-Pontoise) is to “reinvigorate” the community. The government located the university in town to help develop the local economy and to address declining industrialization of the town and region. Cergy-Pontoise saw the need for a Student Center as an important addition to the infrastructure of the community. The University of Thessaly, meanwhile attempted to develop joint projects with the community, but the relationship is largely one of service provider with community residents as “customers,” so no true university-community partnership has emerged. Here again we see that the major impact a university can have on a community is in the development of infrastructure and physical plant. There is also a great deal of friction between the university’s faculty and students with the surrounding community. The University community doesn’t feel its actions and outreach are reciprocated. Space and residency are big issues. Faculty did not settle in town. Some community residents are “unaware” of the university’s existence. In this context the Rector is trying to improve relations. Here again, we see an institution relying on personal relationships rather than institutional policies to address the university’s relationship with the community

The case of Samara reveals strong community relations through support of local government policy objectives with planning and expertise. Also, most see the university as active in shaping the political and social life of the community but also see students as less involved. The university has programs in the community, but they are not designed specifically to increase student participation in the community. Skopje is an example of a relationship with the community that is strictly a consequence of the professional activities that go on in the university. The main points of contact with the community are through symposia, conferences and consultative relationships. Few volunteer activities occur and are not very representative of the university community as a whole.

In Bergen, Norway, the sentiment reported was that the administration does not do a good job of facilitating access to the university and its facilities by the local community. However, there is frequent contact between faculty and community representatives—but largely in their capacity as researchers and experts. The “university makes itself felt indirectly through its researchers.”²⁵ This is a very common attitude and posture at almost all institutions.

Relationship with Local Government.

University’s relations with the local government can be qualitatively different from their relationships with the community and its residents themselves. Because of its history and development of a university town within a town, Samara was extremely active and proactive in working with the local government. Much recent activity is tied to transition to market economy, democratic changes in society as provider of services and expertise required to facilitate transitions. The University of Tirana on the other hand, faces a major issue having to do with privatization of state property. Much

²⁵ Ibid., University of Bergen, Norway report, p. 117

university property is in limbo, and until legal issues are resolved, many facilities can not be used. Bergen also does not actively support all policy objectives of the local government.

The nature of local linkages vary. Cergy-Pontoise's can be characterized as strong; others weaker or adversarial. What factors influence this? At Cergy-Pontoise, the university sees one of its missions is to "bring life to the town." Here, as elsewhere, its biggest impact is on development and infrastructure and physical structure of the community. This comes not only from university development of its own buildings, but the related development that comes from the private sector to serve the intellectual and cultural interests of the university (restaurants, theaters, bookshops, etc.).

In Tuzla the local community does not hold any functions or make use of university facilities for community events. As noted above, Tirana has no funding for community activities or programs, with the exception of the community linkages directly related to national issues and Balkan crises—eg., much was done for Kosovo crisis support. The Tuzla research even went so far as to suggest that students would more likely do more in the community if they were paid for their work. This is perhaps not a surprise in an environment where volunteerism has not become institutionalized or expected among young people. Neither is there any tradition of such activities as fostering or advancing the student's career. Hence, Bosnian students see "no material reward" for civic engagement.

Another means of engagement with the community is through joint projects and by the solicitation of community experts and professionals to work with faculty or teach at the university. These activities also vary tremendously across sites. At Tuzla, community experts, though sought after in the past, are now prohibited from teaching. Formerly, "distinguished professionals" from outside the university were permitted to teach, but the new regulatory environment no longer allows for this. Few are now invited to campus to teach or provide guest-lectures.

Cergy-Pontoise on the other hand has very strong community support for the university and students. Local authorities have established consultative bodies on which students have representation. Though many are low profile and not major projects, both sides acknowledge cooperation and support from each other. Another case of cooperation is at Biccoca, which has established a consultative organ with representatives of the local governmental administration. Community residents-- professionals and experts--are invited to teach and lecture through its operation.

At Vytauti Magni, the university actively participates in programs and projects with the surrounding Kaunas Municipality, including planning functions, providing research, and consultancies for the faculty. These professional relationships operate not just at the individual level, but at the departmental level as well. The community can make use of university facilities at no charge. Similarly, the Samara faculty are also deeply involved in preparing programs and training on problems of economic conversion, unemployment and training, and other labor issues.

Students and Civil Responsibility

Student Life

University Student Unions mostly focus on student life issues: residential issues and housing (landlord relations), jobs, or cultural and educational values. At Tuzla, there was no feeling among the administration that it is the university's responsibility to provide more opportunities for students to engage in university life—it's a student and personal matter. At Thessaly, however, students enjoy important social and economic rights (free tuition, textbooks, subsidies for housing and meals, and medical care too). However, these rights are circumscribed by underfunding, lack of fiscal autonomy and dependence on state funds through tight bureaucratic control.

At Bergen all students are members of the Norwegian Student Union which works to protect students interests through universities and student welfare organizations. So too, the Ankara Student union focuses mainly on the cultural and social life of students. The Vytauti Magni Student Union was resurrected following the model of student "corporations" that were active between world wars. These have been re-introduced to promote nationalism. Culture and sports clubs are very active and a primary focus of interest (as at Cergy-Pontoise, below). It has an active political society for debates. Clubs and organizations are autonomous, without university regulation or oversight.

Student clubs and activities were often affected by the wider society and the availability of resources. At Tuzla, even sport clubs could not be organized by the university. If students belong to one, they would be in one organized by the community, town or canton. At Ankara, many clubs and extracurricular activities exist in the context of strong student autonomy and management of these organizations. Students are also independent financially and are solely responsible for these organizations. Others such as Cergy-Pontoise provided funding for student activities such as these and have very elaborate programs with much university support and large participation. Sports programs are of particular significance and are conceived as being integral to the larger educational mission of the university.

Political societies for discussion and debate suffer not only from a lack of funding but a lack of interest. At Tirana respondents claimed that "people are tired of engaging in politics," and that there is sentiment on campus of stressing social engagement over political engagement. In contrast, at Vytauti Magni, the Political Science Club organizes political discussions, especially before elections. However, few students think the university makes a serious effort to encourage students to get involved in politics and policy.

Biccoca presents a different picture. The only student groups that are self-managed are those with political or ideological orientations. They organize as pressure groups in relation to university administration. Also, there are many extracurricular societies and clubs that students belong to that are completely outside university structures. Students belong to these as private citizens, not as students per se. Student

life and roles are not defined by their membership in the student body. A student's identity is only partially formed by their role as a student and is fragmented due to their other outside interests. Therefore, it is not easy for the university to promote democratic attitudes as students interests go beyond participation in university governance.

Student Representation

One generalization that comes through all the site reports is that whether talking about university administration or student government, people believe that a small group of elites run things. Each university, however, has different institutional and legal arrangements for participation in various university governance activities. Here again, an inventory of the variety of approaches to student participation in governance shows some similarities and differences between them.

In Tirana, because political parties are banned on campus, youth forums function independent of university structures and are a source of support for political parties. Also, ad hoc student clubs are self-organized by students for vocational purposes to lobby government agencies for jobs. There is no evidence of these activities taking on any degree of permanence yet. The site reporter noted "rumors" of students exploring new ways to organize themselves.

As noted above, the idea that elites run things was widely shared. Many sites reported that the same small group of student leaders always seemed to be involved in university activities or leadership roles. As a rule there was little participation and a general lack of interest among the student body as a whole. Some speculated that this was the result of a lack of maturity. Others posited the continuing problems of student life in acquiring housing, food, transportation, and the other amenities of life to support their studies.

It seemed that the more active student bodies were those in the transitional countries or those that had experienced turmoil in the recent past (Vytauti Magni, Samara, Queen's, Tavrichesky, etc.) Some have at least the perception of strong representation (France; Lithuania,) (Cergy-Pontoise). Students feel the university is governed by democratic structures. However, in spite of a strong sense of democratic traditions, even in a young institution, students reported that this is often "more apparent than real" and that their role in governing bodies is minimized.²⁶ In consequence, there is low voter turnout on campus elections (about 10%).

At Thessaly participation and voting in campus elections are in steady decline. However, governance structures allows for student participation at all levels of decision-making, including a substantial one-third membership.

What is the extent of their influence however? Why, with the level of statutory representation is voting so low? Are they restricted on the issues they can vote on?

²⁶ Ibid., University de Cergy-Pontoise, France report, p. 39

For such a large institution it seems odd that Biccoca has no student self-government. Students are, however, governed by and represented in the university's main academic bodies.

At Vytauti Magni the Student Union serves as one of the main governing bodies, with an elected presidium. Students participate in all levels of discussion with student representatives included in discussion of courses and programs.

Samara has no sources of funds to help create and maintain new representational bodies. Students, therefore, are compelled to be more active among themselves. However, student government is seen as ineffective. Perceptions are that only a few students run things and many students feel excluded from participation in university life. Little is understood or known about the work and activities of student leaders and students as a whole are passive about it.

Bergen students are represented on all levels of governing bodies, which have dual administrative appointments for faculty and administrators. Students serve on the main University Board and are elected in a politicized process, representing different political groupings. Still, sentiment is that a small elite dominates student opinion. Students likewise believe the university is run by a small group of people.

At Skopje the Student Union has branches in each faculty. However, the student body is very disorganized and "is the reason for the increasing abstinence of students from voting...and is at the same time an excellent indicator for the (un) popularity [sic] of the student organization within the student circles."²⁷ Most students reported that the student union does not represent the interests of most students.

Tavrichesky National reported low participation of students in the management of the university. Students were nearly unanimous in claiming that the university does not consult with students. Neither do they have input into the curriculum. However, students have a high participation rate in the governance of their own organizations. Most think student representatives represent their interests. Faculty and administrators see student government as ineffective.

What can explain these differences? Do students exaggerate their influence and effectiveness among themselves (student organizations to student organization) because they have absolutely no influence at the university level?

At Queen's the Student Union is well-developed and influential and represents the most highly developed environment for student self-governance and participation in university governance. The executive staff of students are given leave from their studies to do this work full-time. Student representatives serve on university committees and also manage all clubs, sports and student societies on campus. There are no restrictions on the formation of student clubs and organizations except those that are religious or political, which may not receive university funds. The importance of the Student Union in the development of civic consciousness and political awareness is manifested in its

²⁷ Ibid., University of Skopje, Macedonia report, p. 124

record as a source of community and national leaders in later years after graduation from the university.

These findings suggest that the problem of participation and effectiveness of participation also is rooted in perceptions and how they affect motivations for action. Do attributions of elitist structures inhibit greater participation and foster the mentality that students can not influence decisions and processes?

Attitudes and Perceptions

Europe and United States share a common problem of excess vocationalism among students. This pilot study revealed repeatedly that vocational interests dominated student's attention. This is not surprising since one of the primary reasons for attending a university is to advance one's position and insure one's future welfare. Students are and probably always will be interested in acquiring good jobs and higher salaries. Therefore, it came as no surprise that throughout the site reports, vocationally-oriented and technical training programs have the most influence on student's choices and behaviors.

Cergy-Pontoise reported the existence of bodies where students can voice their opinions and day-to-day dialogues between faculty and students are "complementary aspects" for students to learn and understand democratic structures and "were constantly mentioned by those interviewed."²⁸ Students there expressed little interest in social problems. Also, "increasing individualism results in low participation in communal activities."²⁹

Students at Thessaly "insisted" that civic responsibility is best developed through personal and social relationships. In this view, there is no role for the University except indirectly through the student's interactions—"it is not a course's subject matter but the tutor's attitude that encourages civic responsibility."³⁰

Collegial governance was attributed to Biccoca, where many layers of organization allow many channels for expression of viewpoints. While there are no prohibitions or obstacles to the expression of unpopular views, they are not encouraged either. History and culture dominate as well as socialization to a set of expectations on how things work. This is reflected in the notion that respondents reported "difficulties in reconstructing debates and processes that produced decisions."³¹ There was much apathy for specific political participation or involvement in governance processes, though "issues of the day" do engage people within the university.

At Samara, students have organizations for sponsoring political events and claim that the ability to espouse different views on campus is adequate. However, with weak student government and participation in university governance, there is a sense of missed

²⁸ Ibid., University de Cergy-Pontoise, France report, p. 39.

²⁹ Ibid., University de Cergy-Pontoise, France report, p. 43

³⁰ Ibid. University of Thessaly, Greece report, p. 56

³¹ Ibid., University of Milan-Biccoca, Italy report, p. 73

opportunities for citizenship education. Students though do not consider it a responsibility of the university to teach civic duties. This sentiment is echoed across the border in Lithuania where at Vytauti Magni only 25% see civic responsibility as a function of the university.

The report on Skopje revealed that despite weak governance and participation structures, and a long history of faculty autonomy and student inefficacy, most students surveyed thought the future of democratic society depended upon democratically educated students.

This suggests that the future orientation of students should also be considered in evaluating democratic attitudes and civic responsibility. If universities provide positive experiences in student interactions with university structures and with education programs, the socialization of students to democratic attitudes and a sense of civic responsibility may occur without it manifesting itself immediately in student behaviors during their years as a student.

Student Rights

Students enjoy certain rights that vary by institution and country. But in all cases in this study it was clear that there was a real distinction between the *de jure* establishment and provision for student rights, and the *de facto* enforcement and protection of those rights. And as with the other issues covered in this report, student, faculty and administration perceptions differ tremendously on the extent and effectiveness of these rights as well as student's knowledge and understanding of them.

At Tirana student participation is affected by general passivity, especially with regard to the assertion of their rights. *Parents*, it appears, are more likely to advocate for a students rights than the student himself.

The importance of local political history to shape attitudes long after events is suggested by the Thessaly report, which noted that earlier campus struggles in the 1960's were influenced by other student revolts and protests occurring globally. Those events helped to create much of the governance structure and rights available to students today. However, contemporary students seem to have little knowledge of this history and the struggle to advance and protect their rights and in consequence today "indifference and apathy are ripe."³²

The availability of information about student rights was generally lacking at most institutions. Biccoca has no publications on students' rights. No documents are published that specify rights. But the university Statute and "didactic rules" contain information relevant to students' rights. Frequent references are made to the Institute for Student Right to Study, but this deals mostly with student life issues and living requirements of students (housing, medicine, food, etc.) Few students knew what their

³² Ibid. University of Thessaly, Greece report, p. 55

rights were and are passive in their relationship to the university. Most consider other students the primary source of information about their rights.

Perhaps ironically, given reporting on high levels of participation by students, at Vytauti Magni there is a feeling that the University does not do enough to inform students of their rights. Eighty percent (80%) of students learn about their rights from other students.³³ Most faculty and administrators perceives that good information and resources are available to help students understand their rights and how to access the procedural process for complaints.

Samara projects a more favorable view of a university informing students of their rights. (One cannot tell from the material presented if it is substantively correct or what student perceptions really are from the material available.) Students care about their rights but do not know how to realize them. The university does little to inform students of their rights and is also perceived as such by the students. At Samara, as at most other institutions surveyed, student's knowledge of their rights generally comes from their peers.

Skopje noted that students are only partially informed about their rights. Apathy is pervasive. Students do not fight for or demand their rights. Students learn mostly about their rights from university publications (not specific) and student newspapers and pamphlets (student- student). Most rights are perceived to be centered on the right to study from the Law on Higher Education.

Ankara claims that information is widely disseminated and are centered on the higher education law, which pertains to their rights to study. Students rely heavily on friends and informal channels to learn them.

The situation at Tavrichesky also reflects views expressed through many of the site reports, noting that faculty and administrators see information on student rights as the student's responsibility. There is no source of information on student rights .

Ombudsman

Most universities in the study did not have an "Ombudsman's" office—an official university office that exists for processing student complaints, grievances or for enforcing the protection of student rights. None were reported at Tuzla, Tirana, Ankara, Biccoca, or Tavrichesky National. The lack of an ombudsman is particularly critical at institutions characterized by authoritarian management styles and contributes greatly to students' sense of inefficacy and helplessness.

At Biccoca, channels for complaints or grievances are vague with no established procedures. While complaints can go to the Rector's Office, they normally are reviewed

³³ Ibid., University of Vytauti-Magni, Lithuania report, p. 88

at a lower level first, or they can go through student representatives and be officially presented to the university government. It is unclear how well this works.

However, here as elsewhere at the sites studied, there seems to be powerful socialization influences at work in terms of the expectations students and faculty have about mediating conflict or resolving disputes. That is not to say that they are democratic or not. Student passivity and universal declarations of inefficacy with regard to university governance and processes suggests that the socialization that does occur is marked by futility. Expectations are, therefore, low. This should not be interpreted to mean that the university community and students in particular are satisfied with the status quo—quite the contrary. It may mean that students are simply resigned to being unable to alter or influence decisions and policies that directly affect them.

Tirana noted that employees at all levels lacked employment security and had no office or mechanism for employees to deal with situations that threatened their position. The administration there can be arbitrary in hiring and dismissals. There is no unionization. However, proposed revisions of the law may bring change: a new Ombudsman law and Civil Service Law are beginning to create the conditions for legal protection for those with unpopular views or dissenting opinions.

Biccoca reported it had no special office to protect those expressing unpopular views. However, there is statutory protection, and according to the site researcher, the absence of an ombudsman's office does not appear to inhibit the expression of dissenting viewpoints.

Unusual among the transitional states, Vytauti Magni has two offices (“commissions”) for review of conflicts and ethics and a Rector's-level office for further review. Samara also reported having an ombudsman and institutional resources for students to access due process if they are accused of a wrong-doing.

Tirana also reported that it had no procedures for processing complaints and no ombudsman. The researcher noted that the “lack of procedures creates confusion.” Tirana has no right of appeal nor protection against arbitrary decisions. In consequence, students rarely file complaints because of the perceived futility of doing so.

It appears that part of the problem at many of these institutions is rooted in a communist or authoritarian legacy. Hierarchical structures and centralized planning and decision-making did not allow for such channels. Even with more theoretical openness, students do not know where to begin to look for more information on the extent of and means of protecting their rights. There is still an internalized distinction between private and public expression of issues and concerns.

Early socialization combined with this legacy and the continuing structures and institutional inertia is a limitation on the extent to which changes and more openness have had on perceptions about process, the knowledge of students and the available actions open to them.

Funding Issues

Funding for expansion of programs and instruction in human rights, law, and democratic institutions is an issue at the sites surveyed, now and in the future. Existing structures and budgets in many countries, especially those less well-endowed or those recently wracked by conflict or war, are barely sufficient to maintain existing programs. Outside funds have been the catalyst in several instances for new classes, student research projects, or faculty leave time for the pursuit of community-related projects and research. Currently little funding is available at many institutions for student activities such as clubs, sports, and various intellectual and professional societies. Some schools have funds only for specific and narrowly defined projects.

Democratic pedagogy and promotion of civic engagement

Reliance on societal norms

Many sites reported that university faculty and administrators had no expectations to advocate democracy or civic responsibility. Many thought that civic responsibility cannot be taught and there is a general lack of encouragement by the university to do so. Likewise, many expressed the sentiment that such a requirement may be at odds with the primary mission of the university, which is to provide training and specialist knowledge. Few schools seemed committed to really push a democratic or civic engagement agenda. Participation in community and other civic engagement activities are seen by many as interfering with the educational mission.

This was the case at Tirana, where the promotion of civic responsibility and engagement is not perceived by students as an objective of the university. The record is unclear on the university's efforts to cooperate in providing new or additional information on these matters. The belief was expressed that good citizenship would "trickle-down" to the community and to students only by the example the university and its faculty and staff sets.

Likewise, Cergy-Pontoise reported that much education in democracy comes from the day to day contact individuals have with authority structures and university and community leadership. This view suggests that education for democracy is received through daily, personal experiences students have in their life.

We should not underestimate the meaning or effect of these perspectives. Nor should those who want to see democracy and civic education placed at the center of the educational mission of universities be critical of those institutions that reported, as many did, that so much of what passes for civic engagement and democratic participation is considered the individual's responsibility. This view challenges the notion at the heart of this study that universities are important sites of citizenship. But we must not beg the question that this view speaks to by ignoring the important and fundamental societal context in which universities operate.

Organization for these tasks in the University

Most institutions reported a need for centers or institutes for the study of democracy, human rights or civic responsibility, but most also did not have such centers as planning or funding priorities. Some that did had established them as a response to external stimuli: eg., development of programs in human rights, European institutions, and law as response to TEMPUS, ERASMUS, and a desire to broaden connections to the European Union. Funds from private foundations and diaspora groups also facilitated such centers and programs.

Still, many faculty and staff interviewed thought that learning about democracy and one's civic duties was realized indirectly through contact and experience with authorities and authority structures within the university. At Tuzla, for example, there are no programs at the university that promote an understanding of civic duties and responsibilities. This site also reported considering such activities as a "watering down" of academic programs by taking students time away from their "regular" studies. In these cases, activities to promote civic engagement are seen as interfering with the primary educational mission of the university.

Many institutions thought that contributions in this area could be best made by social scientists and those in the humanities, since other faculties (in sciences and business) would not be concerned with a mission to educate for democracy. Such views are further tempered by the absence of official support for such objectives. Biccoca, for example, made no explicit reference to the promotion of democracy or citizenship in official documents or statutes. The University statute refers to the university mission as "cultural renewal through research and transmission of this information through education of the student." Students are free to act, but not encouraged.

At Bergen it was noted that the university held the belief that it should be a center of learning that should foster certain values. However, increasing instrumentality and specialization of expertise in education of students pose challenges to this mission. At Bergen, "...the university leadership is not very specific about what it means by 'democracy', let alone "true democracy," although it emphasizes the necessities of cultivating an understanding of the complexity of society and balancing "instrumental rationality" with "intellectualizing power" through education and personal guidance."³⁴ This comment perhaps best captures the indirect influences the university exerts on education for democracy.

Money again was cited as an obstacle to the creation of new programs for democracy education. Because of the lack of financial support for professors interested in democracy and civic education at many institutions, they naturally gravitate toward external agencies and groups, eg., NGOs.

Evaluations

³⁴ Ibid., University of Bergen, Norway report, p. 114

One means for students to participate in their education and in development of university curricula and policies is through evaluations of courses, professors and activities. The use of evaluations at the sites studied is not widespread, nor connected philosophically to the educational mission of the university, let alone to the large question of their role in democratic citizenship. Sites could be distributed along four dimensions in their use of evaluations: those that do not use them and believe that students are not competent to judge academic matters; those that do, but do not take them seriously; those that use them and see them as important and effective; and those that use them only to meet official requirements, but ignore them. Without strong institutional support evaluations will not have any impact on the curriculum or the quality of teaching because students avoid negative comments for fear of reprisal in their grading. They must also be used without fear of pressure from the administration or their use as the sole means of evaluating a professor's effectiveness.

Classes and teaching

Most sites reported that their university did a good job of teaching for democracy and civic education, though most did so indirectly through courses in departments that would address relevant subject matter.

Citizenship was approached in Bosnia with the expectation that universities will begin making more explicit statements about the acquisition of citizenship skills and responsibilities as part of their educational process. At Tirana, effort seems focused mainly in the social sciences and humanities and not the hard sciences. Structural factors critically affect the ability to place students at the center of the learning process. Lack of teaching materials, overcrowded classrooms, excessive teaching loads all contribute to the problem. More deeply ingrained problems are the deep-rooted traditions noted to be embedded in teacher's habits and approaches.

As noted, many universities thought that they addressed issues of democracy and civic responsibility indirectly—eg., in related courses, or in subject matter that implicitly deals with it. Tuzla sees this as being accomplished through incidental and indirect linkages to community through class projects, field research, faculty connections and assignments. However, little is directly taught on key issues, which were “implicitly dealt with”—the exception being a course in the journalism school on democracy.

The view, shared by many surveyed, that citizenship education is the responsibility of the student, acquired through indirect learning and personal experiences was reiterated by many. This perspective concluded that while students are exposed to concepts of pluralism, democracy, civil rights, political participation and political psychology, in classes they took, it was in the student's capacity as “citizens themselves” who are “most qualified” to set and define needs and priorities of community and society. Only after that, should government, universities and other social and private organizations get involved. This view represents a major obstacle to advancing the notion of universities as sites of citizenship and will require special attention in subsequent research and in any discussions of curricular reform.

Cergy-Pontoise also considered much instruction in these issues to be “implicitly” acquired in the course of regular instruction in subjects that may touch on issues of democracy and democratic theory. Certain subjects and disciplines were more given to comparative study of society. Pedagogy was seen as important—that right teaching methods would also provide a means to acquire democratic learning. However, many faculty see the role of the lecturer as dispensing knowledge or communication of the subject matter that should be value-free. The findings from Biccoca echoed this belief and considered that certain established departments like law and sociology would explicitly address issues of democracy in their courses.

Each school repeated the general idea that their coverage of the subject matter on democracy and civic responsibility could be found in related subjects. While there were different emphases, each made similar points.

At Vytauti Magni there was a very vocational orientation. Due to the state of the economy and student’s concerns about their future, humanities, philosophy and democratic and civic education are considered a luxury. However, it was also reported that most students could identify courses that explicitly address democracy or civic responsibility. Samara had few courses devoted to democracy or civic education. No courses were explicitly focused on democracy or civic education. Here too the subject matter is acquired indirectly in the curriculum. However the university has developed special courses on elections and has an extensive field based projects for students to work in elections. At Ankara instruction is in the related areas of civics, human rights, and democracy and is largely focused on public administration training programs for public and private sector personnel to improve Turkish-European relations. Meanwhile at Bergen, most faculty believed that while no courses existed explicitly dealing with civic responsibility, many courses indirectly broached the subject. Skopje also approached democracy taught within regular courses (indirectly) and in specific courses on democracy and citizenship in the faculty of Law. Pluralism, political participation, civic duties, etc. are taught in courses in the Law and Philosophy faculties.

Throughout the reports there was a tendency to see democratic education as residing in the humanities and social sciences, which have a “natural impulse” for democracy. At issue was whether the natural sciences and technical areas are unaware of centers and programs to promote democracy on campus or simply not interested.

This raises philosophical and pedagogical issues. Also, what role does the researcher’s reflections play in application of ideas and principles being examined in this study? Many reported that faculty as a whole felt such value-laden subject matter was not within their purview or even got in the way of the primary instructional purpose. Many sites reported that the university always encouraged dialogue with the student community and had many mechanisms for explaining university objectives. Yet, surveys reveal a strong dissonance. How are we to understand this? Each site responded differently and conceived it differently. It is important to have some functional comparisons of what counts—some measure of that addresses the gap between what’s available and what’s actually communicated, processed and received by the students.

One thing most universities had in common were fairly well-developed activities to make use of the community for field based research and projects. Field study and research were an important source of learning at many, if not most sites. However, growing numbers of students and rising student/faculty ratios may soon create a barrier to promoting independent study and directed field research experiences. Those that were not engaged as much were considering more “joint projects” between the university and the community. But in some instances this is really service and contract work for government agencies and not field based research connected with classes. Academic programs are not designed to specifically address students undertaking citizenship responsibilities after graduation. The main purpose of education is creation of specialist knowledge. Students are as much responsible for this perspective as the universities are that offer the courses. Students are utilitarian in their academic interests and are worried more about grades and later jobs.

It is unclear what the impact of field based projects are in terms of better relations with community or if it would increase the likelihood that students would subsequently vote in local elections. Experience to date shows a remarkably mercenary outlook with students suggesting that they would place more value on field research or community involvement if they received some kind of compensation for it or a grade.

One site (Biccoca) does not allow for independent study and had no extracurricular activity devoted “even partially” to teaching citizenship. It reported that there is little evidence of democratic teaching methods or pedagogy and little apparent need for it given the passivity of students.

Vytauti Magni on the other hand noted that since independence, “more democratic” relationships are occurring between faculty and students and seems to be the key in civic education there at this time. There are no specific courses but the articulated mission and purpose of the university strives to foster active citizenship. While it is not possible to evaluate the claim, the assertion was made there that communication, faculty-student interaction and more open systems and processes “reveal” or teach democracy to students reflects faculty sentiments throughout many of the site reports.

Multiculturalism

Most sites had a difficult time understanding and explaining multiculturalism and what the university was doing to address the issue. Language study was most often cited as the locus of most multicultural study and the best way to learn about other cultures. We must beware that language study, however essential it is, does not become merely a surrogate for real engagement of issues of understanding and conflict resolution.

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.³⁵

In addition to the findings reported above, a few last issues gleaned from the site reports that did not fit in the discussion above, as well as some conceptual and philosophical issues must be commented upon. 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. The study also raised questions for further inquiry and pointed to dimensions of issues that the questionnaires did not adequately cover.

For example, the status of foreign students was not adequately addressed. While many sites did not have large numbers of foreign or international students, most also reported that the trend was growing. Some had large indigenous minority populations. So the issues surrounding international students and minorities will take on increasing salience in near future. Though underplayed in the reports (largely because of lack of history and experience in dealing with these populations), universities will need to address the infrastructure requirements and student-life services together with programmatic and procedural requirements to make these students full members of the university community.

Many in the Contact group reported that the administration of the survey stimulated thinking and debate in the university regarding the issues raised in the study. On the other hand, it appears that some questions were excessively salient in eliciting particular opinions, and seemed to have had a prescriptive bias. Researchers and respondents both faced the problem of interpretation of concepts and language, especially the most central concept to this study, “democracy.” The term has many uses, including “participation,” style of management, political discussion and free expression, or participation in elections. There seems to be a need for much better conceptual discrimination between “civic engagement,” “democracy,” and “political participation.” There is too much of a tendency to equate them. One outcome of the pilot study will be the assessment of key terms for revision of questionnaires and research protocols. The interpretation problem raises questions about the extent to which trade-offs are made and recognized in the coverage or extension of key concepts in terms of the range of phenomena they are meant to cover. Researchers also reported needing additional material and data to interpret the survey to respondents.

Faculty surveyed constantly contested the idea that universities must stimulate democracy among students. This will pose unique challenges to implementing new

³⁵ Is there a danger in this if “structural convergence” also becomes a test of a university’s progress toward reform?

programs or pedagogies pertaining to democracy and civic education. One persistent question is the extent to which what is going on in the university is reflected and shaped by what's going on in the larger society. Some sites stressed that there is dialogue that goes on at different levels in the university, particularly at the faculty-student interaction level, that facilitates learning about civic responsibility and democracy. Does such "dialogue" substitute for purposeful democratic pedagogies? Do mechanisms for communication and input serve as a surrogate for direct participation and voting in governance processes? Is there some minimal level of dialogue that allays the concerns of students and faculty that their voices are being heard?

Is it possible that the locus of democratic development and civic engagement for students is in the number and quality of extracurricular activities a student participates in? In absence of explicit teaching in democratic principles and civic responsibility, such activities take on special importance. The reports suggest as much in the repeated emphasis by respondents and researchers on the individual's own responsibility and initiatives for greater involvement.

Broader Philosophical Issues and Reflections

Is the university merely a reflection of the larger society? As Jean-Marie Imhoff noted, "it seems that the more democratic the society, the lower the participation rate." The central research question this poses is whether this is true only in the specific or isolated case, or if it is 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 hardening of the arteries of 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. Will purposeful, integrated educational programs for civic engagement accelerate the developmental dynamic of democracy?

There are structural conditions that may produce some of the effects we have witnessed in these studies. The time students spend in university is relatively short. Students are "passing through" and may naturally be more focused on their personal needs than those of society or the community. One institution is considering giving credit for students who serve in some representative capacity—i.e., placing some reward or utility to the service as incentive to increase participation, or at least make the commitments to such service more meaningful.

There is an absence of awareness among students of belonging to a larger community. The French report states this succinctly:

“Paradoxically, the freedom existing at the university appears to be a brake on involvement in the task of representative [sic]: the advantage of an absence of constraints is not compensated for by the indirect and rarely apparent benefits of serving as an elected representative...”³⁶ So, few students volunteer their time in this capacity.

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.

Many researchers were torn between reporting what they learned and what they believed. In some cases there was a clear dissonance between what was reported by the informants and what the university claimed to do or what the researcher’s interpretations were. There were some marked contrasts between faculty and student views of the situation at their institution. Eg., in once instance the researcher may conclude that the university suffers from a democratic deficit in its administrative decisions and governance regulations, yet also conclude that the faculty see the university decision-making as more open than the students would.

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.

The Way Forward

Comparative research 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

³⁶ Ibid., University of Cergy-Pontoise, France report, p. 40.

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.

The Contact Group's reports and the survey data clearly demonstrate that in the minds of the respondents there is a significant perceptions among students of what their universities are doing and not doing with regard to democratic practices, and democracy and civic education. 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.

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 activities³⁷;
3. a means for extending the research globally.

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.

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.

³⁷ 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.

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.

APPENDIX I

Council Committee on Higher Education and Research Universities as Sites of Citizenship Project

LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE WORKING PARTY

FRANCE

Professeur Régis RITZ, Département d'études de français-langue étrangère, Université Michel de Montaigne (Bordeaux III), Domaine Universitaire, F - 33405 TALENCE CEDEX

E tel. +33 5 56 84 50 44 fax: +33 5 56 84 50 90
e-mail: DEFLE@montaigne.u-bordeaux.fr

GERMANY/ALLEMAGNE

Professor Michael DAXNER, President of Oldenburg University, Ammerländer Heerstr. 114-118, D-26129 OLDENBURG

E tel. +49 441 970 64 52 fax: +49 441 798 2399
e-mail: daxner@admin.uni-oldenburg.de

GREECE/GRECE

Professor Philippos LOUKISSAS
University Of Thessaly, Pedio Areos, 38434 Volos, Greece

E+F tel. 003042169781 fax: 03042163793
e-mail: LRL@groovy.gr

NORWAY/NORVEGE

Dr. Per NYBORG, Secretary General of the Norwegian Council of Universities, Harald Haarfagres gate 17, N-5007 BERGEN

E tel. +47 555 898 32 fax: +47 555 89840
e-mail: per.nyborg@dnu.uib.no

(Vice Chair of the CC-HER)

POLAND/POLOGNE

Mr. Krzysztof OSTROWSKI, Minister's Adviser, Elegijna 29, PL - 02-787 WARSZAWA

E tel. 0048226412656 fax: 0048226433537
e-mail: iskra@hsn.com.pl

(Chair of the CC-HER)

PORTUGAL

Professor Virgílio MEIRA SOARES, Former Rector of the University of Lisboa, Departamento de Química e Bioquímica, Faculdade de Ciências da Universidade de Lisboa, R. Ernesto Vasconcelos, 1749-016 P- 1 699 LISBOA

E tel. +351 1 7500136/7277721 +351 931299507 fax +351 1 7500088
e-mail: vmsoares@fc.ul.pt

RUSSIA/RUSSIE

Mr. Yuri AFANASJEV, Rector, Russian State University of Humanities, 125267
MOSCOW - RUSSIA

F tel./fax: +70952505109

SWITZERLAND/SUISSE

Professeur Luc WEBER, University of Geneva, Florissant 6, CH-1206 GENEVA

F tel. +41 22 789 3550 fax: +41 22 347 3906

e-mail: Luc.Weber@ecopo.unige.ch

UNITED KINGDOM/ROYAUME UNI

Professor Robin SIBSON, Vice Chancellor, University of Kent at Canterbury,
Canterbury, OB-KENT CT2 7NZ (Committee of Vice Chancellors and Principals)

E tel. +44 1227 823 201 fax: +44 1227 451 684

e-mail: R.Sibson@ukc.ac.uk

CLARE/CPLRE

Mrs. Mary HUNT, Member of the Waverly Borough Council, Mariposa 4 Stoneyfields,
UK - GU9 8DX FARNHAM, SURREY

E fax: 357 2 66 33 63

CRE

Professor Carlos Antonio Alves BERNARDO, Vice-Rector Universidade do minho,
Campus de Azurém, P - 4800 GUIMARAES

E tel. +351 53 511 670 or 518 801 fax: +351 53 515 086

e-mail: cbernardo@eng.uminho.pt

ESIB

Ms. Manja KLEMENCIC, Director, ESIB, Liechtensteinstrasse 13, A - 1090 WIEN

E tel. +43 6643588514 mobile: +436643588514 fax: +431310888012036

e-mail: esib@oeh.ac.at

Appendix II

Universities as Sites of Citizenship Project Contact Group for European Sites

UNIVERSITIES PARTICIPATING AND THEIR REPRESENTATIVES

ALBANIA/ALBANIE

UNIVERSITY OF TIRANA

Professor Dr. Adem TAMO, Dean of the Faculty of Social Sciences,

University of Tirana, TIRANA

E tel.003554230369

fax: 003554223981

e-mail: atamo@icc.al.eu.org

BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA/BOSNIE ET HERZEGOVINE UNIVERSITY OF TUZLA

Mr. Enver HALILOVIC, Dean of the Faculty of Philosophy, University of Tuzla,

Muharema Fizovica-Fiska br. 3, 7500 TUZLA

E tel. 0038775251524

e-mail: enver@bih.net.ba

FRANCE

UNIVERSITY OF CERGY PONTOISE

Mr. Jean-Marie IMHOFF, Vice-Président, Université de Cergy-Pontoise, F-95000

CFRGY-PONTOISE,

E/F tel. 33 (0)1 34 25 61 14

e-mail: imhoff@u-cergy.fr

GERMANY/ALLEMAGNE

UNIVERSITY OF OLDENBURG

Prof Dr. Franz JANUSCHEK University of Oldenburg, Ammerländer Heerstr. 114-118,

D - 26129 OLDENBURG

E tel.00494419572406

fax: 00494419572407

e-mail: diskfors@hrzl.uni-oldenburg.de

GREECE/GRECE

UNIVERSITY OF TESSALY

Professor Philippos LOUKISSAS, University of Thessaly, Pedio Areos, GR - 38434

VOLOS

E tel. 003042169781

(home: 003016251955)

fax: 003042163793

(home fax:003016251956)

e-mail: LRL@groovy.gr or floukis@uth.gr

HUNGARY/HONGRIE

JOZSEF ATTILA UNIVERSITY

Ms. Gabriella Balog MOLN;R, International Relations Office, Jozsef Attila
University, H - 6720 SZEGED, Dugonics ter 13
E tel./fax: 36 62 420 895
e-mail: gbalog@jate.u-szeged.hu

ITALY/ITALTE

UNIVIERSITY OF MILANO << B >>

Professor Guido MARTINOTTI, Vice Rector of University of Milano "B", Dipartimento
di Sociologia, Universita' degli studi di Milao-Bicocca, via Bicocca delgi Arcimboldi, 8,
Building U7, room 3 3 1, third floor, I - 20126 MILANO
E tel. 00390264487529 or 00390264487557 (secre.) or 003902435604 (home)
fax: 00390264487505 or 003902861891
e-mail: guido.martinotti@unimib.it

LITHUANIA/LITUANIE

VYTAUTAS MAGNI UNIVERSITATAS

Professor Arvydas MATULIONIS, Lithuanian Institute of Culture and Arts, Jovaru 3,
VILNIUS 2009, LITHUANIA
E fax: 003702610989
e-mail: masta@aiva.lt

NORWAY/NORVEGE

UNIVERSITY OF BERGEN

Dr. Ivar BLEIKLIE, Director of the Norwegian Research Centre in Organization and
Management (LOS-senteret). Rosenbergsgate 39, N-5015 Bergen
E tel: 00 4755583900 fax: 00 47.55583901
e-mail: ivar.bleiklie@los.uib.no

POLAND/POLOGNE

UNIWESYTET MIKOLAJA

Ms. Beata DURKA, Institute of Philosophy and Sociology, Polish Academy of Sciences,
A. Ul.Nowy Swiat 72, PL-00-330 WARSZAWA
E tel. (mobile) 48601379580

RUSSIA FEDERATION/FEDERATION DE RUSSIE

UNIVERSITY OF SAMARA

Professor Zshan TOSCHENKO, Russian State University of Humanities, University of
Samara, Pavlova 1, 443011 SAMARA - RUSSIAN FEDERATION
E e-mail: zhantosch@mtu-net-ru

TURKEY/TURQUIE

ANKARA UNIVERSITY

Professor Nahil ALKAN, Deputy Director of the European Community Research Centre,
Ankara University, Tr - 06590 ANKARA
E tel: 00903123620762 or 00903123204936 fax: 00903123205061

**FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA/EX-REPUBLIQUE
YUGOSLAVE DE MACEDOINE
SS.CYRIL AND METHODUS UNIVERSITY**

Mr. Savo SVETANOVSKI, Vice-Rector, SS. Cyril and Methodus University,

Bul. "Krstе Misirkov" bb, 91000 SKOPJE

E tel. 0038991129048/or 134 100 fax : 0038991116370

Home tel./fax: 0038994 384 898

e-mail: S.CVETANOVSKI@ukim.edu.mk

UKRAINE

TAVRIDA NATIONAL UNIVERSITY

Mr. Oleg A. GABRIELIAN, National Taurida Vernadsky University, Yaltinskaya 4,
95053 SIMFEROPOL - UKRAINE

E tel. 00380652230328 fax: 00380652297630

e-mail : tgrn@sonet.crimea.ua

UNITED KINGDOM/ROYAUME UNI

QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY

Mr. Mike SMITH, Lanyon Building D71, Queen's University Belfast, BELFAST BT7
INN - GB NORTHERN IRELAND

E tel. 0044 1232 335 339 fax: 00441232237925

Appendix III

Universities as Sites of Citizenship and Civic Responsibility Project United States Sites and Collaborating Researchers

Catholic University

Collaborating Researcher:

Dr. Michael Foley
Professor, Political Science Department
Catholic University
O: (202) 319-5999
H: (301) 864-1009
Email: foley@cua.edu

Clark-Atlanta University

Collaborating Researcher

Dr. Claudette Williams
Associate Professor,
Educational Leadership Dept.
Clark Atlanta University
223 James P. Brawley Drive
Atlanta GA 30314
Tel. (404) 880-8495
Email: cwilliam@cau.edu

Dr. William Denton
Professor
Clark Atlanta University
223 James P. Brawley Drive
Atlanta GA 30314
Tel. (404) 880-8493

University of Denver

Collaborating Researcher

Dr. Fred Gibson
Lecturer, Pioneer Leadership Program
University of Denver
Mary Reed Bldg, Rm F19
2199 S. University Blvd
Denver, CO 80208
(O) 303-871-3538
(H) 710-475-1570
Email: fgibson@du.edu

Florida International University

Collaborating Researcher:
Dr. Virginia Chanley
Assistant Professor
Department of Political Science
Florida International University
Miami, FL 33199
Tel:(305)348-4066
Home tel: (305)969-0224 (btw. 8:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m)
Fax:(305)348-3765
Email: chanleyv@fiu.edu

University of Georgia

Collaborating Researcher:
Dr. Daniel Hope, III
Public Service Association
Community and Regional Development Division
University of Georgia
Treanor House
1234 S. Lumpkin Street
Athens, GA 30602-3552
Tel: (706) 542-3350
fax: (706) 542-6189
Email: dhopeiii@arches.uga

University of Iowa

Collaborating Researcher:
Ms. Patricia Bennett
Ford Foundation Crossing Borders Fellow
Iowa Fellow
Ph.D. Candidate, Department of Geography
316 Jessup Hall
University of Iowa
Iowa City, IA 52242
Email: patriciabennett@altavista.com

University of Kentucky

Collaborating Researcher:
Mr. Augustine Yao Quashigah
Ph.D. Candidate, College of Education,
Dept. of Curriculum and Instruction
Cooperstown
700 Woodland Ave. Apt. B-14
Lexington, KY 40508

Office: (606) 257-2410
Fax: (606) 257-1602
Home: (606) 323-2626
Email: yaquas0@pop.uky.edu

Rutgers University-Camden

Collaborating Researcher
Dr. Richard A. Harris
Department of Political Science
401 Cooper Street
Camden, NJ 08102
Tel.: (856) 225-6082, Ext. 24; (856) 225-6359
Fax: (856) 225-6085
Email: raharris@crab.rutgers.edu

San Francisco State University

Collaborating Researcher
Dr. Brian Murphy
San Francisco Urban Institute
San Francisco State University
1600 Holloway Ave., Diag C-15
San Francisco, CA 94132
Tel.: (415) 405-3602
Fax:
E-mail: bmurphy@sfsu.edu or Abeng1@aol.com

State University of New York at Buffalo

Collaborating Researcher
Mr. Jeff Kujawa
Assistant Director
Center for Urban Studies
State University of New York at Buffalo
101C Fargo
Building #1, Ellicott Complex
Buffalo, NY 14261-0014
Tel: (716) 645-2374
Email: jkujawa@acsu.buffalo.edu

Swarthmore College

Collaborating Researcher
Dr. Keith Reeves
Email: kreeves1@swarthmore.edu

Trinity College

Collaborating Researcher:

Dr. Daniel Lloyd

Professor of Philosophy

Trinity College

Hartford, CT 06106

Tel: (860) 297-2528

fax: (860) 297 5358

home: (860) 231 7446 (before 7:45 PM)

Email: dan.lloyd@mail.trincoll.edu

University of Texas-El Paso

Collaborating Researcher:

Dr. Irasema Coronado

Assistant Professor

Department of Political Science

University of Texas- El Paso

El Paso, Texas 79968

Telephone: (915) 747-7980 Fax (915) 747-5400

e-mail: icoronado@miners.utep.edu

home phone: (915) 544-8633

Wheaton College

Collaborating Researcher:

Dr. Ashley Woodiwiss

Department of Political Science

Wheaton College

Wheaton, IL 60187

Email: Ashley.Woodiwiss@wheaton.edu

Appendix IV Summary of the United States General Report³⁸

Universities as Sites of Citizenship and Civic Responsibility is an international research project based on the joint efforts of the Council of Europe and the International Consortium on Higher Education, Civic Responsibility and Democracy in the United States. The following U.S. higher educational associations represented on the U.S. Executive Committee of the Consortium: American Association for Higher Education, American Association of Colleges and Universities, American Council on Education, and Campus Compact. The Council of Europe's Committee on Higher Education and Research is the administrative and operational center of activity for the European research. The University of Pennsylvania is the organizational center for the United States' research as well as for the research project and International Consortium as a whole.

The research addresses the actual activities of institutions of higher education that support democratic values and practices; an assessment of their capabilities and dispositions to promote democracy; and dissemination of resources to improve the contributions of higher education to democracy on the campus, and to the local community, and society. This research project is a pilot study of students, faculty, and administration and their relationship to local government, schools, business, media, and civic groups and will serve as the basis for a subsequent large-scale study in Europe and the United States. It seeks to provide a basis for the analysis and formulation of recommendations, and distribution of materials and approaches that can be used by institutions of higher education to discuss and decide their responsibilities for civic education and democracy.

Overview of Findings

Because of the vast differences in size, demographic composition, financial basis and legal incorporation, each site report confirmed the idiosyncratic nature of civic engagement on each campus. A few global generalizations can be made regarding the following concepts and issues:

- Service-learning and community engagement: Many sites treated service learning initiatives as the primary means of providing education for democracy. Sites that were involved in service-learning initiatives seemed to have a greater number of collateral programs working in and with the community.
- Role of leadership: Leadership is critical to engagement. The President's role is especially important both in education for civic engagement and in actual university outreach efforts and community relations.

³⁸ The complete report is available at the website of the International Consortium for Higher Education, Civic Responsibility and Democracy, <http://iche.sas.upenn.edu/>

- **Organizational culture:** The traditions, customs and practice of governance often delimits the range of engagement by faculty and students in university governance. It can both inhibit or promote democratic processes.
- **Cynicism, apathy, and inefficacy:** Both faculty and students, even at sites with relatively well developed participatory mechanisms, were generally found to have high levels of cynicism and apathy about the extent of democratic decision making and their ability to influence the process.
- **Governance and participation:** There was a pervasive belief among both faculty and students that decision-making in universities was concentrated in the hands of an elite few. Consultative processes, anchored in an elaborate and multi-layered committee system, often function and are accepted as legitimate surrogates for direct democratic participation or representation in decision-making.
- **Community relations:** There is an important difference in terms of effectiveness and in the scope and penetration of community outreach initiatives depending on whether they were integrated into the institutional mission or relied upon the activities of university staff acting on their own initiative as individuals engaging the community.

Social and Political Context

One of the central themes of this project is that the mediating role colleges and universities play in working through these issues has been transformed. It is our conviction that the modern university is the key institution in contemporary society for the formulation and transference of stabilizing and legitimizing societal values, the development of the next generation of political elites, and for political socialization in support of democratic values and processes.

In the United States the preoccupations of scholars and those attuned to education policy is motivated by concerns that have as their objectives the development of widely accepted and practiced norms of democracy, a broadening of political participation, and a furthering of institutional safeguards of minority rights. There is a dominant belief and fear among various groups that a continuing steady decline in civic and political participation threatens the long-term stability and health of cherished democratic institutions and traditions. The litany of ailments attributed to American³⁹ democracy are many: widespread lack of interest in public affairs; ever-rising levels of political cynicism and consequent voter apathy; decline in political participation—not only in declining turnouts in elections, but in alternative methods of engaging political issues of the day; and a general deterioration in respect for the agents and agencies of government.

The Special Place of the University

³⁹ Here and throughout “American” refers to characteristics of citizens and institutions within the United States. It is a common colloquialism not intended to expropriate the identities of other hemispheric neighbors in the ‘Americas,’ and will be dropped should the pilot study be expanded to Canada or countries in Latin America.

The disengagement and decline among the general populace from democratic participation and a lack of an internalized sense of civic responsibility is especially marked among the young.⁴⁰ The declines in political participation noted above have occurred despite a modest increase during the last decade in civic education at the elementary and secondary levels.

The core belief of this project is that universities must assume a leading responsibility for research on and education for democracy on a global scale. Universities today are the venue for political participation in neighboring communities and wider society. Universities can provide the platform for a new social architecture that advances the related objectives of greater political participation, and the internalization of civic values. This is because universities build bridges internationally, serve as national gateways for the sharing and dissemination of knowledge, and influence society through the ideas and values shaped by the humanities and liberal arts. Universities have always been involved in the advancement of human civilization and in support of national priorities. They play an enlarged role in the expansion of economic activity through the development and provision of human capital and technological and scientific advances. Today democratic development is the primary challenge of society, yet most institutions of higher education have remained trapped by their own inertia of traditional practices in administration, teaching, and research.

The burgeoning demand for increased access to higher education places this institution at the center of societal change and political and economic development. It has become critical to the development of democratic values, greater political participation, and to the civil education of the young.

There is a growing concern that a continuing steady decline in civic and political participation threatens the long-term stability and health of cherished democratic institutions and traditions. The litany of ailments attributed to American⁴¹ democracy are many: widespread lack of interest in public affairs; ever-rising levels of political cynicism and consequent voter apathy; decline in political participation—not only in declining turnouts in elections, but in alternative methods of engaging political issues of the day; and a general deterioration in respect for the agents and agencies of government.

⁴⁰ Here, “college aged” students, including pre-freshmen and recent alumni. Early political socialization studies in the 1950s and 1960s focused on the influence of elementary and secondary education and other development aspects of pre- and adolescent youth. It was generally regarded that by the time students reached college, their political consciousness, represented by such things as party identification, and scores on political ideological scales, was determined. The presumption of this research project (and an unstated hypothesis) is that the phenomena of delayed adolescence, or what we prefer to call the deferral of adult responsibilities (independence, jobs, marriage, family responsibilities, etc.) has fundamentally altered previous generalizations about the political socialization of youth. Contemporary delays in the onset or achieving of political consciousness or identity underscores the salient role of the university today in shaping democratic attitudes and a sense of civic responsibility.

⁴¹ Here and throughout “American” refers to characteristics of citizens and institutions within the United States. It is a common colloquialism not intended to expropriate the identities of other hemispheric neighbors in the ‘Americas,’ and will be dropped should the pilot study be expanded to Canada or countries in Latin America.

Thomas Ehrlich has called attention to the impact these trends have had on American campuses, noting,

“political discussion has declined: Data from annual freshman surveys indicate that the percentage of college freshmen who report frequently discussing politics dropped from a high of 30 percent in 1968 to 15 percent in 1995. Similar decreases were seen in the percentages of those who believe it is important to keep up to date with the political affairs or who have worked on a political campaign.”⁴²

This research addresses one of the most pressing issues of our time--democratic political development and the creation of civil society. Declining levels of political participation in Europe and US is a widespread problem, and is particularly acute among the young. It may only be a slight exaggeration to say that the future of democracy is at stake. Colleges and universities are widely acknowledged as the central, strategic social institution in the 21st century. Colleges and universities, moreover, may be the core institution shaping the political socialization of young.

Highlights from the Study

- ◆ An important distinction and contrast needs to be made regarding formal practices of “shared governance,” and actual decision-making practices. Each institution exhibits a different organizational culture and tradition of custom and practice that shapes the actual exercise of authority at a particular institution.
- ◆ The extent to which the university community, particularly the faculty, perceive that they have some degree of input into decisions regarding resource allocation and financial support, there tend to be more favorable assessments of democratic participation and more benevolent assessment of boards and presidential authority. However, the one dimension of the issue of governance and democratic decision-making which had general agreement was that decision-making was generally concentrated in the hands of a few. In consequence, both faculty and students frequently questioned the extent to which decision-making is open and democratic. While university constituents believe in democratic decision-making, they generally agreed “that the university does not act like a democracy” due to too much hierarchy, bureaucracy and processes of exclusion (e.g., committees that only have recommendation power).
- ◆ One process issue that was of great concern at many of the sites was a perceived lack of transparency in governance processes. “Closed door” decision-making exacerbated the beliefs that faculty had no sense of ownership.
- ◆ It was noted above that civic engagement and participation in campus governance and political activities varied by discipline. The perceived challenge to engaging faculty

⁴² Ehrlich, Thomas, Civic Responsibility and Higher Education, Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education and The Oryx Press, 2000, p. xxii.

and students in the sciences, business and other technical areas needs further examination.

- ◆ Diverse perspectives concerning democracy and democratic ideals are important to creating an atmosphere and environment conducive to democratic practices and civic engagement. The conflict and competition among competing interests that can result from the ‘free expression’ of a “cacophony” of voices, demands greater attention for the development of democratic institutions and processes. Many of the individual site reports, raised important questions about realities of democratic practices and citizenship “that fall short of the ideal.”
- ◆ Religiously-affiliated or sectarian colleges compounded the dilemmas of participation and democratic decision-making because of the mandates and traditional obligations imposed on the usual governance structure of the university.
- ◆ Mission statements frequently made references to preparing students for “full participation” in global society or to fostering respect for differences among people in order to produce “an enlightened and informed citizenry.” Democratic values and civic engagement are often considered implicit to the university’s mission, even to the point where explicit reference to them seemed obvious or superfluous.
- ◆ Many institutions have made provisions for the formal representation of students on academic senate, university disciplinary and student life committees. Nearly all student associations that manage student clubs, organizations and various aspects of student life have budgets and programs governed by a student-elected leadership. However, though students are frequently represented (occasionally with voting rights) on many university committees, a solid majority feel underrepresented. Foreign students feel even more underrepresented.
- ◆ Students do not see how civic responsibility relates to their immediate lives. On a more optimistic note, students do tend to be more animated by issues within the university as opposed to the outside world. The explanation for this may be that students have many more channels for participation as “citizens of the university community.”
- ◆ One theme that seems to come through in many of the reports is an overall assessment that students on many campuses are “comfortable” and that this comfort is perhaps a source of complacency. In such case, they do not take full advantage of the opportunities afforded them for greater participation and involvement in governance.
- ◆ Many campuses reported tensions in their relations with the local community. In addition to the usual “town and gown” problems, relations often are exacerbated by racial differences for institutions in urban settings. Some of the most contentious issues had to do with housing, land development issues and student behavior off-campus.

- ◆ Service learning has been mentioned as one of the primary means of facilitating student engagement in the community. Several institutions also reported the central role internships can play in student participation in community work and life.
- ◆ Nearly all the sites in this study reported what one researcher called, “moments of agreement” between all constituent groups in the university on issues of civic engagement, democratic practices, and education for democracy and civic engagement. These represent a consensus on principles of free speech, the potential of the university to effect social transformation, and valuing democratic decision-making. Free speech is the most commonly expressed value in this regard, especially as linked as it is to intellectual and academic freedom.
- ◆ There is general agreement that the university can and should serve as an agent of social transformation.
- ◆ While university constituents believe in democratic decision-making, they generally agreed “that the university does not act like a democracy” due to too much hierarchy, bureaucracy and processes of exclusion (e.g., committees that only have recommendation power).

Emergent Questions for Subsequent Research

Who drives these issues and sets the democratic and civic engagement agenda on campus? Does university administration take proper account of external forces? Does proactive leadership correlate with the degree of ‘activeness,’ commitment, and effectiveness of engagement on a particular campus?

Does like-mindedness among students or faculty induce complacency? In homogeneous environments in this study the absence of democratic processes was not seen as problematic. In relatively secure settings where the surrounding community is not impinging upon the institutions or impacting it in terms of crime, poverty, lack of infrastructure, there is less incentive to develop community relations through civic engagement and civics education?

Should we distinguish between the nature and type of activities present on campus? Have we sufficiently questioned our assumptions about the relationship between democratic education (democratic pedagogy), education for democracy (democracy education), service-learning, civic engagement and civic education and education for civil society?

Are programs and activities in civic education and engagement institutionalized? Is there ‘alignment’ between university commitments and plans and the administration and execution of them? I.e., do rewards, promotion and standards of accountability reflect espoused commitments for civic engagement and democracy education?

Do formal roles and programs produce the desired result? Does actual practice correspond with espoused goals and objectives and articulation of policy? In many cases the perception of the university's engagement and activities differed from the reality. This may suggest that in these instances a better job needs to be done in communicating and promoting these activities (perhaps with the consequent result that more faculty and students would become involved in the community).

Has service learning and promotion of civic engagement through alternative activities become coterminous with the teaching of democracy and democratic processes? A couple of sites reported a clear correlation between service learning and engagement in campus politics, but the causal relationship is unclear. Could it be that the same students who would be predisposed to participate in campus governance are also the ones most pre-disposed to take part in service learning courses? Are institutions more democratic or more successful in teaching democratic values because they have highly developed service-learning and civic engagement programs or do they have these programs because they are more democratic in the first place?

Are programs for democratic and civic education being institutionalized? Advocates for the civic engagement agenda view the issue primarily as a problem of overcoming the narrowness of focus, excessive specialization, and pre-professionalism that characterizes so much of the curriculum. Universities must decide how they can resolve the apparent contradictions between competing educational goals within the constraints of time, available resources, and certification needs that drive student demand for particular training and degree programs.

Has "consultation" taken precedence over actual or more direct participation in decision-making? Many of the sites reported similar consultative roles for faculty and students in the multi-layered governance structures and processes of the institution. Where there has been a history of struggle and contentiousness over the prerogatives of faculty and students or a dispute over due process, the resulting "democratic expectation" is that consultation and recommendations from stakeholders and members of the university community will be solicited from decision-makers regardless of their legal authority to act autonomously. Campuses that have a "legitimization of authority" as a result of such consultative processes and traditions appear to be seen as more democratic and more civically engaged.

It is not possible to generalize about whether there is a private – public distinction in terms of democratic practices. Some private colleges and universities are very democratic and others are characterized by autocratic decision-making. Likewise with public institutions, where state control imposes special constraints.

It is apparent that *leadership matters*. Clearly one follow-up to this study would be to focus on the role of the college and university president as a determining factor in the development and success of civic education and engagement programs.

Appendix V

U.S. Data Available for Public Access

Aggregate data from the United States is available to the public via the International Consortium for Higher Education and Civic Responsibility internet web site: (<http://iche.sas.upenn.edu>). Summary statistics for aggregate faculty and student surveys can be viewed in a PDF document. The data is also available for download in Microsoft Excel format. Each file includes the mean value, standard deviation and number of responses for each variable for the entire body of faculty or student data. In addition, each file includes the mean values, standard deviation, and number of aggregate responses per variable, with t-values and p-values, for each participating American institution. Faculty and student codebooks are posted for use in deciphering the data.

Additional data and other documentary materials used by collaborating researchers at each site are available on request, including: newly generated data, frequency distributions for European institutions and factor analysis for both U.S. and European sites.

Appendix VI

Materials Used: U.S. Site Reports

Selected Materials

Site	Administration and Student Government	Curriculum	Institutes and Activities	Community Relations
Catholic University	Faculty Handbook Student Handbook	N/A	N/A	N/A
Clark-Atlanta University	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Florida International University	Mission Statement Conduct and Policies College of Urban and Public Affairs Diversity Update Faculty Senate	Course catalog Educational Leadership and Policies Studies	Center for Leadership Development and Civic Responsibility <i>SUS Advocate</i> FIU Radio/TV	The Beacon Council “Dialogue on the Economic Status of Miami-Dade County” Volunteer Action Center
San Francisco State University	Administrative statement Faculty Constitution Academic Senate By-Laws Student disciplinary procedures Student Government	Course catalog Service-Learning Curriculum Awards Addresses on service learning	San Francisco Urban Institute California Campus Compact America Reads <i>First Monday</i>	Community Responsibility Planning Group “Memorandum of Understanding between San Francisco Housing Authority and SFSU”
State University of New Jersey Rutgers at Camden	N/A	Course catalog	Center for State Constitutional Studies Walter Rand Institute for Public Affairs Housing Scholars Program	“50 Years of Community Building” Center for Strategic Urban Community Leadership School-to-Work Partnership LEAP Charter School
State University of New York at Buffalo	Mission Review Faculty Senate Professional Staff Senate Graduate Student Association Student	Course catalog	<i>Reporter</i> <i>The Spectrum</i> <i>The Independent Observer</i> <i>Visions</i> WBFO Radio	N/A

	Government			
Trinity College	Student Handbook "Strategic Directions, Strategic Imperatives" "Stepping Down from the Ivory Tower"	Course catalog Civil Society in Moscow Study Abroad Program	<i>Trinity Reporter</i>	"Strengthening a Neighborhood from Within" Civic Engagement Series Trinfo Internet Café Learning Corridor

Site	Administration and Student Government	Curriculum	Institutes and Activities	Community Relations
University of Denver	Administrative statement Faculty Senate Staff Advisory Board Honor Code	Course catalog List courses that address civics, etc. Center for Service Learning	Center for Public Policy and Contemporary Affairs Office of Multicultural Affairs Carl M. Williams Institute for Ethics and Values	The Bridge Project VIP Partnership Community Action Program
University of Georgia	Administrative statement "Joint Statement on the Rights and Freedoms of Students" Good Practices Student Government	Course catalog Intro to Political Theory Syllabus College Multicultural Requirement	International Center for Democratic Governance UGA LEADS <i>Columns Red and Black</i>	Center for Continuing Education Outreach Services Student Leadership and Service to the Community Public Service Mission Community Interviews
University of Iowa	Faculty Senate Graduate Student Senate Staff Council COGS Union Student	Course catalog Introduction to Leadership Syllabus	Students Against Sweatshops Small Business Development	Volunteering in Iowa City University Hospitals Community Interviews

	Government		Center	ICAN: Iowa Citizen Action Network
University of Kentucky	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
University of Pennsylvania	Office of the President Faculty Senate Penn Professional Staff Assembly	Course catalog g Service-learning courses Washington Semester Program	Penn National Commission <u>Daily Pennsylvanian</u> <i>Penn Current</i>	Center for Community Partnerships “Our Commitment to West Philadelphia” Civic House Penn Faculty and Staff for Neighborhood Issues
University of Texas at El Paso	Administrative statement Administrative information	Course catalog	N/A	El Paso Collaborative for Educational Excellence Community Interviews
Wheaton College	Administrative Statement Faculty Committee Minutes College Statement of Faith	Course Catalog Off-Campus Programs	Billy Graham Center Center for Applied Christian Ethics <i>The Record</i>	N/A