

---

## SUMMARIUM

---

### CHANGING UNIVERSITIES

#### *Ildikó Hrubos: The university of the 21st century*

The rectors of European Universities signed the Magna Charta Universitatum in Bologna, in the year 1988. The document stated four basic principles. The first one declared that universities should be autonomous institutions, which, in order to achieve their objectives, namely to generate and transmit cultural values, had to be independent from all political, economic and ideological powers. The second principle referred to the integration of the educational and research activities. The third principle supported freedom of research, education and training provided by the state governance and by the universities, in their own area of competence. Finally, the fourth principle stated that universities were the originators of the European humanistic traditions, and they could fulfill their mission only by disregarding the geographic and political boundaries, and emphasizing the necessity of mutual understanding and interaction among cultures. At the beginning of the 21st century, rapid and unexpected worldwide shifts in the economic, technical, social, and scientific area have changed the higher educational environment, and forced it to redefine its function and role. The higher education reform declared in 1999 is basically an attempt to renew the so-far existing social contract. European universities have to find their place in the globalizing academic world and in a more competitive environment. They can only expect success if they retain their traditions, their most fundamental values, while also learning to adapt to constantly changing situations.

#### *Viktor Karády: The Napoleonic French University and its afterlife (institutional historic overview)*

The new, centralized school system created by decrees during the Napoleonic Empire (1808) achieved for the first time the nationalization and planned development of education of the elites in a nation state, during its formation. This happened after the Revolution, when the educational traditions of the old school-system had almost completely been destroyed. The system known as *Université de France* introduced state monopoly over the entire educational spectrum. Although the monopoly was dissolved on the level of secondary education (1851), and later on higher education (1876), it is still partially prevailing (for instance, in the use of

the label 'university', in the issuing of university titles, or in examination rights). The four pillars of the previous system still existed following the extensive reforms that started at the beginning of the Third Republic (1878-1896) and finished after the 1968 student revolution. The pillars, strongly connected, building upon and complementing each other, were the following: the network of classic high-schools (lycées, collèges), the system of faculties (comprising law, medical, humanities, and realities faculties, the latter two focusing on educating the catholic theological intelligentsia, and later on teacher-training and education of scholars), the hierarchic system of selective higher vocational schools (with the *École Normale Supérieure* and the *Polytechnique* at the top of the list), and the autonomous, state-owned research and research-educational institutions (*Muséum, Collège de France, Observatoire, Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes*, etc.). The study provides an overview of the social and political circumstances of the formation and transformation of the University.

*Péter Tibor Nagy: The graduates of the Humboldtian and post-Humboldtian university in the Hungarian society*

Based on the empirical data of the 1930's census, the TARKI mobility panel survey from 1992, the TARKI household panel survey, the data-set of fifty thousand respondents aggregated from the TARKI Omnibus surveys from the end of the nineties, and the educational sociology survey data on first-year students, we intend to demonstrate that the differences in values and preferences between the Humboldtian and post-Humboldtian universities did not originate in the world of values, and that they are not connected merely to the transformation of the university population. Nevertheless, they are linked to the obvious differences in the social positions of the graduates "produced" by the Humboldtian and post-Humboldtian university. The Humboldtian university educates for leading market positions, while the post-Humboldtian university trains employees; the Humboldtian university educates for city life associated with intensive cultural consumerism, while the post-Humboldtian prepares its graduates for living in a territorially scattered population; the Humboldtian university focuses on male gender roles, the post-Humboldtian on both gender roles; the Humboldtian university involves groups easily described by confessional attributes, the post-Humboldtian prepares for living in a strongly secularized society. The Humboldtian university did not arrive to its crisis because the concept of the university had changed in society, and not only because the population entering universities was different, but because the social position of the graduates had also changed, and the university, being part of the community of professionals, reflects this transformation.

*Zsolt Nagy: The comparative study of historic and present-day systems of legal education*

This essay reflects on the development of legal education systems in Europe, England and the United States. The article elaborates on the causes of the current

situations of the training system, the connection between legal instruction and society, and the legal profession in different countries. It attempts to show that the differences among the American, English and Continental legal education go back to historic – medieval – roots. The essay concentrates on the classification criteria of legal training systems, and pays special attention to the dynamics of the different educational systems. It illustrates that there are legal training systems based on one legal tradition, and there are systems that are grounded in two or more legal cultures. Furthermore, it mentions that, because of the effects of legal harmonization in the European Union, faculties have to specialize in different fields of knowledge using the experience of “multijural” legal education.

*Marianna Szemerszki: Students in the era of massification - an international outlook*

The 20th century, and especially its second half, has brought about a considerable change in university structures. The greater complexity of higher education systems, the Bologna process in Europe, and globalization - internationally perceptible even in this area - have forced different countries to face similar challenges, even though their starting positions were different in many respects. Our data shows that not only the higher education system of each country, but also the groups of people using these services, the students, seem to be homogenizing. Meanwhile, the specificities of each country still remain valid. The expectations towards the higher education system in each country highly influence the evolution of student numbers and student profiles, therefore the objectives expressed along these lines would make the achievement of political, economic and social priorities possible.

*János Zlinszky: University after Bologna*

The new higher educational law may bereave the university from its essence: to carry out autonomous, independent and free scientific activity. It intends to squeeze profit out of education and research, and tries to determine what and how to educate and research using financial arguments. This principle is against the Constitution, against science and society. If this becomes reality, diploma-factories will be created, satisfying only the needs of the richest. We have to defend ourselves against this tendency before it becomes too late. The legal order has to be rethought and reformulated by its representatives, according to scientific logic.

*István Polónyi: The slow change of university leadership*

The essay analyzes the change of leadership of higher education institutions in Hungary over the last twenty years. Before the regime change, higher education was ruled by Act I of 1985, outlining a Humboldtian-type institutional leadership, characterized by shared scope of authority between leaders and professoral bodies. Naturally, the Law took care that representatives of various “social organizations” (meaning the HSLP/MSZMP and the Union) were always delegated to the professoral bodies.

After the regime change, in an era when the Humboldtian principle and higher educational autonomy were strongly losing ground in the more developed western world, their place being overtaken by the managerial leadership of mass higher education, in Hungary the new Act on Higher Education of 1993 consolidated autonomy.

Acting upon these processes, the preparation document for the new Act on Higher Education of 2005 states the aim that the institutions should have a BD (Board of Directors) responsible for setting strategic objectives, decisive in strategic, financial and human resource issues. Beside this board, the Senate acts only upon academic matters.

The sections referring to the BD of the Act passed in December 2005 were overruled by the Constitutional Court, emphasizing that the composition of the board and its scope of authority would hinder the autonomy of higher education institutions. Following the decision of the Constitutional Court, the Act now speaks about a Financial Council, as only a preparatory body.

Studying the composition of the Financial Councils of public universities, we can observe that they are characterized by a very low ratio of professional managers. Therefore, we can state that although modernization of higher education leadership was an extremely timely and urgent task, educational policy has not found its proper allies to perform this job.