Canadian Society for the Study of Higher Education

La Société canadienne pour l'étude de l'enseignement supérieur

Professional File

July 2005, Number 26
juillet 2005, numéro 26

The Mission of the University

Professor George Fallis

Department of Economics and Division of Social Science
York University
Toronto Canada

PROLOGUE

"In the Ontario Budget 2004, the government said that in order to build a high-skill, high-wage economy, Ontario requires higher learning that is second to none. To assist in reaching that goal, the Postsecondary Review was announced."[1]

The Postsecondary Review is chaired by Bob Rae, former premier of the Province of Ontario. The Review is to provide recommendations on the design of a publicly-funded system of postsecondary education, on model(s) for funding that system, and on an accountability and performance measurement framework that supports the design and funding recommendations. In September 2004, the Review released a Discussion Paper. The Discussion Paper is organized into six themes: the importance of higher education, accessibility, quality, system design, funding, and accountability. Bob Rae, in his message accompanying the Discussion Paper, asks: "Please share your own research and views—this is an essential part of making reasoned recommendations." This essay responds to that request. It builds upon my own research and draws heavily upon a book manuscript: *Universities, Ideas and Democracy*.

The Discussion Paper recognizes that Ontario's system of postsecondary education has two distinct components: universities and colleges of applied arts and technology. However, there is almost no analysis of their separate missions; virtually all of the discussion deals with higher education as an undifferentiated whole. This essay separates the two components and addresses the mission of the university. Any design for a system of postsecondary education in Ontario must be based upon a clear articulation of the mission of the university (and of course, also upon a clear articulation of the mission of the colleges). Furthermore, it is only with a clear articulation of mission that an appropriate accountability framework can be established for universities. It is hoped, therefore, that this essay can contribute to deliberations about system design and accountability.

George Fallis is a professor and former Dean of the Faculty of Arts at York University. This essay is based upon and excerpted from a book manuscript: Universities, Ideas and Democracy. *The essay was written for submission to the Postsecondary Review: Higher Expectations for Higher Education, established by the Government of Ontario.*

The mission of the university requires a special form of governance. Universities are autonomous institutions, whose professors have academic freedom in their teaching and research, and which in academic matters operate in a system of collegial self-governance. The mission and the governance are inseparable. The one requires the other. This brings a deep tension. Universities receive public money and a fundamental principle of democracy is that elected representatives be accountable for the use of public funds. Any design of a system of higher education, or accountability framework for universities, must build upon this complex reality.

The Discussion Paper briefly notes the many purposes and benefits of higher education. But almost all of the discussion and analysis is focused upon the economic benefits. These economic benefits are undeniable and important—but not the whole story. This essay offers a more comprehensive picture of the purposes and benefits of universities, and so offers a richer perspective on the importance of higher education.

The mission of the university must be determined in each age, responding to the nature and needs of the society which supports the university. We live in a post-industrial society. The mission of the university in such a knowledge-based society is well-recognized. We also live in a democracy—a democracy of a particular form and with particular needs at the beginning of the twenty-first century. What is less recognized is that universities have become fundamental institutions of our democracy. This democratic mission must be articulated—and universities held accountable for its achievement.

The university is only as strong as public understanding of what universities are for and public willingness to support their mission. Informed reflection and a vigorous civic conversation are required as we redesign our system of postsecondary education. The conversation includes dozens of voices, the words of writers past and present who have thought about universities.[2] We discover and listen to these voices because they are insightful and because this is the beginning of learning and the beginning of conversation.

Introduction

Clark Kerr in his book, *The Uses of the University*, has famously written: "About eighty-five institutions in the Western world established by 1520 still exist in recognizable forms, with similar functions and unbroken histories, including the Catholic church, the Parliaments of the Isle of Man, of Iceland, and of Great Britain, several Swiss cantons, and seventy universities. Kings that rule, feudal lords with vassals, and guilds with monopolies are all gone. These seventy universities, however, are still in the same locations with some of the same buildings, with professors and students doing much the same things, and with governance carried on in much the same ways."[3]

One interpretation of this extraordinary fact would be that universities are isolated, conservative institutions—ivory towers—which have persisted in their sixteenth century ways despite the industrial revolution, the transition to liberal democratic government, and the creation of the postwar welfare state. A corollary conclusion might be that eventually, likely very soon, this inflexible institution will be so out of sync with society that it will be washed away or restructured out of all recognition. Another interpretation would be that the tasks of the university, the tasks of teaching and learning, are the same today as they were in 1520 and, therefore, professors and students could and should be doing much the same things and going about their business in much the same ways. A corollary conclusion might be that, because teaching and learning will always be needed, universities will dominate the list, compiled one hundred years from now, of institutions with similar functions and unbroken histories.

Neither interpretation is entirely correct. Universities have not been ivory towers; throughout history they have been remarkably attentive to the needs of the society which supported them. They have evolved and taken on new tasks as society required, particularly in the last 50 years when they accommodated mass university education, established and expanded professional schools, and became research institutions in service of the nation. Nevertheless, they have always had core tasks and core ideals which persist and allow us to recognize them as universities, despite their transformation. Universities are committed to knowledge for its own sake, to the liberal education of undergraduates, and to disinterested free inquiry. They are autonomous institutions, independent of the state; yet paradoxically, they undertake vital tasks for the state which place them at the heart of society. The university is supported financially by governments. It is also financially supported by tuition fees, grants and contracts for research, and by private donations. The university and society are parties to a social contract. In each era, this social contract must be adapted and renegotiated.

Here at the beginning of the twenty-first century, we are renegotiating the social contract between universities and the society which supports them. What should be the mission of the university? What are the essential characteristics of our age and how should the university adapt to them? What should be the balance between the traditional mission of the university and the changes required of our age?

It is widely recognized that, in post-industrial society, the university is important to our economy, to our health care, and to our culture. This essay argues that the nature of democracy in our age must also be addressed and that universities have a special democratic mission. Universities have become institutions of democracy, alongside political parties, parliaments, and a free press. Universities have a vital role in democratic life with special obligations regarding accessibility and inclusion, for providing a liberal undergraduate education for citizenship, and for educating the self-regulating professions. University professors have special obligations as critics and conscience of society and to be public intellectuals. This democratic mission must be articulated. Given this mission, universities must be accountable for their contributions to democratic life.

Today, even as their responsibilities increase and even as universities are recognized as crucial institutions, public support diminishes, criticisms mount, and misunderstanding persists. The real value of government support per student declines. Senior civil servants see the university as recalcitrant and unresponsive to new realities and government priorities. Critics claim that professors neglect undergraduate teaching in favour of their own research and that knowledge has become fragmented and esoteric, unconnected to the needs of students or society. Many parents understand the university simply as a place where students go to prepare for a job and demand this be the focus of instruction. There is a loss of confidence within the university, as well, which pervades the writing about universities by professors.[4] Parties to the social contract are frustrated, believing others do not understand and have violated fundamental tenets of the social contract.

The university is buffeted today, as it has been many times in history. Old values are challenged, seem uncertain, and may disappear. Reflecting on 10 years as President of the University of Michigan, James Duderstadt observes: "The most predictable feature of modern society is its unpredictability. We no longer believe that tomorrow will look much like today. Universities must find ways to sustain the most cherished aspects of their core values, while discovering new ways to respond vigorously to the opportunities of a rapidly changing world. This is the principal challenge to higher education as we enter a new century."[5]

The university is only as strong as the social contract which sustains it. Informed reflection and a vigorous civic conversation are required as we renew the social contract in our age. This essay wants to provoke and contribute to this informed reflection and civic conversation.

Origins and Antecedents

The modern university is an amalgam of universities past. Its mission today is a combination of many missions. This history is our heritage. It has given us the core values which we must retain, even as we adjust to our age.

The first universities were medieval institutions, established in the thirteenth century. These early universities sometimes emphasized one field, acquiring a continental reputation. Three great prototypes were Salerno, known for medicine; Bologna known for law; and Paris for theology. Across the century, universities proliferated. New faculties were added and gradually a "typical" structure emerged with four faculties: arts, law, medicine, and theology. Study in the arts faculty was preparatory to study in the latter three which were regarded as the higher faculties.

Thus, these first universities had two components, two missions: liberal education and professional education. These are with us still.

And these medieval universities contained an irreconcilable conflict, which is also still with us: the university must provide knowledge for its own sake, particularly through the liberal arts, but also knowledge to meet the economic needs of society, in the medieval era through the professions. Although we often forget, from the very outset, universities connected academic study and career.

Our ideas about a liberal education are as old as the Greeks and Romans, and because its history reaches back into the variegated thought of antiquity, the idea of liberal education has taken many forms. Its history has not been linear, but discontinuous, marked by adaptations to each age and often inconsistent elements combined together. It is a task of every age, and every university, to reflect upon what it means to be liberally educated in our age. In this history of liberal education, several themes stand out which should be emphasized for our age.

The first theme is that a liberal education values knowledge for its own sake. Cardinal John Henry Newman, author of *The Idea of a University*, the most influential book ever written about universities in the English language, defined the university as a place of teaching, a place of liberal education. He writes: "Knowledge is capable of being its own end. Such is the constitution of the human mind, that any kind of knowledge, if it be really such, is its own reward." A liberal education is the "process of training, by which the intellect, instead of being formed or sacrificed to some particular or accidental purpose, some specific trade or profession, or study or science, is disciplined for its own sake, for the perception of its own proper object, and for its own highest culture." If a "practical end must be

assigned to a University course, I say it is that of training good members of society. It is the art of social life, and its end is fitness for the world."[6]

The second theme is that a liberal education should be a broad education, rather than focused upon a single discipline. Again, we can turn to Newman. He recognized that students could not study every subject; but he also believed that a university must be a place of great breadth, where traditions of thought learn "to respect, to consult and to aid each other. Thus is created a pure atmosphere of thought, which the student also breathes, although in his own case he only pursues a few sciences from among the multitude." At such a place a student "apprehends the great outlines of knowledge, the principles on which it rests, the scale of its parts, its lights and its shades, its great points and its little, as he otherwise cannot comprehend them. Hence it is that his education is 'Liberal.'"[7]

The third theme is that a liberal education creates a free and autonomous individual, free from *a priori* strictures. One can only be free and fully human if one has subjected all of one's convictions to the scrutiny of reason; a sentiment captured in Socrates' declaration that the unexamined life is not worth living. Also, a liberal education is an education for citizenship. During the nineteenth century, and certainly this would have been Newman's view, liberal education was for a small elite who would be leaders. However into the twentieth century, we have returned to the Greek and Roman traditions of liberal education for citizenship.[8]

For Newman, the university was a place of *teaching*, of undergraduate education. His ideal was Oxford of the early nineteenth century. He has surprisingly little to say about research, about the discovery of new knowledge. Research is so much a part of a modern university professor's work, and so much the focus of public policy toward universities, that we might think the discovery of new knowledge had always been a raison d'etre for universities. But this is not the case. Certainly Newman believed otherwise. His university was for *teaching* and for students, not for *research*. He believed the search for new knowledge was better done outside the university, in literary and scientific academies. We look elsewhere to discover the origin of the research mission of the university—to Germany also in the nineteenth century. Here we find another mission of a university, the idea of a university devoted to research. The University of Berlin, founded in 1809, is the archetype and has been called the first modern university. At Berlin, both *teaching* and *research* became primary duties of professors.

The nineteenth century German universities were shaped by Enlightenment philosophy, especially the writings of Immanuel Kant. Knowledge is the result of scientific inquiry. The university is a place of scientific inquiry; scientific inquiry is governed by reason. The university should be dominated by reason and free inquiry, and not by the needs of the professions.

In an Enlightenment university, professors would not be generalists responsible for teaching diverse aspects of the curriculum; instead there should be a division of labour into the fields of knowledge. Professors teach and examine in their own field. There is a perpetual conflict between tradition (established knowledge) and rational inquiry; each discipline advances by re-examining its established knowledge under the light of reason. Knowledge progresses through this perpetual conflict between reason and tradition. This dialectic requires that professors be free to study and to teach according to the dictates of their curiosity and their application of reason. This ideal of free inquiry has profoundly influenced the modern university. Knowledge will be most effectively advanced when professors are free to use their reason to confront established knowledge.

The University of Berlin was organized and administered around disciplinary specialization. It greatly enhanced the rigour of research and allowed new professorships and disciplines to be added as knowledge advanced and expanded. German universities led the world in introducing science and engineering into universities. The professor, an accomplished leader in their chosen discipline, worked with students who had chosen this discipline. Pedagogical methods were designed to simultaneously create new knowledge and fully-realized individuals. Lectures, rather than tutorials, became the mode of instruction. In lectures, professors were not simply to offer explications of existing knowledge, but also critiques, and to discuss recent advances in knowledge. The curriculum emphasized, and examinations rewarded, both original thought and the understanding of basic philosophical principles. Research and teaching were inseparable.

The German universities were also places of advanced study, where the next generation of professors and researchers could learn and develop. Here we see graduate education as a mission of the university.

The German university was also to serve the project of building a modern German nation. The university must prepare lawyers, civil administrators, doctors, and scientists; and enhance the knowledge which each could apply. And the German universities prospered as the modern German nation state was created during the industrial boom of the later nineteenth century. But nonetheless, the German universities had to be autonomous. In the dynamic application of reason which

produced new knowledge, only scholars could judge the work of students and other scholars. The German universities created a rationale for government support of universities coupled with university autonomy—another defining characteristic of the modern university.

The combination of ideas and structures represented by the University of Berlin has been enormously influential in the evolution of universities of Canada and around the world. By the late nineteenth century, Berlin and other German universities had become world-leading centers of scientific research—much admired and much emulated.

The present high renown of Oxford, its long history and frequent appearance in famous English lives, might seem to imply an equally long history of intellectual leadership—if not across Europe, at least in the British Isles. However, Oxford (and Cambridge) suffered a long period of decline during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, not truly recovering until the later nineteenth century. The curriculum remained steadfast in its medieval conception, resisting the introduction of the new knowledge in science, technology, and medicine. Most English leaders of Enlightenment and scientific thought worked outside these established universities—their new learning was not welcome there—and found homes in new scientific societies such as the Royal Society of Arts, founded in 1754 for "the encouragement of the arts, manufactures, and commerce" in Great Britain.

Real dynamism and academic leadership in this period were found in the Scottish universities, leadership which predates and presages the University of Berlin. The Scottish universities provide another model, another idea, of a university. We hear far less of the University of Edinburgh than we hear of Oxford or Berlin, despite the Scottish universities being internationally acknowledged centers of knowledge. Perhaps this is because institutions of the periphery will always be less regarded than institutions of the centre.

The Scottish universities, unlike Oxford and Cambridge, always had close associations with government, often the town council, and with the broader society. The Scottish Reformation, especially the writings of John Knox, emphasized universal public education. The Scottish universities were part of an educational tradition which sought to reach all classes of society. Accessibility was the virtue, not gentlemanly manners. Scotland shows us the university as a public institution of opportunity and social mobility.

The Scottish universities, long before Oxford or Berlin, opened themselves to scientific learning. They welcomed their connection to the "arts, manufactures, and commerce." Following the Dutch example, Scottish universities established new chairs in natural philosophy (physical science) and moral philosophy, from which came the field of political economy and, later, the social sciences such as economics, political science, and psychology. Specialist chairs were appointed within the traditional fields of mathematics, astronomy, and medicine (notably chairs in biology and chemistry). Pedagogy was reformed. Laboratory demonstrations became part of the curriculum in science and medicine. The Scottish universities became world leaders in medical education.

These ideas and accomplishments of Scottish universities were recognized widely, particularly for their commitment to serving society and to curricular and pedagogical reform. Accessible, reformist, and socially engaged, Scottish universities were also admired for their contributions to Scotland's robust industrialization and "national" development. Wherever industrialization and nation building were interconnected national priorities, as in Canada, the Scottish model was influential. As medieval universities responded to the social and economic needs of their time, so, too, did Scottish universities in the eighteenth century, offering avenues of opportunity to the growing middle class and advancing knowledge in science and technology to propel the process of industrialization. Although seldom given the acknowledgment deserved, the Scottish universities provided much of the model for today's universities.

Another influential model for universities in Canada was the land grant movement in the United States. Under the Morrill Act of 1862, the U.S. federal government provided land to the states for new universities. These new state-owned universities would serve regional interests for social and economic development, by offering educational opportunities to the children of farmers and industrial workers, as well as of the middle class, and by offering degree programs in applied fields such as agriculture, business, engineering, and home economics. Extension programs in agriculture often were offered across the state. One of the most famous land grant universities is the University of Wisconsin. The land grant movement may be uniquely American, but the motivations are shared in many nations. Many land grant universities soon added liberal arts faculties, so that these American universities came to combine the mission of the liberal undergraduate education and the land grant mission.

In Canada, the universities were given the additional task of nurturing a national culture and creating a national identity. A.B. McKillop concludes his encyclopaedic *Matters of Mind: The University in Ontario 1791–1957* by

examining the 1951 report of the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences—the Massey Commission—a national commission to chart the future of postwar Canada. The Order in Council creating and charging the Commission begins: "It is desirable that the Canadian people know as much as possible about their country, its history and traditions; and about their national life and common achievements."[9]

McKillop writes: "The commissioners concluded that the universities were essential to the nation's future as never before. They were the 'nurseries of a truly Canadian civilization and culture.'… 'All civilized societies,' the commissioner's report asserted, 'strive for a common good, including not only material but intellectual and moral elements.'"[10]

The Mission of the University

Universities in Canada developed out of these origins and antecedents: the Oxford ideal of liberal undergraduate education, the (medieval) tradition of professional schools, the Berlin model of research and graduate education, the Scottish model of accessibility and social service (along with the similar land grant model), and the Massey conception of nation-building and national culture. These are the many missions and tasks of the university today.

During the nineteenth century, Canadian universities were small, attended only by the elite, and were not central institutions of society. But, a great transformation began in the twentieth century with industrialization, urbanization, and the gradual democratization of society. Universities grew, were attended by students from wider backgrounds, and moved toward the center of society.

The university system, as we know it today, was put in place during the thirty years after World War Two as a response to profound changes in our society. It was a response to the growing importance of ideas and organized research in economic and social growth. It was a response to the increasing professionalization of occupations. It was a response to the expanding role of government and the democratization of society. Existing universities grew and new universities were formed, especially during the 1960s and 70s to meet the increasing demand for university education from the baby-boom generation. The expansion was underwritten by government commitments to mass higher education and to university research; and was made possible by robust and sustained economic growth.

Not every university has all of these missions. Some focus on undergraduate education. Others add some graduate education and some professional education. And still others have become great conglomerates, with a range of professional schools and doctoral programs, and are marked by a particularly intense commitment to graduate education and research. Those in this last group have been labelled "multiversities" or "research universities."

But all universities have certain similarities. It is the mission of all universities to provide liberal education for undergraduates, to conduct research, and to contribute to society including the economy and culture. It is the responsibility of all professors to teach, to conduct research, and to provide service to their university and to society. Professors (and their universities) only differ in balance among these activities. It is a characteristic of universities that they offer breadth of study, across many disciplines.

As we renew the social contract between universities and the society which supports them, it is important that we understand and reflect upon these various missions. And we must recognize that these missions are not always compatible, indeed are often in conflict. Also, this reflection will help to distinguish the mission of the university from the mission of other institutions of higher education, in Ontario known as colleges of applied arts and technology or community colleges.

a) Undergraduate Liberal Education

Unquestionably, the central task of the university is undergraduate education. This is true whether the university is "primarily undergraduate" or a "research university." In 2001, Ontario universities awarded about 55,000 undergraduate degrees, 9,700 master's degrees, and 1,400 doctorates—83 percent of all degrees are at the undergraduate level.

Universities offer both undergraduate education in the liberal arts and in the professional fields, but these missions are distinct. The liberal arts are defined here as the humanities, fine arts, social sciences, and physical and biological sciences. Professional education is in fields such as engineering, law, medicine, or education. In this subsection, the focus is liberal education.

Undergraduate degree programs are a minimum of three years, with many four years, in duration. In the liberal arts, the focus of most students' degree programs is the study of one (or perhaps two) disciplines—a student specializes, for example, in history, or biology, or psychology. The student specializes to acquire a deep and thorough knowledge of one discipline. There is much less emphasis on breadth than in years past. Nonetheless, liberal undergraduate education remains committed to knowledge for its own sake, to some breadth of knowledge and exploration of the interconnections across branches of knowledge, and to education for autonomy and citizenship. This education is

theoretical in orientation. Although extraordinarily useful in preparation for employment and most students proceed from their degree to a job, it is not primarily designed to be preparation for employment. An undergraduate education at a university is a prerequisite to graduate education and to university study in many professions, for example law and medicine.

In contrast, higher education at a community college has an applied rather than theoretical orientation, is designed as preparation for employment in a specific field, and is offered in programs of study which last one or two years. Community college diplomas do not provide the prerequisites for graduate education or professional study.[11]

Many modern authors have articulated the purposes of a liberal education; a notable recent example is Paul Axelrod in his *Values in Conflict: The University, the Marketplace, and the Trials of Liberal Education*. For Axelrod, a liberal education is intended "to cultivate intellectual creativity, autonomy, and resilience; critical thinking; a combination of intellectual breadth and specialized knowledge; the comprehension and tolerance of diverse ideas; informed participation in community life; and effective communications skills."[12]

Frank Rhodes, former president of Cornell University, emphasizes that undergraduate education is the central mission of all universities, even the research universities like Cornell. "I believe it is time to state clearly and firmly that, while research and teaching both contribute to the strength and vitality of the U.S. research university, it is undergraduate teaching, and learning, that is the central task. Undergraduate education is fundamental to the existence of the university: it occupies more time, involves more people, consumes more resources, requires more facilities, and generates more revenue than any other activity. …It is through undergraduate education that the public encounters the university most directly, and it is on undergraduate education that the health of the research university will stand or fall."[13]

Frank Rhodes outlined his conception of the purposes of an undergraduate education. "I believe the purpose of an undergraduate education is to develop a person of judgement, discernment, and balance, with professional competence in one specific area." An undergraduate education should develop: "the ability to listen, read, and analyse with comprehension and to write and speak with precision and clarity in the expression of disciplined thought; the ability to reason effectively in quantitative and formal terms; the ability to engage people of different cultural perspectives; the appreciation of the modes of thought and expression of the natural sciences, the social sciences, the humanities and the arts; some sensitivity toward the ideas, values, and goals that have shaped society and some sense of the moral implications of actions and ideas; skill in one chosen area of knowledge, with an understanding of its assumptions, foundations, relationships and implications; [and should include] some active participation in the life of the campus community."[14]

Each of us might articulate the purposes of an undergraduate education differently and with different emphases. Many in Ontario would place more emphasis on the value of tolerance and the need to develop a multi-cultural and global perspective, because of the nature of our world and the nature of Ontario today. Nonetheless, virtually all would be some alternative articulation of what it means to be *liberally educated* in our age and would recognize that the primary purpose was not to prepare for a job—although this most certainly is part of the purpose.

Any sensible system of accountability must, therefore, address whether undergraduate education is fulfilling its many purposes, including but not limited to preparation for the labour market.[15]

b) Research

The second great task of the university is research. This role for universities is relatively recent, being adopted in Canada only in the twentieth century. Our older universities all began as undergraduate colleges focussed on teaching; research and graduate education were added later. Tom Pocklington and Allan Tupper, in their chapter "The Canadian University: From College to Knowledge Factory" write: "The nineteenth-century German university established two significant new ideas in higher education: that professors were researchers, and that advanced scientific research was central to a great university. In the United States, a radical departure occurred with the creation of the Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore. Johns Hopkins was an American replica of the University of Berlin that was dedicated to scientific and medical research and graduate studies. Early in the twentieth century, the philosophy of Johns Hopkins University made its presence known at the University of Toronto and McGill. While heavily contested in Canada, the German model grew in prestige, especially among the university-based scientists, who began to define research as their mission."[16]

The involvement of Canadian governments with research began with the establishment of the National Research Council (NRC) in 1916. The government's strategy at this time was to support research in this national institution, rather than in universities. The NRC offered

advice to government on science and technology, funded fellowships at Canadian universities, and conducted its own research, principally industrial and applied research. During the Second World War, the NRC expanded significantly, working on diverse projects from weapons and synthetic fuels, to food packaging and medicines. After the war, it began to support universities more extensively and established the principle that its external grants would match its internal budget. Gradually however, the strategy of the government shifted toward supporting research at universities, rather than in special-purpose national institutions. The Medical Research Council (MRC) was founded in 1966, and the National Science and Engineering Research Council (NSERC) was formed in 1978, both functions had previously existed as committees of the National Research Council. The Canada Council for the Arts Humanities and Social Sciences was established in 1957, following the recommendations of the Massey Commission. In 1978, the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) was spun off as a separate entity.[17] Throughout this evolution, the emphasis shifted to supporting university and hospital-based research.

The adoption of the research mission has profound implications for the university. The research mission and the emphasis on finding new knowledge, although not the sole cause, brings specialization. The university becomes organized by department (by academic discipline). The responsibility of professors is not just to teach, but both to teach and to conduct research. This becomes a distinguishing characteristic of universities and university-level instruction: professors are up-to-date and active scholars in the areas where they teach. In contrast, in the community college, there is no presumption that instructors are active scholars, indeed the preference is for those who have practical experience in their area of expertise.

These implications of the research mission bring tensions; most obviously that the commitment to research may lead professors to give too little time and attention to undergraduate teaching. Good undergraduate teaching becomes undervalued: we often hear that professors must publish or perish, …but, we never hear that they must teach well or perish. Also the emphasis on discovery and the accompanying specialization mean that knowledge becomes ever more fragmented. The synthesis and reflection which should be part of liberal education can be pushed aside.[18]

The research mission connects the university and society in a fundamentally new way. New knowledge is useful to society and, therefore, society financially supports the research. The new knowledge has been most evidently useful in the agricultural economy, in the industrial economy, and to health care (and, particularly in the United States, to the military). And therefore, most research support has gone to agriculture, science, engineering, and medicine. There has been rather less support for the social sciences, humanities, and fine arts—a source of constant tension within the university.

Although society supports the research because of its ultimate usefulness, most professors believe deeply that basic research is the fundamental wellspring of new knowledge (and the eventual wellspring of application), and that academic curiosity is the fundamental driver of basic research. Therefore, society should support basic research within the university and let academic merit direct the research funds. Not surprisingly, society often wants the research to be more concerned with immediate application and also wants to have a say in directing the research funds.

The research mission also makes the university an international institution; its researchers join the international community of scholars. A contribution to new knowledge can come from anywhere; and new knowledge should be shared everywhere. This international orientation also brings competition: today's research universities compete with other research universities across the world to hire the best faculty and to attract the best graduate students. In contrast, the mission of community colleges is—as their name reveals—to focus upon their local community and its labour market.

Writing in 1963 about the university, Clark Kerr wrote: "The basic reality, for the university, is the widespread recognition that new knowledge is the most important factor in economic and social growth. We are just now perceiving that the university's invisible product, knowledge, may be the most powerful single element in our culture, affecting the rise and fall of professions and even of social classes, of regions and even of nations."

"Because of this fundamental reality, the university is being called upon to produce knowledge as never before—for civic and regional purposes, for national purposes, and even for no purpose at all beyond the realization that knowledge eventually comes to serve mankind. And it is also being called upon to transmit knowledge to an unprecedented proportion of the population."[19]

In the 1990s, business commentators breathlessly announced the arrival of the new economy—a knowledge-based economy. Even allowing for the commentators' constant need to discover "new" trends, such proclamations show remarkable myopia. Clark Kerr was writing about the knowledge-based economy in 1963.

In 1973, Daniel Bell culminated ten years of thinking and writing on the subject of a knowledge-based economy with the publication of his seminal book *The Coming of Post-Industrial Society*. His analysis focussed on the United States, because there the post-industrial society had already arrived. Over the later twentieth century, Canada also became a post-industrial society.

A post-industrial society emerges from changes in the economy, technology, and occupational system. Daniel Bell identifies several dimensions of change: the change from an economy dominated by goods production to an economy dominated by services; the rise to pre-eminence of the professional and technical class; and theoretical knowledge becomes central to innovation and to policy formation.

The term "service economy" can be misunderstood. Services include the familiar personal services of the retail, travel, and entertainment industries; but the term also includes business services (such as banking, finance, real estate, and insurance) and other categories including communications, utilities, government, health, education, and research. It is all these services—the other-than-personal services—which are decisive in the post-industrial society. Workers in the service industry manipulate symbols and ideas, rather than physical objects. They are the knowledge workers.

Bell points out forcefully that "knowledge has of course been necessary in the functioning of any society. What is distinctive about the post-industrial society is the change in the character of knowledge itself. What has become decisive for the organization of decisions and the direction of change is the centrality of theoretical knowledge,"[20] and a new relationship between theory and application, between abstract learning and real world phenomena. The new relationship between theory and application is most evident in a new relationship between science and technology. The post-industrial society, as no society before it, engages in self-conscious research programs to advance theoretical knowledge and to solve applied problems.

The university is a primary institution of post-industrial society. It is one of the chief innovative forces of the society, one of the chief determinants of social opportunity and social stratification, and a focus of intellectual and cultural life. Its missions take on a new urgency and importance. In 1967, Daniel Bell wrote: "If the business firm was the key institution of the past one hundred years, because of its role in organizing production for the mass creation of products, the university will become the central institution of the next one hundred years because of its role as the new source of innovation and knowledge."[21] The emergence of post-industrial society moved the university's mission to centre stage.

Since the Second World War, national governments accepted the responsibility to pursue full employment and to encourage economic growth. Government policy recognized that universities are important for economic growth: mass university education and university research contributed to economic growth. However, this connection between the universities and economic growth was not subject to much scrutiny. And scrutiny seemed unnecessary because economic growth proceeded robustly through the 1950s, the 1960s, and into the 1970s.

However, the high unemployment of the mid-1970s and the slowdown in productivity, rudely and painfully, exposed this hubris. Robust economic growth was not assured. The question of how governments could encourage economic growth became urgent. The deep recessions of the 1980s and early 1990s, and the wrenching economic restructuring of those decades, were a profound trauma. The burst of productivity improvement of the late 1990s has not removed the insecurity. The question remains: is our future prosperity secure?

Moreover, the world economy is changing. Many developing nations are advancing rapidly, former planned economies are being transformed into market economies, transportation costs are falling, communications costs are falling because of the information technology revolution, financial markets are fully international, and barriers to trade are being removed. For the first time in history, we have a truly integrated global economy. Economics identifies three main sources of economic growth: increases in the size of the market which allow economies of scale to be exploited; new investment in both physical and human capital; and technological change. Many analysts believe that future economic growth in the Ontario economy will be overwhelmingly determined by technological change. We are entering a period of transforming technological change, propelled first and foremost by the information technology revolution. We have moved from an industrial age to the beginning of the information age. The implications of this technological revolution will take years to work out. We have not yet seen its full effects. Furthermore, there are other major technological changes on the horizon, most especially in biotechnology, nanotechnology, revolutionary new materials, and changes in fuel technology. The economic prosperity of a nation will depend upon how it generates and adopts new technologies—ideas and knowledge workers will explain the wealth of nations.

John Evans, former president of the University of Toronto and current Chair of the Canada Foundation for Innovation, articulates the consensus of our age when he states: "We now live in a world in which the organized

ability to create and commercialize new ideas is the critical determinant of economic success."[22]

This has brought a change in the way governments support university research. There has been a shift from supporting basic research and from letting the researchers choose the priorities, to a greater emphasis on science and technology research and to selecting priorities based upon the potential contributions to economic growth.

In the 1980s, the Corporate-Higher Education Forum was established by university presidents and industry leaders. Canada's national economic strategy sought to increase domestic research and development, and to make university research more responsive to the demands of the economy. Research parks were created on university campuses to facilitate technology transfer. The Canadian federal government made major new financial commitments to university research. This new support for university research was welcome on the campuses; but there were strings attached: the support was targeted and contingent. For example, the Canada Foundation for Innovation provides major capital grants to universities for research infrastructure; however the infrastructure is mainly to support research in science, health, and engineering and the federal capital grants cover only one third of the cost, requiring institutional and private sector matching funds. The federal Advisory Council on Science and Technology in 1999 convened an "Expert Panel on the Commercialization of University Research" which *inter alia* in their report, *Public Investments in University Research: Reaping the Benefits*, recommended that "commercialization" become the fourth fundamental responsibility of universities, joining teaching, research, and service.[23]

In the renegotiation of the social contract, governments at all levels now want universities to move closer to industry, and to become more involved in targeted and applied research. However, this shift brings great dangers. It may compromise the integrity of both research and teaching. This proximity may distort the choice of research topics, and move people away from basic research. Critical thought will be repressed. And the commitments to private firms may curtail the open communication of research results upon which the scientific enterprise has always been based.

These worries demand our attention. But, many critics display little awareness of how universities have been connected to industry since the nineteenth century. In the early nineteenth century, Oxford and Cambridge stood gloriously apart from commerce and industry. Many recall this as the golden age of knowledge for its own sake. Unfortunately, Oxford and Cambridge also stood gloriously apart from scientific thought and from all but the children of privilege. The Scottish universities in contrast were connected to commerce and industry, and were accessible to far more people. The University of London was a reaction against the Oxbridge models, and taking inspiration from the Scots emphasized medicine, science, engineering, and accessibility. The American land grant universities were very engaged in applied research and provided opportunity to children of the middle and working classes. This is a lesson we must not ignore today: the applied orientation of universities is inescapably connected to accessibility. As the university educates a greater share of society, its graduates will find their future in all sectors of the economy and society.

However, even with greater historical awareness of university-industry connections, it is clear something very fundamental is changing today. The university and industry are in much closer partnership and in a new form. Applied science and technology are being privileged over all other research fields. Universities are being asked to make commercialization of research one of their core responsibilities. Universities (and professors) dream of new revenues from patents which they will own. Whether this might overwhelm other responsibilities and ideals is the danger now faced. The danger is especially acute because if the university is to resist giving priority to research which promotes economic growth and to the task of commercializing research, it must resist its two greatest patrons—government and industry.

In the early twentieth century, the university institutionalized the numerous applied fields and many professions, while remaining true to its core ideals. Whether it can institutionalize the responsibility to commercialize research equally successfully is one of its greatest challenges ahead.

c) Graduate Education

Closely related to the research mission, although conceptually distinct from it, is the mission to provide graduate education. After completion of a bachelor's degree, a student may go on to complete a master's degree, or a doctorate. After an undergraduate program of both breadth and depth, graduate education becomes more and more specialized. The master's degrees are across the liberal arts (the humanities, fine arts, social sciences, and physical and biological sciences) and increasingly in the professional fields, most notably the MBA, the Masters of Business Administration. The doctoral degree is relatively rare in the professional fields (except engineering).

Master's degree programs may combine course work with a thesis, but some are course work only. The doctorate involves both course work and a dissertation. It involves both study at the most advanced level, as well as the submission of written work of publishable quality—a dissertation is the product of original research and represents a contribution to knowledge. The doctorate is a prerequisite to a faculty position at a university and to certain advanced research positions in industry and government.

A distinguishing feature of the "research university," complementary to its especially intense commitment to research, is an especially intense commitment to graduate education: a research university has a large graduate school, with many programs proceeding to the doctoral level.

A special task of the research university is to train the next generation of advanced researchers and faculty members for the universities. Graduate students are involved often in the research projects of faculty members; in many areas of science, engineering, and medicine, graduate education uses a research-apprenticeship model (less so in the humanities and social sciences). In most laboratories, the graduate students are an essential part of the research enterprise. The research could not be done without them. When the government supports research in the universities, it is also supporting the education of advanced researchers. This interconnection of research and graduate education could not occur if government research money went to specialized national laboratories. Under the social contract, the support for university research is partly based on this model of how best to train the next generation of advanced knowledge workers. (It should be noted that undergraduate education at a university also involves the close association between researchers and students, because it is the responsibility of all professors to be active in research.)

There are other intellectual and practical complementarities between graduate and undergraduate education within the university. With a graduate school on campus, the undergraduate student is better able to glimpse what lies ahead in study at an advanced level. The student sees areas and choices not visible in undergraduate-focused universities. The student has access to better libraries, laboratories, and computer facilities. In a system of mass higher education, it is financially impossible to have all instruction provided by professors in small classes. Because the research university combines undergraduate and graduate education, it allows some lectures and seminars to be provided by graduate students (by apprentice professors under the guidance of professors). Admittedly this is less costly and has some drawbacks compared to instruction by professors. But there are some advantages. The graduate students are closer in age to the undergraduates, and undergraduates can better relate to this next stage of advanced study. Many graduate students are from abroad and undergraduates are given new perspectives on the world. And it also helps graduate students to prepare to become professors themselves.[24]

Although graduate education is not specifically designed to prepare for employment, because graduate education takes so long and is so costly, there are special concerns with the employment of graduates not found at the undergraduate level. Doctoral programs are assessed in part by how well they place their graduates. Ph.D. graduates of elite graduate programs find positions as faculty members at leading research universities. Most forecasts are for a sharply increasing demand for doctoral graduates. Our universities will be growing and almost one half of the existing professoriate will retire in the next 15 years. Both the private sector and the public sector will need more people with advanced research skills. It will be a major challenge for Ontario universities to meet this increased demand.

d) Professional Education

A fourth mission of the university is to be home to professional schools. This is the least-emphasized and least-analysed mission of the university, all the more surprising because professional schools played such a prominent role in the emergence of the modern university and will become even more influential. Each professional school operates relatively independently and no single professional school is dominant (except perhaps medicine), but collectively the professional schools are so large that liberal arts, including undergraduate and graduate activity, are a minority in some research universities.

The forces encouraging new professional schools in the university will no doubt continue. Also, the relative importance of professional schools will continue to rise because many of the current trends shaping universities—such as an increased vocational orientation of students, increasing tuition fees, and increased reliance on external contracts and gifts—are far less threatening to professional education than to other parts of the university.

The place of the professional schools in universities is as old as the university itself. The medieval universities might even be described as collections of professional schools linked with an arts faculty. But the place of the professional schools began truly to rise with the development of the concepts of career and professionalism among the middle class. Burton J. Bledstein, in *The Culture of Professionalism: The Middle Class and the Development*

of Higher Education, argues these concepts are essential to understanding the development of modern universities. In nineteenth century America, the middle class "appeared as a new class with an unprecedented enthusiasm for its own forms of self-expression, peculiar ideas and devices for self-discipline." "Ambitious individuals in America were instrumental in structuring society according to a distinct vision—the vertical one of career. The most emphatically middle-class man was the professional, improving his worldly lot as he offered his services to society as ascending stages of an occupation." "By and large the American university came into existence to serve and promote professional authority in society."[25] We have no analogous study of the rise of the middle class in Canada, but their story and the role of Canadian universities is very similar.

A precise definition of a "profession" would elude us, whatever methodology we adopted, whether proceeding from abstract principles, or by examining histories of what we now call professions such as law or medicine, or by examining the motivations of members of professions. Nonetheless, professions can be taken to have certain characteristics, as the word is used in this analysis. A profession is an occupation based upon a well-defined body of specialized knowledge and upon skills and expertise which are developed through practical experience. The specialized knowledge is not a blueprint; its application requires discretion. The client of the professional does not have this specialized knowledge and experience, and therefore has difficulty assessing the quality of service provided. Governments recognize the need for competent, ethical practitioners, and recognize the inequalities and complexities of the client/professional relationship. This suggests the need for government regulation of the profession in order to protect the public interest and the client, but an alternative means has been adopted to these ends. Organizations of professionals are granted self-regulating status by governments: the professional organizations determine who can practice the occupation, especially through control of how people are trained to qualify for their "license;" the professional organizations establish the standards of practice; and the organizations discipline members who fail to meet the standards of the profession. The Law Society of Upper Canada and the Ontario Medical Association are familiar examples. The government's grant of self-regulation carries a reciprocal obligation to society. Membership in the profession carries the obligation of concern for the client's interest and the public interest. The professional association has been granted the right to regulate on behalf of the public interest and is responsible for encouraging, among its members, awareness of the public interest and a motivation to attend to it.

An analysis of professional schools in the university should be expanded to include those faculties/schools known within the university as "professional schools," whose graduates have many of the characteristics of a profession, although not the self-regulating powers of a professional association. The most important example is the business school. Other examples are schools of public administration and journalism, and faculties of education. These schools/faculties are occupationally defined. Their curricula cover a specialized body of knowledge; and they recognize the importance of apprenticeship and practical experience in developing professional competence. In almost every respect, these schools behave in the same way as the schools for self-regulating professions and therefore should be included among the professional schools of the multiversity. They, too, have an obligation of concern for the client's interest and the public interest.

The liberal arts faculties and the professional schools are two parts in the bundle which is the university, but often relations between them are strained. Their educational purposes are at odds: the arts devoted to knowledge for its own sake, the professions to knowledge in application. The liberal arts curriculum fights to preserve its independence and resists connection to the labour market; whereas the professional curriculum is strongly influenced by external practitioners and celebrates its connection to the labour market.

e) Accessibility

One cannot understand the mission of the modern Canadian university without understanding its responsibility to be accessible to all who are capable of and willing to undertake university study.

The government commitment to mass higher education, like the commitment to supporting university research, had its genesis in the Second World War. The great postwar expansion of higher education began with the commitment to assist the veterans' return to civilian life. Having risked their lives, veterans were offered assistance toward higher education by their grateful country. The veterans came from all walks of life, all races and social classes, all regions and provinces, forcing the universities to open up to this diversity. Soon thereafter, the democratic spirit of time would urge higher education be made available to all who were capable and interested. Such education not only gave access to new perspectives which could enrich your life; it also ensured a better job, a higher salary, lower unemployment, faster promotion, not to mention a certain

measure of social prestige. It improved both your quality of life and your standard of living. Therefore, equality of opportunity required equality of access to higher education, regardless of class, race, or gender. Fortunately, the labour market, propelled by robust growth and the economic transformation to a post-industrial society, required more and more graduates. Growing democratic aspiration and a growing economy were synchronized.

Martin Trow in his 1973 essay, *Problems in the Transition from Elite to Mass Higher Education*, emphasizes how different in character a system of mass higher education will be from an elite system. He defines an elite system as educating about five to ten percent of the eligible age cohort. An elite system can expand to about 15 percent, without changing its character, through growth of the original institutions. Thereafter, there will be a great transformation. Many of the original institutions must grow so large as to alter their essential character. New institutions, also large, must be created. A system of mass higher education enrolls about 15 to 50 percent of the age cohort; and beyond that level, the system may be characterized as universal access.[26]

When a country shifts from an elite to a mass system, the purpose of an undergraduate education shifts as well. Martin Trow argued that an elite system is "concerned primarily with shaping the mind and the character of the ruling class, as it prepares students for broad elite roles in government and the learned professions. In mass higher education, the institutions are still preparing elites, but a much broader range of elites that includes the leading strata of all technical and economic organizations of society. And the emphasis shifts from the shaping of character to the transmission of skills for more specific technical elite roles."[27]

The accessibility of universities is measured first by the participation rate: the percentage of the eligible age cohort which attends university. Accessibility is also measured by the family background of students. It is expensive to attend university—for tuition, books, living expenses, and foregone income from not working—but equality of opportunity requires that family or personal income not be a barrier to participation. As participation rates have risen, the percentage of students of all income backgrounds attending university has risen, but it still remains that students from higher income backgrounds are more likely to attend university. Accessibility is also measured by whether men and women are equally likely to attend university. And accessibility is measured by whether visible minorities, persons with disabilities, and aboriginal peoples are able to attend. Ontario has a commitment to ensure that university study is available in both French and English. Accessibility is also connected to whether there are opportunities for adults, for part-time study, and for distance education. University study is not just for students between 18 and 21; it must be part of lifelong learning. Each university and the entire system of universities (and the system of student assistance) must be accountable for their contributions to accessibility.

Unquestionably, Ontario universities have become much more accessible over the postwar period. This is a wonderful accomplishment and a great contribution to the nature of Ontario today. But much remains to be done: both to sustain the current situation and to further improve accessibility. This applies equally to undergraduate education, graduate education, and to professional education. By far the greatest barrier is the increase in tuition fees.

Ontario now faces a decade of increasing demand for university education. The population aged 18-21 in Ontario is projected to rise by almost 12 percent over the next ten years (and double that amount in the Greater Toronto Area).[28] Over the 1990s, public sector support per student fell precipitously. Tuition fees rose steeply early in the decade, but could not offset the falling government grants. Ontario requires major expenditure increases to restore quality and ensure access.

A crucial issue for Ontario today is how to fund universities. The post-industrial society demands a high priority for universities if we are to meet our economic and democratic aspirations. It becomes a strategic priority in all nations and jurisdictions to implement a sound framework for financing higher education. If we get the framework wrong, we will stunt individual lives and irreparably harm national well-being. The architecture of the framework is obvious: increases in public funds *and* increases in tuition fees *and* improvements in student assistance. If even one is missing, the structure will not hold and we will not meet our aspirations. In recent years, Ontario has relied too heavily on increased tuition fees, with neither a full system of student assistance nor a sustained level of public sector support.

The Social Contract: Institutional Autonomy, Academic Freedom, and Collegial-Governance

The university serves many purposes for society: the university provides mass university education and opportunity for social mobility; it is the center of society's organized research enterprise; it provides liberal education for citizenship and trains the future, self-regulated professionals; it is both the means to pass on a shared

culture and the means to re-define this culture. These are the responsibilities given to the university by society. The public provides huge sums of money to the university for both its teaching and its research. These are vital tasks. How are we to ensure that they are carried out in the best possible manner?

One approach would be to place universities under the supervision and direction of the government, as are our primary and secondary schools. This approach has been rejected. Universities have always been autonomous.

Institutional autonomy is required for the mission of the university. Autonomy is required for free inquiry—the raison d'etre of the modern university. It is integral to all the responsibilities of the university. Free inquiry is the essence of the tradition of liberal education. The theory of knowledge inherent in the research mission of the university assumes free inquiry: knowledge is best advanced when it is subjected to tests based in free inquiry. Free inquiry encourages a diversity of opinions and allows the university to fulfill its responsibility for preparing future citizens. Free inquiry values knowledge for its own sake, escaping the distortions which can arise when there is concern with how the knowledge will be applied, or who paid for the inquiry, or what the government wants to hear.

Furthermore, the professors within these autonomous institutions should have academic freedom as they go about their tasks of teaching, research, and service to society. The Academic Freedom amendment to the Education Bill of 1988 in England provides professors: "the freedom within the law to question and test received wisdom, and to put forward new ideas and controversial or unpopular opinions without placing themselves in jeopardy of losing their jobs or privileges they may have at their institutions."[29] Professors in all universities today are protected by academic freedom. This is a distinguishing characteristic of a university. It is necessary for the mission of the university.[30]

And finally, to buttress institutional autonomy and academic freedom, the university must be governed by the professors themselves. There should be collegial self-governance on academic matters. Collegial self-governance is also required to ensure that academics oversee academic matters; in much the same way as in the medical or legal profession, professionals oversee professional matters.

The mission of the university is inseparable from these principles: institutional autonomy, academic freedom, and collegial self-governance on academic matters. These principles of governance define a university as much as its responsibilities for teaching, granting degrees, and conducting research. These principles help us to separate universities from other institutions of higher education and help us in designing systems of accountability for universities.

But, universities are not independent from society. These special freedoms carry special responsibilities. And, there is an inescapable tension between the university and the democratic society which supports it. The modern university exists because of government financial support for mass university education and for university research. It is a fundamental principle of our democracy that public money must be accounted for; and we hold our elected representative accountable for how they dispose of public funds.

The relationship between the university and the society which supports it can be spoken of in various ways. We can say that universities must be accountable to our elected representatives and to the general public. Or, they must be responsive to their various stakeholders and constituencies. It is an elusive and multi-faceted relationship. One powerful metaphor to describe the relationship is that there is a social contract between the university and democratic society.[31] Borrowed from political theory, the metaphor of a social contract emphasizes the democratic role of the multiversity. The modern university comes into existence to meet the needs and aspirations of democratic societies.

In political philosophy, social contract theory is used to conceptualize the founding of democratic societies. It asserts that the legitimacy of government is derived from an implicit agreement, a social contract, under which individuals surrender certain of their rights and agree to obey the laws in return for the protection and stability of an effective government. The social contract is the basis of political legitimacy and of political obedience in a democratic society.

To say that universities and government (and thus also the public) are in a social contract, is not a precise use of the political philosophical concept, but it is an illuminating metaphor. Ultimate authority, to create universities, to sanction their degrees, and to determine how much money to give to universities, rests with the government (and the public). The government has assigned certain tasks to the university and provides it (relatively) stable long-term support. To better fulfill these tasks, the university is autonomous from government and its professors have academic freedom. The university and professors agree to fulfill these tasks with disinterest and integrity. But the ultimate legitimacy—for its many tasks and its privileged standing—comes from the people in a democratic society.

The social contract with universities is formulated over time and shaped by history. A government of the day, backed by public opinion of the moment, does have authority to

change universities; but the history of autonomy and the history of the social contract dictate that the essence of universities not be changed. Like a written constitution, a social contract is above easy or abrupt change; but it does evolve over time. The social contract requires continuous reflection and dialogue among the university and society, as each era renews the social contract according to its needs.

Under our current understanding of autonomy, an autonomous university can determine the standards for entry, the curriculum of study, the assessment of students, and who is awarded a degree. The university is responsible for academic standards, and the government cannot be allowed to interfere with these standards. An autonomous university can determine which professors it will hire, which it will tenure, and which it will promote. The autonomous university has the obligation to protect the academic freedom of professors in research and teaching, and to ensure the highest ethical and professional standards in research and teaching. Also, the autonomous university should be free to allocate as it sees fit the resources assigned to it through government grants and student tuition fees. For example, the university should be free to make the choice between spending money on hiring more professors versus hiring more laboratory assistants, between which departments to support, or between computing and libraries. Of course, the autonomous university is subject to the laws of the land, and its professors, staff, and students have all the rights and responsibilities of other citizens.

But, this autonomy is circumscribed, as it must be for such an institution, fulfilling so many social purposes, and receiving so much financial support from the government and the public. The university must permit public scrutiny of its affairs, be transparent in how choices are made to achieve its academic mission, and be accountable to government and to the public about how public funds have been spent. The government has responsibility for broad policy direction in higher education: determining the amount of public funds to be allocated to universities and research granting councils; setting tuition fees or establishing the discretion allowed universities in setting fees; and determining the allocation of public funds for student assistance, and whether the funds will be dispersed as grants or loans, and how the loans will be repaid. However, as these broad policy directions become more specific, the terrain is contested. Most observers agree that the social contract allows governments to determine whether to open a new medical school or engineering faculty; but most observers argue the social contract has been violated if government policy were to cut back the English department and expand the biology department. Broad policy direction is fine, micromanagement is not; the controversial question is where to draw the line.

The autonomy of the university is constructed in a social contract; it is circumscribed and the external influences are many, but the autonomy is real. How, then, are universities to be governed to ensure their autonomy and to preserve academic freedom? And how is this internal governance structure to ensure that the university is accountable to government and the public?

The university is established by a charter or statute of the government. Universities owe their legitimacy to an action of government; no new university, even one funded entirely privately, could be established to grant degrees without the approval of the government. This government charter gives the university the right to grant degrees and establishes the internal governance structure for the university. In most cases, there is a two-tier structure.

One tier is the board of governors; and the other tier is the senate. The board of governors has "final responsibility" for the university, and is charged to serve the best long-run interests of the institution. The board both interprets the needs of society to the university and represents the university to society. The board has special responsibility for the finances and property of the university, with a duty to ensure the long-run fiscal soundness of the university. The senate is responsible for all academic matters of the university, including admissions, curriculum, grading, and awarding of degrees.

The board of governors is made up of representatives of society—mainly business persons and professionals, but also representatives of religious communities, of labour, non-profit groups, and the arts community. The board also includes representatives of the faculty, staff, students and alumni of the university, but the university representatives are a small minority.

The senate is made up primarily of professors; but includes members of the university administration, also usually student representatives, and occasionally staff. Each faculty within the university and each department within the faculty will also have its own academic council equivalent to the senate, dominated by professors, with responsibility for academic programs and policy in their domain. These councils derive their authority by delegation from the senate. It is in these councils that collegial self-governance is strongest.

The board of governors may have *de jure* responsibility for the university; but the board chooses a president, after consultation with the senate, and then delegates most of its authority to the president who has *de facto* responsibility for the university. Governors have full careers and lives of

their own, and no special expertise in academic matters. The operations of the university are managed by the officers of the university, typically known as "the university administration" or "the senior administration," headed by the president. The president selects his/her vice-presidents and the deans of the various faculties, after consultation with the academic council of the faculty.

Although only having authority by delegation, the president and senior administration are so influential that they should be identified as a third tier of university governance.[32] The reasons for their power are many. Although formally they only "implement" and "administer" the academic decisions of senate and academic councils; in practice, they are responsible for the budget and have authority to allocate resources. The senior administration is "full-time," whereas the faculty members on the senate devote only a small portion of their time to administration. The staff of the university report to the senior administration, in the manner of employees in business or government, and provide analytical support to the president and senior administration. All these reasons combine to provide the president (and by delegation, the vice-presidents and deans) with *de facto* authority and responsibility for management and leadership of the university, albeit within a complex environment of collegial governance. The president has a special responsibility to protect institutional autonomy and academic freedom.

The university, in its social contract with democratic society, has been assigned certain tasks and has been granted autonomy in pursuing these tasks. But, this does not mean that the multiversity can proceed without further consultation. In order to maintain its autonomy, the university must make a commitment to dialogue—a continuing and public dialogue—about these tasks and the role of the university in society. The social contract implies an obligation on the university to reflect upon these tasks, to think and to write about them publicly, to articulate their value in society; to defend them when they are threatened, but also to reconsider them in light of criticism and evolving social needs. The university must lead the civic conversation as we renew the social contract in our age.

The social contact requires that the university explicitly articulate its mission, and that the mission be carried out with integrity, at the highest professional standards, and with a commitment to quality and constant improvement. And it must account to society how these obligations are being met.

To provide one concrete example: consider the mission of undergraduate liberal education. The university must articulate the purposes of these degree programs and then demonstrate how these purposes are being fulfilled. If we would take Frank Rhodes' statement of purposes, the university must explain how students are acquiring "professional competence in one specific area," how they are developing the ability "to write and speak with precision and clarity," how they are developing "some sense of the moral implications of actions and ideas," (and so on….including how they are acquiring skills which will be transferable to the labour market). The university must account for how the curriculum is assessed and improved; and for how professors are assessed and how they improve.

We already have many parts of an accountability framework, but many others are needed. A glaring gap is the lack of a code of professional conduct for professors. Henry Rosovsky, a former dean at Harvard University has noted, "an important characteristic of nearly all professions is the existence of explicit and shared codes of conduct that are part of the training received by those preparing to enter these fields. …Medical schools make an effort to teach the aspiring doctor the norms of proper professional behaviour. Every young physician is given a sense of what is and is not permitted or proper in dealing with patients. ….The legal profession shows similar concerns. Judges enforce standards of conduct, lawyers are responsible to a bar, and one does not graduate from law school without some acquaintance with a code of ethics."[33] But we have no such code or training for people becoming professors. After stepping down as president of Stanford University, Donald Kennedy wrote in his book *Academic Duty*: there has been an "internal failure to come to grips with responsibility in the university. Having been given a generous dose of academic freedom, we haven't taken care of the other side of the bargain."[34]

University professors have fought for and secured academic freedom but have not fulfilled the reciprocal responsibility to articulate academic duties and to instruct the next generation in these duties. All too often, professors are absent from campus because of their research or external commitments; too often lectures are poorly prepared and grudgingly delivered. Although primary fault must rest with the profession, senior administrators are not blameless. Henry Rosovsky observed: the first step toward discharging duties is to know what they are and "that we often accomplish in unforgivably casual fashion. Most professors have little sense of social contract—after all, who or what will give them that sense?" They receive little from the administration beyond statements of the responsibility to do teaching, research, and service. "Universities also show administrative lack of will, and

that is a more damaging weakness. Faculty behaviour (e.g., little teaching and frequent absences) has been rational and understandable, given the absence of constraints. For this, administrations should assume a major share of the blame because of a manifest unwillingness to set clear tasks and clear limits."[35]

In renewing the social contract between the university and society, the universities—their senior administration and their professors—have no task more important than to develop an explicit code of professorial responsibilities and conduct and to incorporate this into graduate education.

The particular governance structure of the university means that the board, senior administration, and senate will have to play key roles in the system of accountability. To date, they have not been sufficiently proactive in satisfying the government's and the public's desire for accountability.

Universities and Democracy

Usually when we think about the mission of the university, we think about its teaching, its research, and its contributions to economic, cultural, and social life. But in the later twentieth-century, the university has taken on a new role: the university has become an institution of democracy. We have not fully recognized or fully digested this new role. Perhaps, this is because we know that universities must remain autonomous from democratically-elected governments.

A profound change of the postwar period which reshaped the university is the implementation of the welfare state. For thirty years after the Second World War, the role of government expanded, built upon a remarkable consensus about the objectives of government and the means to achieve them. There was a new relationship between citizens and their government—a new social contract (in the proper political philosophical meaning of the term). Liberal democracies assumed new responsibilities for the welfare of their citizens—hence the term welfare state—rather than allowing private markets to fully determine the outcomes. The term "welfare state" was first used in the Second World War, to contrast with the Nazi "power state." The ideals and commitments of the welfare state were developed to better articulate what was at stake in the war, more especially why the average soldier/citizen had a stake in the outcome.

The welfare state was built upon a number of basic commitments of governments to their citizens. The first was the commitment to full employment. The private market economy would not be left on its own; rather, the government would intervene to stabilize fluctuations, to encourage economic growth, and to pursue employment for all. The second was the provision of public insurance against certain risks. People should not be destitute because of unemployment, old age, or ill health. Government would provide unemployment insurance, old age pensions, and health insurance. And finally, the government recognized that citizenship implied certain social rights.

Thomas H. Marshall, the English sociologist, articulated the concept of social rights of citizenship in his famous 1949 essay: "Citizenship and Social Class." Marshall said citizenship has three elements: civil, political, and social citizenship. "The civil element is composed of the rights necessary for individual freedom—liberty of the person, freedom of speech, thought and faith, the right to own property and to conclude valid contracts, and the right to justice."[36] The institutions most associated with civil citizenship are the courts of law. Political citizenship, for Marshall, means "the right to participate in the exercise of political power, as a member of the body invested with political authority or as an elector of the members of such a body. The corresponding institutions are parliament and councils of local government."[37] Social citizenship means "the whole range from the right to a modicum of economic welfare and security to the right to share to the full in the social heritage and to live the life of a civilized being according to the standards prevailing in the society. The institutions most closely connected with it are the educational system and the social services."[38]

Civil citizenship was extended during the eighteenth century with the emergence of the middle class. Political citizenship was extended during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, accommodating the working class and extending the suffrage to all men, and belatedly, after much struggle, to all women. Social citizenship is the citizenship of the twentieth century welfare state, the citizenship of postwar democracies. The benefits from the welfare state are due, not as charity, but to citizens. Social citizenship is inclusive, granting full membership for all. Marshall asserted that the welfare state embodied recognition of citizens' social rights and a commitment to overcoming the divisions of social class.

Education becomes a core public commitment for social citizenship, because full membership requires equality of opportunity, which education can help to provide. Also, civil and political rights are designed for reasonable and intelligent persons, and therefore, education is a necessary prerequisite to civil and political freedom. Education is so necessary that primary and secondary education should be free—and compulsory. Universities, though not compulsory, would become increasingly important to social citizenship,

until in today's post-industrial society, accessible university education is a necessary component of social citizenship.

The university's democratic role goes much beyond social citizenship. Each component of the bundle which is the university—undergraduate education, the professional schools, graduate education, and research—has a crucial role in the liberal democracy of post-industrial society. Undergraduate education is, in part, an education for political citizenship. The universities are the gateways to the professions, and democracy requires equality of access to the professions. The practice of all professions involves an imbalance between the professional and the client; and virtually all professions have been granted self-regulation rather than being regulated by government. Therefore, in a democratic society, it is important that all professionals be attentive to issues of the client's interest and the public interest. The university shares the responsibility to educate professionals for this attentiveness, on behalf of our democracy. In our knowledge-based post-industrial society, political choices require assessment of complex questions. Sometimes, the assessment requires scientific knowledge: for example, what are the environmental risks of automobile pollution and what technology might reduce that pollution? At other times, the assessment can involve social science: for example, how will new information technologies influence the practice of democratic politics? And the assessment can involve knowledge of the humanities: for example, the history of Islam can help us to evaluate proposals for peace in the Middle East. The university can contribute this scientific, social scientific, and humanistic knowledge to political deliberation. And finally, the multiversity as a research institution, financed by our democratic governments, is crucial in the dynamic of generating new ideas which so influence our society. The universities have a democratic obligation to ask what questions are being studied, and to assess the impact of the new knowledge. They must ask: ideas for whom?

Usually when we think of democracy, we do not think of universities.[39] We generally think first of the institutions of government—a representative assembly, political parties, and elections. We think of choice between political parties and between party platforms. We often think of the importance of a free press to ensure democratic choice in elections. But if we reflect for a moment, we realize universities in post-industrial society are equally important to ensuring democratic choice. Democracies require the development and assessment of alternatives. In post-industrial society, propelled by the codification and application of theoretical knowledge, the development and assessment of alternatives more than ever requires the application of knowledge. Many emerging issues are generated by new knowledge and require still further new knowledge to understand and assess them. The university is a crucial institution in the generation of new knowledge and in the assessment of alternatives.

Sometimes when we think of democracies, we think of the institutions of civil society, such as religious institutions, labour unions, and a free press, necessary to counteract concentrations of power in government and business. Now, in our post-industrial society, in our world where knowledge is the most important factor in economic and social growth, the university has become a crucial institution in civil society. The university is important in counteracting concentrations of power in government and business.

The link between democracy and education is as old as the discussion of each. It can be argued that all educational theory is at the same time political theory. Educational theory asks: what kind of person do we seek to create through education? Embedded in this question is another question: what sort of citizen do we want? However, most writing on education and democracy has dealt with education of the young, with primary and secondary education.[40] But, we must keep primary and secondary education distinct from university education because the democratic functions of each are separate.

This distinction is clear in Amy Gutmann's reflections: *Democratic Education*. Intriguingly, she began intending to write a book about liberal education but found her thoughts coalesced around the theme of democratic education. Her work demonstrates that ideas about liberal education are inseparable from ideas about democracy. The book begins: "When citizens rule in a democracy, they determine among other things, how future citizens will be educated."[41] There is a process, a conscious process, of social reproduction. One must ask what sort of moral character is to be cultivated, and who should share the authority for how future citizens are to be educated. Following the philosophical precepts of liberal democracy, she argues that the democratic purpose of primary and secondary education is the development of "deliberative," or what she calls interchangeably "democratic" character. Such character involves moral reasoning, as well as "the development of capacities for criticism, rational argument, by being taught how to think logically, to argue coherently and fairly, and to consider relevant alternatives before coming to conclusions." Basic democratic virtues such as toleration, truthfulness, and a predisposition to nonviolence should be inculcated. Also, "children must learn not just to *behave* in accordance with authority but to *think* critically

about authority, if they are to live up to the democratic ideal of sharing political sovereignty as citizens."[42] Authority to determine the goals and content of primary and secondary education, to determine this conscious process of social reproduction, Gutmann argues, should be shared between parents, the state, and professional educators. But, the government has the central role.

University education has related but different democratic purposes. In contrast to primary and secondary education, university education is not compulsory and involves only a portion of the eligible population. University education relies on the success of primary and secondary education. A university education is less explicitly about character formation; "although learning how to think carefully and critically about political problems, to articulate one's views and defend them before people with whom one disagrees is a form of moral education to which young adults are more receptive and for which universities are well suited."[43] The university does continue the process of building democratic character, but the fundamental democratic purpose of a university is protection against the democratic tyranny of ideas. Control of the creation of ideas—whether by a majority or a minority—subverts democracy. "As institutional sanctuaries for free scholarly inquiry, universities can help prevent such subversion. They can provide a realm where new and unorthodox ideas are judged on their intellectual merits; where the men and women who defend such ideas are not strangers, but valuable members of the community. Universities thereby serve democracy as sanctuaries of nonrepression."[44] Universities serve democracy, but paradoxically democratic authority over the university must be highly attenuated. Its democratic purposes are best served with institutional autonomy and academic freedom.

Critic, Conscience, and Public Intellectual

During the 1980s, New Zealand was in political turmoil. The economy was shrinking; government deficits and debt were rising. Many critics, including the Labour Party which formed the government, concluded that the government programs of social democracy required radical redesign. Universities were not exempt, indeed were often the focus, because higher education was to be part of the redesign of economic policy. What followed was a "decade-long war" between the university and the government—the universities felt betrayed by what they saw as a crippling assault on institutional autonomy and academic freedom. During this war, the Education Amendment Act (1990) was passed. The Act is an extraordinary document because it reaffirms unequivocally the core ideals of academic freedom and institutional autonomy, even amidst political turmoil and radical redesign of the welfare state. There are lessons here for Ontario.

The objective of the Act was to give universities "as much independence and freedom to make academic, operational, and management decisions as is consistent with the nature of the services they provide, the efficient use of national resources, the national interest and the demands of accountability."[45]

The Act defines universities as having certain essential characteristics: "(i) They are principally concerned with more advanced learning, the principal aim being to develop intellectual independence; (ii) Their research and teaching are closely interdependent and most of their teaching is done by people who are active in advancing knowledge; (iii) They meet international standards of research and teaching; (iv) They are repositories of knowledge and expertise." These first four characteristics reaffirm the long-established nature of universities. What is extraordinary is the fifth essential characteristic of universities: (v) "They accept a role as critic and conscience of society."[46] Here we see a democratic function of universities made explicit.

As we renew the social contract for universities in our times, the role critic and conscience of society should be made explicit. This responsibility of the modern university is connected to its responsibility for research, under the guarantees of autonomy and academic freedom. Unlike other democratic institutions such as political parties or the media, the university is committed to research; it is an institution which allows sustained critical reflection and analysis. In a knowledge-based society, sustained critical reflection and analysis are essential to the articulation and evaluation of alternatives which are needed in the electoral process. This responsibility should be made explicit because the university is crucial to democracy in a knowledge-based society. And as an explicit responsibility, we can then ask universities how well they fulfill it, and judge them accordingly. They should be accountable for this responsibility.

The New Zealand Amendment says universities "accept" a role as critic and conscience of society—the choice of verb acknowledges this is not a role to be welcomed by everyone. Although many professors and students see themselves as "activists" and welcome the role, most professors and students are uneasy, as are boards of governors, presidents, and senior administrators. They would prefer social criticism remain an indirect implication of autonomy and academic freedom, rather than an explicit responsibility to society. The university requires the support of the centers of political and economic power;

the role of critic and conscience would bring it into conflict with the powerful.

The dangers to the university of this role are evident and many. Research and teaching, which should be founded upon curiosity and tolerance, might become advocacy and intolerance. It might be that social criticism, like participation in partisan politics, spoils the habits of good scholarship. Social criticism can become political protest, which, in turn, can slide into anti-democratic politics. On the other hand, some social theorists are quite explicit in embracing this role: they identify university intellectuals and students as fundamental actors in social change. But, however much the activists want the university to be the primary agent of social change, this is surely not what society wants under the social contract. The university's obligation, as an institution, is to remain neutral; its autonomy is at risk when activists demand that the university as an institution take explicit political stands.

In accepting the role of critic and conscience, the university risks betraying its essential character of disinterested free inquiry, civil debate, and institutional autonomy. This risk is real and universities must guard against it vigilantly. Critical ideas and alternatives must be advanced according to the scholarly canons of respectful, evidence-based exchange.

These reflections on democracy in a knowledge-based society lead toward an additional democratic responsibility of professors: the role of public intellectual. The university is a place of advancement and dissemination of knowledge, a place of research and teaching. Universities are the core of society's research enterprise, the source of innovation and ideas. New knowledge is disseminated in the classroom through the teaching of undergraduate and graduate students, through continuing education, and through the publication of research. But, dissemination must not end there. The public has financed this research and therefore professors have a responsibility to discuss their research with the public.

However, almost all publishing by professors is now through academic journals and academic presses; the intended audience is other professors, students, and specialists. Little writing is directed to the public. The professor's role as a public intellectual has diminished because of the disciplinary organization of universities and increasing specialization in the search for new knowledge. The very success of the research enterprise has alienated it from the sponsoring public.

It is obviously in the selfish interests of professors and the university to speak publicly about the research enterprise, to engage the public imagination with the process, and to explain the findings in language accessible to the curious educated public. When the public is engaged, they will be more likely to support universities. But the role of public intellectual cannot be motivated by this instrumental purpose; rather it must be recognized as an obligation to democratic society. In post-industrial society, theoretical knowledge and new knowledge are increasingly important. Society finances the research at universities. The university, with its enormous privileges, has an obligation to make this knowledge as accessible as possible, to disseminate it as a public intellectual. The responsibility has always existed, but tends to be ignored under the pressures to publish in peer-reviewed outlets.

Universities have not emphasized this responsibility. Professors enjoying a profile as public intellectual invariably say that most of their colleagues are wary (they say that it takes you away from real research, or that addressing the public requires too much dumbing-down); other colleagues are hostile (you have given up the pursuit of truth for the pursuit of celebrity); and some are simply envious (you are successful and I wish I could be like you). The systems of evaluation in academic life are not equipped to evaluate the contributions of public intellectuals to public dialogue; promotion and tenure committees seldom give these contributions much attention. This needs to change. Similarly, tenure and promotion must change to accommodate the social responsibility to be critic and conscience. The first steps would be to recognize explicitly this mission of the university, and then to develop means to evaluate public contributions. Then they can be given weight in tenure, promotions, and merit decisions. The time spent as a public intellectual is time spent on the mission of the university in a democratic society. Not every professor must engage in these activities, but collectively, the professoriate must accept the role.

Jeffery C. Goldfarb has explored this role in *Civility and Subversion: The Intellectual in Democratic Society.* He argues that "intellectuals have played crucial roles in the making of democracy and in the ongoing practices of democratic life."[47] Further, "the diminution of intellectual activity presents a major threat to democracy in our times. Intellectuals are central democratic actors, and when they leave the political stage, democratic performance ends in failure. …Intellectuals are particularly able to address one of the most pressing needs of democracies: the need to deliberate about common problems. Intellectuals help societies to talk about their problems. They contribute to democratic life when they civilize political contestation and when they subvert complacent consensus."[48] University professors should be among the most important public intellectuals of a democratic society.

Deliberative Democracy and Citizenship

There are great concerns about our democracy at the beginning of the twenty-first century. A growing disillusionment with electoral politics is evident in declining voter turnout, and declining participation in all aspects of organized party politics. At best a bemused disinterest, at worst a hardened cynicism, is a common stance, especially among the young. The civility and public-spiritedness which should mark the liberal citizen seem to be disappearing. The quality of public discussion declines. When public discussion does occur, it is fractious and polarized. All our political parties share these concerns and are offering reforms to address the "democratic deficit."

These criticisms and worries have sparked a renewal of interest in liberal democratic theory among philosophers and political scientists, reflecting a deep concern about the legitimacy of liberal democracies. The recent literature about democracy is marked by two closely related themes: an emphasis on the idea of deliberative democracy and an emphasis on the idea of citizenship. Both themes have signal implications for the place of universities in democratic society.

One line of thought centers on how democracy can retain legitimacy given the inevitability of disagreement in our pluralist complex societies. To political philosophy's usual emphasis on equality, liberty, power, and representation, has been added a focus on disagreement. In politics today, whether on economic policy, foreign policy, or social policies dealing with abortion, drugs, or gay rights, disagreement is fundamental. In the late twentieth century, in the phrase of John S. Dryzek, the theory of democracy has taken "a strong deliberative turn." Prior to that turn, democratic legitimacy was seen mainly in terms of aggregation of preferences or interests into collective decisions, through devices such as voting or representation. After the deliberative turn, "democratic legitimacy came to be seen in terms of the ability or opportunity to participate in effective deliberation on the part of those subject to collective decisions." "The essence of democracy itself is now widely taken to be deliberation, rather than voting, interest aggregation, constitutional rights, or even self-government."[49] The deliberative democracy literature emphasizes that deliberation should occur not just in the explicit political process, but in many dispersed forums of civil society.

The deliberation of democracy will surely draw upon existing knowledge and call for new knowledge; it will require the adjudication of competing knowledge claims. It will require the involvement of public intellectuals and engaged, informed citizens. All these are the stuff and substance of the university. The deliberation of democracy is not just in the political process, it must be throughout society, and wherever it occurs, the deliberation must be public. The university is an ideal forum—in the classroom and through its graduates and its professors as public intellectuals—for such public deliberation in civil society. The university's values are consonant with those required by deliberative democracy. It is a sanctuary of nonrepression where men and women who hold contrary ideas are full members of the community. The university is an institution necessary for achieving a deliberative democracy.

Concerns about our democracy have also sparked a renewed interest in concepts of citizenship. It is imperative as we renew the social contract that we renew the emphasis on citizenship in undergraduate liberal education.

One strand of this current literature on citizenship is especially interested in how political participation in our liberal democracies might be increased and how the civility and public-spiritedness of citizens could be encouraged. Will Kymlicka and Wayne Norman survey this literature in their article: "Return of the Citizen: A Survey of Recent Work on Citizenship Theory." They identify several answers to the question of how the challenges to democratic citizenship might be met. One answer comes from liberal virtue theorists. They acknowledge that liberals must share blame for the current imbalance between rights and responsibilities. Liberals placed too much emphasis "on the justification of rights and the institutions to secure these rights, without attending to the responsibilities of citizens." Liberal virtue theorists articulate a list of citizenship virtues, including political virtues: a "capacity to discern and respect the rights of others, willingness to demand only what can be paid for, ability to evaluate the performance of those in office, willingness to engage in public discourse." According to Kymlicka and Norman, "it is the last two virtues—the ability to question authority and the willingness to engage in public discourse—which are the most distinctive components of liberal virtue theory."[50]

These capacities of a good citizen have clear and direct implications for undergraduate education. An undergraduate education is well-suited to developing the capacity to question authority and the willingness to engage in public discourse. And the complementarity to the concept of a deliberative democracy is also clear. An undergraduate education should include the development of political virtues and prepare citizens for participation in a deliberative democracy.

Thus, universities have a new mission, a mission because they are institutions of democracy. Great universities should be judged not just by the quality of

their research, the learning of their students, and the contributions and accomplishments of their graduates, but also by their service to democratic society as critic, conscience, and public intellectual and by their preparation of students for citizenship.

Epilogue

We live in tumultuous times—unpredictable and perplexing. The ideas of our age are changing society. The ideas of our age may transform the university. The new relationship between citizen, market, and state limits government expenditure, forcing higher tuition fees and increased reliance on external fundraising. Governments are shifting from supporting basic research toward supporting applied research and are asking that commercialization of research become a fundamental responsibility of the multiversity.

The university is an extraordinarily long-lived institution. We risk squandering our inheritance, partly through inattention, partly through intransigence, and partly through prodigal adaptation to the ideas of our age.

Will the traditions of liberal learning survive? What should be the curriculum for an undergraduate? What should be the interconnections between liberal learning, the professions, and advanced research? Will the reliance on external fundraising destroy the commitment to disinterested inquiry? Will the multiversity remain committed to public knowledge under pressures to commercialize its research? Can quality be maintained when government support per student continues to decline? Can accessibility be maintained if tuition fees rise still further? These are questions facing Ontario and posterity will judge us how they are answered.

Many in the university are convinced that the ideas of our age will revolutionize the university, so radically changing its functions that the unbroken history will be severed. The modern university has a multitude of functions, often conflicting and always with shifting emphasis. If the tormenting worry had to be summarized in a single sentence it would be: in post-industrial society of the twenty-first century, the economic mission of the university will flourish and the democratic mission will wither. We must not allow this to happen.

Endnotes

[1] Discussion Paper (2004), p. 5.

[2] The Discussion Paper contains a literature review and list of references. However, the review and list are very limited. Another purpose of this essay is to offer a broader perspective on the literature on universities. This essay draws its title from another essay, see Gasset (2001). Jose Ortega y Gasset delivered his "Mission of the University" in lectures at the University of Madrid in 1930. They were published in 1944 and republished in 2001, with an introduction by Clark Kerr.

[3] Kerr (2001). Clark Kerr's 1963 lectures, "The Uses of the University," were delivered at Harvard University in the annual Godkin Lectures on the Essentials of Free Government and Duties of the Citizen. They have been republished four times, each time including new chapters by Kerr.

[4] Recent examples are Cole, Barber, and Graubard, Eds., (1994): *The Research University in a Time of Discontent*; Emberley and Newall (1994): *Bankrupt Education: The Decline of Liberal Education in Canada*; Readings (1996): *The University in Ruins*; and Kolodny (1998): *Failing the Future: A Dean Looks at Higher Education in the Twenty-first Century*.

[5] Duderstadt (2000), p. 21.

[6] Cardinal Newman in Turner (1996), p. 78, 109, and 125. The quotations from Cardinal Newman are taken from Frank M. Turner, Ed.: (1996) *The Idea of a University: John Henry Newman*. Newman's book was first published in 1873.

[7] Cardinal Newman in Turner (1996), p. 77.

[8] Nussbaum (1997): *Cultivating Humanity: A Classical Defense of Reform in Liberal Education*, offers a marvellous exploration of the relevance of classical ideas of citizenship to contemporary liberal education.

[9] McKillop (1994), p. 563.

[10] McKillop (1994), p. 563–4.

[11] These distinctions between university study and community college study correspond almost exactly to the distinctions made in the UNESCO International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED). ISCED divides the first stage of postsecondary education into level 5A (like Ontario universities) and level 5B (like Ontario colleges). Across the world, countries have identified two separate and distinct types of postsecondary education. Each has its own mission.

[12] Axelrod (2002), p. 34–35.

[13] Rhodes (1994), p. 180–81.

[14] Rhodes (1994), p. 182–83.

[15] Liberal education graduates do very well in the labour market. The literature on this topic is briefly reviewed in the Discussion Paper (2004). Axelrod (2002) also reviews the literature. Ironically, this is the one purpose of a liberal education which the Ontario government has focussed upon, and the one area where a performance indicator has been developed, with money tied to the indicator.

[16] Pocklington and Tupper (2002), p. 23–24.

[17] These brief characterizations of the NRC and the national granting councils are taken from the relevant entries in *The Canadian Encyclopedia*.

[18] Pocklington and Tupper (2002) make these themes the focus of their critique of undergraduate education at Canadian universities.

[19] Kerr (2001), p. xi–xii.

[20] Bell (1999), p. 20.

[21] Bell (1967), p. 30.

[22] Evans (2003), p. 1.

[23] For reviews of research policy in Canada, see Axelrod (2002), Chapter 4; Gu and Whewell (1999); and Fisher, Atkinson-Grosjean and House (2001). See also Expert Panel Report (1999).

[24] It must be acknowledged that some graduate students are not very good teachers and some are still learning English. These difficulties are a common complaint and concern at research universities.

[25] Bledstein (1976), p. ix and x.

[26] Trow (1973).

[27] Trow (1973), p. 7–8.

[28] This implies that outside the GTA, the growth will be much less that 12 percent. Outside of central Ontario, there will be almost no growth in the population aged 18-24.

[29] As quoted in Russell (1993), p.1–2.

[30] See Horn (1999) for an analysis of academic freedom in Canada.

[31] Various authors have, from time to time, described the relationship between the university and society as a social contract. See for example Bok (1982), p. 5.

[32] A complete analysis of the internal governance of the university would include discussion of the role and influence of students and of faculty unions.

[33] Rosovsky with Ameer (1998), p. 119.

[34] Kennedy (1997), p. 22.

[35] Rosovsky with Ameer (1998), p. 125.

[36] Marshall (1963), p. 74.

[37] Marshall (1963), p. 74.

[38] Marshall (1963), p. 74.

[39] There are a few notable exceptions. Some political scientists and political philosophers have written about liberal democracy and universities including Gutmann (1987), Ryan (1998), and Shils (1997).

[40] See Manzer (2003) for an analysis of the relationship of political ideas to primary and secondary education in the Anglo-American world.

[41] Gutmann (1987), p. 3.

[42] Gutmann (1987), p. 50–51.

[43] Gutmann (1987), p. 173.

[44] Gutmann (1987), p. 174.

[45] New Zealand (1990). See also Crozier (2000).

[46] New Zealand (1990).

[47] Goldfarb (1998), p. 1.

[48] Goldfarb (1998), p. 1.

[49] Dryzek (2000), p. 1.

[50] Kymlicka and Norman (1994), p. 365.

References

Axelrod, P. (2002). *Values in conflict: The university, the marketplace, and the trials of liberal education*. Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press.

Bell, D. (1967). Notes on the post-industrial society (I), *The Public Interest, Number 6*, Winter, pp. 24–35.

Bell, D. (1999). *The coming of post-industrial society: A venture in social forecasting*, third edition, first published in 1973. New York: Basic Books.

Bledstein, B.J. (1976). *The culture of professionalism: The middle class and the development of higher education in America*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc.

Bok, D. (1982). *Beyond the ivory tower: Social responsibilities of the modern university*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Cole, J.R., Barber, E.G., & Graubard, S.R. (Eds.). (1994). *The research university in a time of discontent*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Crozier, R. (Ed.). (2000). *Troubled times: Academic freedom in New Zealand*. Palmerston, New Zealand: Dunmore Press.

Discussion Paper. (2004). *Postsecondary review: Higher expectations for higher education*. Retrieved from: http://www.raereview.on.ca.

Dryzek, J.S. (2000). *Deliberative democracy and beyond: Liberals, critics, contestations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Duderstadt, J.J. (2000). *A university for the 21st century*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Emberley, P.C., & Newall, W.R. (1994). *Bankrupt education: The decline of liberal education in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Evans, J. (2003). Cited in *The Ontario Business Report. Volume 6*, Edition 8, December/January 2003. Ministry of Enterprise, Opportunity and Innovation, Government of Ontario.

Expert Panel Report. (1999). *Public investments in university research: Reaping the benefits*. Ottawa: Advisory Council on Science and Technology. Retrievable at: http://acst-ccst.gc.ca.

Gasset, J.O. (2001). *The mission of the university*. With a new introduction by Clark Kerr. Lectures first presented in 1930. New Brunswick (USA): Transaction Publishers.

Goldfarb, J.C. (1998). *Civility and subversion: The intellectual in democratic society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gu, W., & Whewell, L. (1999). *University research and the commercialization of intellectual property in Canada*. Ottawa: Industry Canada.

Gutmann, A. (1987). *Democratic education*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Horn, M. (1999). *Academic freedom in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Kennedy, D. (1997). *Academic duty*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Kerr, C. (2001). *The uses of the university*, fifth edition, first published in 1963, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Kolodny, A. (1998). *Failing the future: A dean looks at higher education in the twenty-first century*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Kymlicka, W., & Norman, N. (1994). Return of the citizen: A survey of recent work on citizenship theory. *Ethics, Volume 104*, No. 2, pp. 352–381.

Manzer, R. (2003). *Educational regimes in Anglo-American democracies*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Marshall, T.H. (1963). Citizenship and social class. In T.H. Marshall, 1963, *Sociology at the crossroads and other essays*. London: Heinemann.

McKillop, A.B. (1994). *Matters of mind: The university in Ontario, 1791–1951*. Toronto: Ontario Historical Studies Series, University of Toronto Press.

New Zealand. (1990). *Education Amendment Act 1990*. Retrieved at: http://rangi.knowledge-basket.co.nz/gpacts/public/text/1990/.

Nussbaum, M. (1997). *Cultivating humanity: A classical defense of reform in liberal education*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Polklington, T., & Tupper, A. (2002). *No place to learn: Why universities aren't working*. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Readings, B. (1996). *The university in ruins*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Rhodes, F.H.T. (1994). The place of teaching in the research university. In J.R. Cole, E. Barber, & S.R. Graubard, (Eds.), *The research university in a time of discontent*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Rosovsky, H., & Ameer, I.L. (1998). A neglected topic: Professional conduct of college and university teachers. In W.G. Bowen & H.T. Shapiro, (Eds.). *Universities and their leadership*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Russell, C. (1993). *Academic freedom*. London: Routledge.

Ryan, A. (1998). *Liberal anxieties and liberal education*. New York: Hill and Wang.

Shils, E. (1989). The modern university and liberal democracy. In E. Shils, 1997, *The calling of education. The academic ethic and other essays on higher education*. Edited by S. Grosby. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Trow, M. (1973). *Problems in the transition from elite to mass higher education*. Washington: Carnegie Commission on Higher Education.

Turner, F.M. (Ed.). (1996). *The idea of a university: John Henry Newman*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

UNESCO. (1997). *International Standard Classification of Education ISCED 1997*. Retrieved at: http://www.unesco.org/education/information/nfsunesco/doc/ised_1997.

CSSHE Professional File

The *CSSHE Professional Files* describe and analyse current issues in higher education policy and practice. They offer a critical assessment of the issue under consideration, then suggest alternatives for policy and practice, and identify directions for further research.

Submissions consistent with the purpose of the *CSSHE Professional File* should be submitted to the editor. *CSSHE Professional Files* are published up to four times per year and are distributed free of charge to CSSHE Members (as PDF files by email).

Editor

Daniel W. Lang
Professor and Senior Policy Advisor to the President
University of Toronto
Room 6–278
252 Bloor Street West
Toronto, ON M5S 1V6

Email: dan.lang@utoronto.ca

Membership Inquiries

Canadian Society for the Study of Higher Education
c/o CSSHE Secretariat
P.O. Box 34091
RPO Fort Richmond
Winnipeg, MB R3T 5T5

Email: csshe@cc.umanitoba.ca
Website: www.umanitoba.ca/csshe