Higher Education in a PLURALIST World:
A Transatlantic View

MADELEINE GREEN,
American Council on Education

ANDRIS BARBLAN,
European University Association

EUA
European University Association

AC

Table of Contents

Foreword

In June 2003, the European University Association (EUA) and the American Council on Education (ACE), in cooperation with the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC), organized the eighth session of the Transatlantic Dialogue, a cross-border conversation that both associations have been co-sponsoring since 1989. The dialogues bring together approximately 30 presidents, rectors, and vice chancellors from the United States, Canada, and Europe to engage in an in-depth conversation on contemporary higher education issues.

This most recent conversation was held at Schloss Leopoldskron in Salzburg, Austria, the home of the Salzburg Seminar. The location seemed fitting, combining 18th century rococo architectural splendor and a great sense of Austrian hospitality with a notable history of political debate. Since 1947, Schloss Leopoldskron has been a center for intellectual exchange in the heart of Europe, where discussions have explored areas of social, economic, and cultural development across the globe.

To this setting, EUA, ACE, and AUCC invited academic leaders representing a variety of colleges and universities from Canada, Europe, and the United States to discuss the role of and challenges to colleges and universities in developing pluralist societies. Referring to a rich literature on universities' capacity for change and their ability to transform the social environment, participants compared across cultures and borders their own institutional experiences in a plural society and tried to define a common ground for action.

Rather than provide a summary of the conversation, the organizers asked the event's two facilitators, Madeleine Green, vice president and director of ACE's Center for Institutional and International Initiatives, and Andris Barblan, the former secretary general of EUA, to write an essay that captured the discussion highlights. This report reflects the richness of the conversation in Salzburg and showcases the relevance and importance of the meeting's theme to the future of higher education on both sides of the Atlantic.

ACE and EUA are pleased to offer this essay to their members and to others who are deeply concerned about the future of colleges and universities in a world

challenged by ethnic conflicts and fundamentalism. Many may be asking the important question: How can academics, staff, and students contribute to a community of tolerance and understanding? The essay that follows points to some possible answers to this difficult question.

David Ward
President
American Council on Education

Eric Froment
President
European University Association

Washington, Brussels, June 2004

Introduction:

The Transatlantic Gap:
False Hopes and True Misunderstandings

Since the first biennial meeting of the Transatlantic Dialogue in 1989, the climate for mutual understanding and collaboration across the Atlantic has changed in ways that no one could have predicted. When they met at the Université Laval in Quebec for the seventh meeting of the Transatlantic Dialogue in June 2001, the 30 presidents, rectors, and vice chancellors of European and North American universities who participated expected their future to be characterized by national or international partnerships. These alliances would allow them to join forces and invest in areas of mutual interest. A shrinking world and new possibilities for collaboration would help higher education meet the challenges of growing technology, globalization, and competition. The seminar participants agreed that the changing external landscape would force a redefinition of institutional identities, an investment in enhancing quality, and a redeployment of human resources. The capacity to innovate would become the decisive advantage for survival in the brave new world of higher education.[1]

None of the participants at that meeting could have expected that a vastly different version of the brave new world would impose itself 10 weeks later when, on 11 September 2001, terrorists destroyed the symbols of international finance and U.S. economic might in New York City. What seemed to be the Western world's strength–high-tech machines and communication wonders–proved to be a source of vulnerability in ways that were simply unimaginable. Countries on both shores of the Atlantic reacted in unison: "We are all Americans!" The threat to modernity would be met by nations with essential common interests acting in unison.

Two years later, at the eighth session of the Transatlantic Dialogue in June 2003 at the Salzburg Seminar in Austria, the common front had broken. The United States had taken contrasting positions with Europe and Canada, on not only interventions in Iraq and the Middle East, but also trade negotiations at the World Trade Organization (WTO) concerning services, agriculture, and, in the case of Canada, softwood lumber. The rift on the conditions needed for peace, safety, and prosperity was deepening with the U.S. war in Iraq and growing anger among other nations that the U.S. government was acting increasingly unilaterally in matters of trade and foreign policy. As the world became more threatening and the war

A Pluralistic Higher Education Institution…

is open to all students who can benefit——regardless of economic, cultural, or academic background. The challenge for higher education is not in selecting students who will be successful, but in ensuring success for those who chose to come.

AUGUSTINE GALLEGO, San Diego Community College District

A Pluralistic Higher Education Institution…

strives to meet all the needs of the communities that it serves.

RODERICK FLOUD, London Metropolitan University

on terrorism became a reality, the United States seemed to divide the world into supporters and enemies. America appeared to pose a question to the world, as U.S. columnist Charles Krauthammer put it: "Are you in the trenches with us or not?"[2] This position left little room for debate or negotiation.

In this Manichean context, divisions grew in a Europe unable to develop a unified foreign policy: Britain, Spain, and Italy aligned with the United States, while France and Germany declined to do so. In the United Nations debate, Canada sought (unsuccessfully) to broker a multilateral solution. In the United States, these disagreements spurred intense media coverage and rising public opinion decrying French treachery and German ingratitude. In Europe, the differences complicated European Union (EU) negotiations to enlarge the Union to include 10 additional nations, most of which were still under communist rule in 1989 (the year of the first Transatlantic Dialogue). When the leaders of these 10 nations offered strong support to U.S. policy, many in Brussels insisted that entering the EU by May 2004 required allegiance to Europe that precluded a pro-American stand. Indeed, Europe could not become a community of

Was not higher education a laboratory for pluralism, where different opinions, identities, and creative innovations informed a changing society?

some 600 million people without reinforcing its internal ties and governance as well as its common foreign policy. That issue was central to the discussions of the convention, which in spring 2003 presented a constitutional treaty for an enlarged EU, both streamlined internally and consistent in its external positions.

Thus, between the 2001 and 2003 sessions of the Transatlantic Dialogue, Europe focused predominantly on its own economic, social, and political development. At the same time, the United States remained preoccupied with its own security (which included developing a coordinated regional defense plan with Canada) and unconcerned with the growing criticisms of its policies from other nations. Did the universities–mirrors of society–reflect such developments? Was their place in society now being confined by their national borders? Could academe present a more universal view of diversity, in terms of people, interests, and cultures? Was not higher education a laboratory for pluralism, where different opinions, identities, and creative innovations informed a changing society? Or were European and North American higher education taking different paths of development, for instance through the government-driven

Bologna process[3] in Europe and through market-driven approaches in the United States? And could Canada mediate between U.S. and European models?

In the context of these apparent transatlantic rifts, the June 2003 Transatlantic Dialogue focused on the theme Higher Education in a Pluralist World. Background readings from a wide range of sources set the stage for an intense discussion of the role of higher education in a world where the pluralistic basis of democracy seemed to be increasingly fragile and to follow a dramatically different trajectory than that of only two years earlier. Thus, the 30 university leaders present in Austria had been asked to come prepared to reflect on the definitions and experiences of pluralism at their institutions and on the academic and social engagement that connected them to an increasingly diverse set of stakeholders. This essay draws on two days of lively dialogue, as well as the valuable conversations that occurred outside the formal sessions.

Defining Pluralism

As any veteran of conversations across borders, languages, and cultures will acknowledge, many discussions stumble because of an absence of shared definitions and common terminology. These difficulties are not limited to international dialogues; they occur just as frequently in a national context in which there are many more shared experiences and assumptions. Even on a single campus, individuals assign different meanings and bring different value frameworks to terms such as globalization, affirmative action, positive discrimination, or "Europeanization."

Thus, the 2003 Transatlantic seminar began by elaborating on the multiple dimensions of pluralism and exploring the similarities and differences in interpretations among the participants. Indeed, definitions proved to be significantly diverse. For at least one European participant in the seminar, the term that supplied the meeting's focus–pluralism–did not resonate at all.

Before the meeting, the seminar organizers had asked participants to define pluralism in the higher education context by completing the sentence, "A pluralistic higher education institution..." To launch the discussion, the organizers created a list of salient themes from the responses they received, which included the following dimensions of pluralism in higher education institutions:

- Diverse by race, ethnicity, gender.
- Socially diverse.
- Politically diverse.
- Multilingual.
- Multigenerational.
- International.
- Open to different intellectual approaches and perspectives.
- Promoting academic freedom.
- Providing safe space for debate.
- Engaged with community stakeholders.

As the seminar opened, the organizers proposed an exercise in which the participants would vote on the most important characteristics of pluralism for higher education in their countries as the decade ended. The vote revealed several strongly shared views, and some divergences.

Of greatest importance for the Europeans, Canadians, and Americans was that institutions be ***open to different intellectual perspectives.*** Closely related to this dimension, and affirmed by the votes, was that institutions serve as ***safe spaces for debate.*** Clearly, the enduring function of

A Pluralistic Higher Education Institution…

is characterized by a plurality of scientific theories and methods, by an internationalized faculty and student body, and by cultural and linguistic diversity.

GEORG WINCKLER, University of Vienna

higher education to foster unfettered inquiry, and the debate and dissent that accompanies that process, remain central in the eyes of academic leaders on both sides of the Atlantic. They share the view that it is their obligation to safeguard this tradition of intellectual pluralism by ensuring that the campus continues to be safe from both the threats posed by external groups and intolerance and incivility within the institution's community.

Another key dimension of pluralism –ranking second among participants– was that institutions maintain *diversity of race, gender, and ethnicity.* It is not surprising that the U.S. leaders assigned even greater importance to this dimension than their European counterparts. As one U.S. president put it, "Race is a defining characteristic in the United States; nothing else is on that level." But these are hardly issues confined to the United States. Certainly, issues of race and ethnicity are central to the North American dialogue on higher education's larger role in society, and were even more prominent in the United States as summer 2003 began, because of the impending Supreme Court decision on affirmative action.[4] But they also are increasingly visible in Europe, where the population has diversified tremendously in the past 15 years. Today's Europe includes a significant Muslim population, sizeable minority language groups, and immigrants from poor and war-torn southeast Europe, as well as from African and Asian countries.

Some interesting differences in perceptions of pluralism also emerged. The Europeans considered *engaging with community stakeholders* to be more central to the pluralistic identity of their institutions than did the North Americans. This difference was somewhat surprising, given the longstanding emphasis that North American public colleges and universities (especially U.S. land-grant universities and community colleges) have placed on public service and engagement with their communities. One U.S. president offered a possible explanation, suggesting that, for him, pluralism is more of an internal institutional issue. Although engagement with community stakeholders is vital for U.S. colleges and universities, connecting to diverse stakeholders is but one aspect of a complex series of commitments with external groups.

Far less surprising was an insistence by the Europeans on *internationalization* as a dimension of pluralism. The Bologna process has provided enormous energy and visibility for an agenda that will increase the cultural and linguistic diversity of European higher education institutions by enabling students to move freely among those institutions and bringing students from around the world into Europe.

A third point of difference was the European identification of *social diversity* as important to a pluralistic institution. This divergence also may reflect different social contexts in Europe and North America, specifically, that social class figures less prominently in the younger North American societies, in which socioeconomic status is much more likely to be linked to race and ethnicity.

As the ensuing discussion revealed, different institutional missions and student populations refracted the concept of pluralism in different ways. At London Metropolitan University,

which has a racially diverse student population and a mission to educate the London workforce, pluralism is a function of *who* the students are and *where* the university is located. At San Francisco State University, also a highly diverse urban institution, 25 percent of students were born outside the United States, 50 percent are from homes in which English is not the first language, 70 percent of students are non-white, and a similar percentage of students are older than 22 years of age. Such diversity inevitably shapes the institution's culture, as well as students' experience within the classroom.

For the University of Geneva, where 40 percent of students hold foreign passports, pluralism is tied to internationalism. Similarly, an important dimension of pluralism for Pennsylvania State University is defined by the 4,000 international students who enrich its student body. And for the "research" universities (as the North Americans would call them) or "classical" universities (in European parlance), international cooperation is an important means to promote intellectual pluralism.

With static or diminishing resources, increasing numbers of students to serve, and a student body that is increasingly diverse in its level of preparation, interests, and goals, differentiation of institutional mission is taking on urgency in the public policy debate.

As institutional leaders, the seminar participants largely focused on the institution as the unit of analysis. But a broader perspective also surfaced, with some participants noting that great diversity exists across European nations (in languages, cultures, higher education systems, and laws) as well as within them. As one participant noted, at the national, state, or provincial level, the concept of pluralism also applies to institutional type and mission. With static or diminishing resources, increasing numbers of students to serve, and a student body that is increasingly diverse in its level of preparation, interests, and goals, differentiation of institutional mission is taking on urgency in the public policy debate. How should government differentiate among missions and thus allocate scarce resources to those universities most likely to stimulate high-quality teaching and learning, excellent research, and maximum service to society?

As the discussion over the next few days was to reveal in greater depth, a dynamic tension exists between

the concept and the realization of pluralism–between diversity and unity, fragmentation and coherence, and pluralism and integration. Again, historical and cultural differences shape the North American and European perspectives. As immigrant societies, the populations of Canada and the United States originate in different nations, cultures, and languages. Building unity from this pluralism has been a major task in both countries, where the current legal frameworks affirm equality, but history shapes the present. The U.S. history of slavery and legalized discrimination against African Americans and Native Americans casts a long shadow over current efforts to create a multicultural society. In early 20th century America, the minimization or even the elimination of difference was embodied in the goal–or the myth, as some would say–of the "melting pot." That metaphor now has been largely displaced by the "salad" or "stew" concept, in which the ingredients retain their distinctiveness while combining into a coherent whole. In Canada, federal legislation enacted in 1971 recognized multiculturalism as a fundamental characteristic of Canadian society. The legislation asserted the equality of all Canadians, while affirming ethno-cultural, racial, and religious diversity. But the legal framework does not guarantee a tolerant or well-mixed society. As pluralism grows in European nations, largely due to immigration and the expansion of the EU, the same tensions between unity and diversity are surfacing.

The celebration of difference and identity politics are two sides of the same coin. These issues are played out on North American campuses, where

interest groups–political, cultural, racial, ethnic, and academic–claim their individuality and space to affirm their agenda and interests. At the same time, institutions seek to foster learning, attitudes, and behaviors that reinforce shared interests and values and affirm a sense of purpose and belonging that transcends one's narrow community, however that is defined.

Although not every European nation approaches European integration in the same way or with equal fervor, those countries are making steady progress toward creating an integrated and united continent. This push for European integration includes higher education, with the Bologna process as the key driver of the changes that are required to make courses of study compatible and to harmonize degree structures. But neither integration nor harmonization is easily accomplished. At the national political level, the debate over accepting the European constitution highlights the tendency of each nation to assert its independence. Similarly, the devastating wars of only a decade ago in the former Yugoslavia are evidence of the potential explosiveness of multi-ethnic societies.

The drive for integration within European nations–and the surrounding tensions that result–is illustrated by the French debate over allowing Muslim girls to wear headscarves in school. French schools have been the battleground for the development of a lay society over the last 150 years and, in 1905, religious education was totally banished from state-supported schools. The prevailing belief was that the "Republic," as a neutral organization of society, considered religion to

be a private matter that should not interfere with education aimed to prepare students for citizenship. If, for example, Catholics wanted their children to be schooled in a religious setting, they could create, at their expense, their own system of schooling. (And indeed, they did so.) Members of the French National Assembly used the same argument of neutral citizenship and equal conditions in a lay society when it recently debated a law that would ban conspicuous religious symbols (including headscarves) from public schools.

Although the separation of church and state represent important political values in both France and the United States, the approaches differ markedly. The French view the republican ideal of public secularism as a way to promote the integration of different groups into society. This cultural value framework posits that religious difference is a private matter and that the separation of church and state requires that personal religious symbols be kept out of the public realm. (It does not, however, preclude the availability of French state funds to support religious schools.) The U.S. approach historically has been to separate "church and state," so that public funds are not used to support religious activities or institutions. (That concept has been challenged by the Bush administration and some state govern-

ments.) But in the United States, the rights of the individual to express his or her religion in a public setting are strongly asserted.

Each approach has its price. In the United States, social fragmentation through the voluntary separation of groups within society can threaten the sense of a shared common good that is a cornerstone of a healthy democracy. In France, the price of official insistence on minimizing difference is the failure to recognize and act on the consequences of that resolve and the seeming rejection of anything "unrepublican." Indeed, there are no simple solutions, either in higher education or in the larger society. While campuses seek to provide a forum for the conflicting views and needs of different groups, and to build a sense of common purpose in the pursuit of knowledge, the path is fraught with difficulties. Are all views equally valid? If so, how do universities deal with views that are unscientific or racist? What do we do with those ideas, views, and scholarship that have been freely produced and expressed under the banner of academic freedom, but which are unenlightened or even dangerous? If not, then how do institutions decide which views are acceptable and which are not? These and other questions were the subject of the ensuing discussions.

A Pluralistic Higher Education Institution…

guarantees that different approaches, methodologies, and conflicting theories and scientific results are presented and confronted in teaching and research, thus avoiding domination by one school of thought or ideology.

Luc Weber, Université de Genève

A Portrait of Pluralism

As the opening seminar conversation richly illustrated, pluralism has many dimensions. The populations of the United States, Europe, and Canada are all growing increasingly diverse. On both sides of the Atlantic, immigration plays an important role in creating diversity; in Europe, it is clearly the single greatest factor in creating ethnic, cultural, and religious pluralism. Both the United States and Canada have long histories as multiracial and multi-ethnic societies. In the United States, the African-American population, largely descendants of slaves, has a history much longer than and different from that of more recent arrivals to the country. Both the United States and Canada have small populations of "Native Americans" or "members of the first nation," as they are called in Canada. Their presence serves as a pointed reminder to their countries that even the current majority populations were immigrants at one time.

Immigration—legal and illegal—is the main driver of diversity in Europe, Canada, and the United States, with similar rates of immigration relative to those populations (see "The Changing Face of Europe"). According to *The Economist*, approximately 1 million people a year enter the United States legally, and about half that number come in illegally. Approximately 1.2 million enter the EU legally, and about 500,000 illegally.[5] Canada's illegal community is about 8 percent of the 800,000 immigrants who legally enter the country each year. The total number of illegal inhabitants in Canada is estimated at between 100,000 and 200,000.[6]

Because immigration is vital to Europe's future prosperity, it is likely to be a continuing force in increasing the diversity of European societies. With low birth rates and an aging population, Europe needs immigrants to bolster a diminishing workforce. According to EU estimates, the number of active persons in the workforce will diminish by 19 million, or 8.8 percent, between 2010 and 2030.[7] The inflow of immigrants is a relatively new phenomenon for Europe, a continent that has been exporting people for the last several centuries.

The growth of immigration in Europe has raised a host of issues. Acculturation of people of different backgrounds will challenge Europeans to shift their psychological and cultural outlooks and references. As successive generations become more comfortable with pluralistic societies, one can hope that such changes will facilitate

A Pluralistic Higher Education Institution…

is one in which we are open not only to persons of different cultures and countries, but also to new ideas.

Robert Lacroix,
Université de Montréal

the cultural and social integration of diverse groups.

Fear that immigrants will take scarce jobs away from the native population, while unfounded, often fuels a backlash. Immigrants disproportionately work in low-wage jobs, or are unemployed. In Denmark, they are twice as likely as natives to be unemployed, three times as likely in Finland, and four times as likely in the Netherlands.[8] In Canada, it takes more than 10 years for unemployment among immigrants to drop to the level of native-born Canadians.[9] A related challenge is underemployment–connecting the growing pool of foreign-trained, highly educated migrants in Canada's larger cities with appropriate-level jobs.

Societies continue to struggle with these issues, emphasizing education as the most important route to the acculturation of future citizens. Yet different immigrant groups fare differently in educational achievement. A U.S. study showed much higher grade point averages for the children of Chinese, Korean, Vietnamese, Laotian, and Cambodian immigrants than for those of Mexican and Cuban origin, even after adjusting for family and school characteristics.[10] In Germany, only 8 percent of Turkish children pass the *Abitur*, the academic high school examination, compared with 12 percent of children of all foreigners and 30 percent of Germans. Factors such as parents' educational level, their linguistic capacity, and

THE CHANGING FACE OF EUROPE

As the following statistics illustrate, immigration has altered the make-up of Europe:

- In Germany, the foreign population—now nearly 10 percent of the total population—grew from 4.5 million to 7.3 million between 1980 and 2002.[11, 12] This group includes 1.9 million Turks.
- In England, approximately 4.5 million of the 44.5 million inhabitants were born outside the country, or just over 10 percent. Of the foreign-born population, approximately 3.4 million were born outside EU countries.
- In 2000, 11.3 percent of Sweden's population was foreign-born, as was 10.4 percent of Austria's inhabitants.
- The 1999 census showed that France's population included 3.26 million foreign-born individuals and 4.3 million immigrants, out of a population of 60.7 million inhabitants in metropolitan France and its four overseas departments.[13, 14] Estimates of the Muslim population in France vary between 7 percent and 10 percent. (These data are not collected in the census.)
- The Greek census of 2001 recorded an increase of 1 million people over the previous census, to 11 million. Of that increase, all but 40,000 residents were attributable to immigration. According to Demetrios Papademetriou, co-director of the Migration Policy Institute in Washington, DC, "In a decade, Greece has jumped from being one of the world's least immigrant-dense countries to being nearly as immigrant-dense as the United States."[15]

their employment in the new country affect their children's educational performance.

Contrary to Europe, Canada, like the United States, was built on immigration. In 2001, there were 5.4 million foreign-born persons out of a total population of 29.6 million, or about 18 percent of the population.[16] In 1996, 4.9 million foreign-born individuals resided in Canada. Recent Canadian census data show a very slow rate of population growth–with only a 4 percent gain between 1996 and 2001. Immigration was the main source of this growth.[17] In recent years, Asia has been the single greatest source of immigrants; of the 1.8 million people who migrated to Canada in the last decade, about half were from Asia. For Canada, as for Europe, immigration provides an important way to meet workforce needs, especially in high-demand areas such as technology. The country also has a high level of acceptance of asylum seekers, given its more generous definition of eligibility compared to other countries.

An important dimension of Canada's pluralism is its linguistic diversity; 17.3 million Canadians speak English as their first language, and 6.7 million speak French (the vast majority in the province of Quebec). The predominance among Canadian immigrants of English-speakers (83 percent) over French-speakers (7 percent) points to a decline in the proportion of French-speaking Canadians, unless immigration of French-speakers increases.[18]

Linguistic diversity is also an issue in several European countries, and often has been divisive, as in the case in Belgium. And, in the Balkans, the legacy of the war in the former Yugoslavia has been a fight to create new countries speaking "different" languages, even if these languages originate from Serbo-Croatian, the common language spoken in the former Yugoslav Federation before it collapsed. Thus, Bosnia, Croatia, and Macedonia justified their emergence as distinct political entities through linguistic attributes. In Kosovo, the Albanian-speaking majority took over all "national" agencies and institutions, and the Serb minority was reduced to a negligible presence.

Higher education has mirrored the political convulsions in Kosovo. Founded in 1962 as a bilingual institution (Albanian and Serbo-Croatian), the University of Pristina began teaching only in Serbo-Croatian after a government fiat in 1992. In 2000, after NATO intervention, Albanian once again became the language of instruction and the Serbs created their own Serbian-speaking institution in Mitrovica, with the financial and technical support of the Belgrade government. In short, pluralism has been replaced by the reorganization of the country along ethnic and linguistic lines; people of different languages simply no longer communicate– despite centuries of having a common past.

The United States provides a complex picture of pluralism, with immigration providing only part of the story (see U.S. Trends in Immigration, next page). The implications of diversity for U.S. education are enormous. Currently, nearly 17 percent of U.S. children between the ages of 5 and 17 speak a language other than English at home. To the extent that a growing proportion of immigrants in the

A Pluralistic Higher Education Institution…

encourages the intellectual and social interaction of multiple perspectives, born of the experiences of a diverse campus community— diverse in terms of race, ethnicity, gender, geography, class, and age.

JUAN MESTAS, University of Michigan–Flint

United States (and in many other countries) cluster at the lower end of the skill and education spectrums, the educational system is challenged to overcome high drop-out and failure rates. Otherwise, the children of poor immigrants will have less chance of attaining higher education and the benefits it brings. Additionally, they will face complex obstacles in developing an identity that synthesizes their culture of origin and the culture of their new country.[19]

Thus, the challenge of providing equal educational opportunity to all citizens, regardless of race, ethnicity, or socioeconomic class is shared by the United States, Canada, and Europe. The United States has addressed historic inequities–most prominently those associated with race and ethnicity–since the end of official segregation in 1954. In Europe, some of the challenges that diversity brings, especially those associated with immi-gration, are more recent. But the route is an arduous one in all countries and, increasingly, the well-being of nations, including those that are economically sound, depends on their ability to provide social, economic, and educational opportunities for all who live or choose to live there.

A further challenge to primary and secondary education is to turn the pluralism of the student body into a positive learning experience for all. For first- and second-generation immigrant students, and non-immigrant students from marginalized groups, education is charged with helping them develop a positive identity, counter negative stereotypes from the dominant culture, and avert potential alienation from an unwelcoming society. For students from the dominant culture, the challenge is to "broaden the cultural horizons to incorporate the changing perspectives, habits, and potentials of its diverse newcomers."[22]

U.S. TRENDS IN IMMIGRATION

- In 2000, foreign-born individuals accounted for 11.1 percent of the U.S. population of approximately 282 million.[20]
- Of the 13 million immigrants who came to the United States in the last decade, more than half (7.2 million) were from Latin America (including Mexico).
- Nearly 13 percent of Americans are black, most of whom are U.S. born, and a nearly equal percentage are Hispanic. The latter group includes both U.S.- and foreign-born individuals.
- Asian-born persons or individuals of Asian descent constitute nearly 4 percent of the population, while other groups make up 2.5 percent.
- Population projections suggest that by 2020, blacks will constitute 13.5 percent of the population, and Hispanics will account for nearly 18 percent. In 2050, those numbers are projected to rise to 14.6 percent and 24.4 percent, respectively.[21] The picture varies considerably by state; in a number of school districts already, the majority of students belong to "minority" groups.

The Pluralistic Institution

In his address at the 650th anniversary of Charles University in Prague in 1998, Czech President Vaclav Havel encouraged academics to find inspiration for their work in the two words that comprise the word for university, *universitas* (i.e., *unum* or "one") and *vertere* ("to turn"). According to Havel, to "turn to the one" (*ad unum vertere*) is to search for the patterns in matter and society that provide a unifying framework for science and social organization. The drive for unity is a dynamic process that recognizes the fragmentation of knowledge and society. At the same time, it is a call to explore complexity and create new points of commonality and shared rules of behavior. The university is the institution created to undertake these tasks.

Given that, a central social role of higher education institutions is to recognize the diversity and complexity of the members of any group, probe what makes them unique, and encourage shared attitudes among faculty, staff, and students that lead to a community of belonging and to common goals. Individual identity has many dimensions—perceptions, desires, emotions, and opinions. Academics study those individual characteristics in physical, biological, or psychological terms. When shared among individuals, these dimensions inform group identities, which can be examined from a legal, social, or political perspective, or in philosophical and theological terms. Intellectual inquiry seeks to understand the human condition and the world from as many angles as there are disciplines, and from as many points of view as there are observers. That is a key aspect of academic pluralism.

However, higher education is more than a spectator of society; it is a part of its community and, indeed, an actor in its development. An institution's role in society is not neutral. Seminar participants agreed that higher education's capacity to stand apart from society is increasingly balanced by growing connections to it. If higher education institutions were ever an ivory tower, that is certainly no longer an option. Where then does higher education integration with its community begin and end? This question became central to the Transatlantic Dialogue debate.

The seminar provided multiple examples of how institutions deal with the many faces of pluralism, as partic-

A Pluralistic Higher Education Institution…

is characterized by diversity of thought, attitudes, and cultures.

Kermit L. Hall, Utah State University

The newly remodeled Cesar Chavez Student Center on the campus of San Francisco State University.

ipants defined it. In some cases, institutions mirrored the complexity of their community, with all its attendant tensions. At the same time, leaders present in Salzburg recognized the imperative of transcending these differences by providing opportunities for institutional learning. They stressed the need to create a kind of laboratory within their institutions to deal with the conflicts of identity that prevail outside its walls. In so doing, they often were able to address these conflicts and tensions by enabling members of the academic community to change their perspective to a more holistic and long-term view of the community. Additionally, they could capitalize on these differences by using them to further their communities' economic and social development.

The group defined several overlapping roles of the higher education institution: as a forum for debate, as a crossroads of cultures, and as a partner with its community. As *a forum for debate*, the institution fulfills its educational mission of providing a safe space for disagreement and acceptance of difference. These debates, however, risk accentuating the differences among members of the campus community and reducing group identity to a single attribute–the Muslim, the Jew, the Serb, the female, or the disabled.

As *a crossroads of cultures*, a higher education institution seeks common ground to unite differences. It does so by focusing not on single characteristics of individuals or their cultures (be they ethnic, social, linguistic, cultural, or political), but on their common human rights and characteristics. In this way, the institution builds on differences that distinguish people from one another but do not imprison them within a single attribute.

As *a partner with its community*, the institution takes advantage of its internal diversity to enrich and stimulate social renewal. It serves as a catalyst for possible changes in society as a whole.

THE INSTITUTION AS A FORUM FOR DEBATE: SAN FRANCISCO STATE UNIVERSITY

To the extent that higher education around the world asserts a common set of core values, the free expression of diverse ideas and viewpoints is perhaps the most frequently cited and deeply cherished academic ideal.

Yet this paradigm is often difficult to realize in real life. Students and faculty bring their passions and ideologies to the campus, and discourse is not always civil. While the saga of San Francisco State University (SFSU) is

not typical of most North American or European campuses, it provides a rich case study of what can happen when events test the limits of free speech and challenge the notion that disagreement on a university campus can be contained within the boundaries of civility. It also demonstrates how difficult it is to separate the passions and action of campus actors from those of the larger community, and of the world.

In a brief presentation to the seminar participants, SFSU President Robert Corrigan described the campus when he assumed the presidency in 1988. The memory of the longest strike of faculty and students in the history of U.S. higher education was still alive on campus 20 years later; to be certain, the campus had been permanently changed by the student activism and racial strife of the 1960s. Anti-Semitism was a continuing issue, to some extent fuelled by the anti-Zionism of some Jewish faculty. SFSU had the first black studies program in the United States, and when Corrigan arrived, the campus suffered from ongoing tensions between sets of racial and ethnic student groups: Koreans and Filipinos, Japanese and Chinese, Arab Americans and Jews.

Shortly after his arrival, he established a Commission on Human Relations and charged it with studying how the campus community (students, faculty, staff, and administration) deals with human relations, both inside and outside the classroom, focusing on tensions that arise from interactions involving race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, disability, or religion. In its final report, the committee made a series of recommendations that included creating a cabinet-level officer for human relations, conducting workshops on diversity, strengthening curricular requirements focusing on issues of pluralism, increasing efforts to attract and retain ethnic minority students, and adopting "Principles of Good Conduct for a Multicultural University." As Corrigan noted, the value of this exercise was found not only in these recommendations and their subsequent implementation, but also in the fact that "the commission put issues on the table that caused people to reexamine their values. It spotlighted the importance of working toward respect and understanding of all segments of our exceptionally diverse campus."[23]

Fast forward to 1994 and the firestorm created by a mural of Malcolm X, a leader of the black Muslim movement of the 1960s. Commissioned by the student-run governing board of the student union, the mural was to be painted on a wall near the

…when Corrigan arrived, the campus suffered from ongoing tensions between sets of racial and ethnic student groups…

student union, next to a mural of Cesar Chavez, the nationally known leader of the California farm workers union. The mural of Malcolm X, which had not been reviewed and approved by a student-based group, as required by university procedures, contained anti-Semitic images. When the news of the contents of the mural leaked out, the telephone calls, letters, and faxes came to the president's office by the hundreds, and the media

descended on campus. Corrigan immediately issued a statement indicating that this was not a free speech issue, but a matter of what a public university would allow as a permanent art installation on a publicly owned building.

Corrigan also saw that the crisis provided an opportunity for learning, and he decided to give the students a chance to resolve the crisis themselves. The president brought a team

CANADIAN CAMPUSES FACE CONFLICT OVER THE MIDDLE EAST[24]

On September 9, 2002, the Canadian media portrayed Concordia University's Hall Building, in downtown Montreal, as divided between two high-voltage factions. One of the factions was Hillel, Concordia's Jewish student association, which had invited former Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu to speak. The other group was made up of pro-Palestinian activists, outraged that the right-wing Israeli politician was being given a forum at their university. Across Canada and the United States, the public saw shocking images of riot police pushing back an angry mob and then the massive, plate-glass window façade being smashed, an act that led the university to cancel Netanyahu's appearance. How could this Canadian university, a bastion of civil discourse since the 1960s, succumb to such violence? The Concordia administration was criticized by all sides—for allowing Netanyahu to speak in the first place, for canceling the speech when the situation heated up, and for being both too tough and too lenient with the protestors. Concordia's Board of Governors immediately imposed a "cooling-off period"

(also much criticized), during which time no public meetings, speeches, exhibits, installations, information tables, or posters dealing with Israeli-Palestinian issues were permitted. All university clubs also were banned from setting up information tables in the Hall Building lobby. Five months later, the Concordia administration issued a report outlining strategies to ensure a peaceful and safe campus, clearer rules for acceptable advertising of events, new committees to implement the plan, and a strategy to deal with the students who had been involved in the riot. Some of these students had been charged by police and had stood before a tribunal of their university peers in closed hearings to determine their punishment. Penalties ranged from community service to expulsion from the university. In the midst of the hearings, the pro-Palestinian student union leadership (since replaced in an election) tried to ban Hillel as a campus group, and Hillel, in return, launched a lawsuit against the student union.

A year and half later, Concordia is finding a successful balance within its community. Charles Bertrand, known for

together to mediate, hoping either for a decision by the artist to remove the offending aspects, or for the student union governing board to withdraw the mural. Neither happened, and the mural was unveiled. After a few days of angry protests on campus, and the presence of media waiting for news-worthy drama, Corrigan announced that the mural would be painted over. He continued to speak out about hate-ful speech and behavior, and reminded the public–as well as the vast majority of students who repudiated such behavior–of SFSU's central role as a place of debate, not hate.

SFSU weathered the events of September 11, 2001, calmly, and like other U.S. presidents, Corrigan took the opportunity to make strong public statements affirming the university's commitment to free speech, mutual respect, and the promotion of peace on campus. However, another crisis

his no-nonsense approach to conflict resolution, was appointed vice-rector for student life and interim dean of stu-dents. In late March 2003, the student body decisively voted for a new slate of executives for the Concordia Student Union, with a 47 percent increase in voter turnout from the general election a year earlier.

"I think we have to be less naïve," Bertrand said. "We live in Canada, where everyone has the right to speak, but there are people who want to destabilize the debate." The university must provide a forum for open discussion, he argued, but it also must enforce existing rules and regulations regarding behavior on campus, to ensure that "nothing crosses the line into hate." If that means moni-toring posters and information tables, and diffusing potentially violent situations by banning certain people from campus, he added, that will happen, even if "the university is loathe to do it."

Events at Concordia were a wake-up call to Canadian universities, particularly those in larger cities with diverse popu-lations, alerting them to the challenges of protecting freedom of speech for all

voices. What restrictions, if any, could they place on the right of members of the university community to speak their minds, even when what they say gravely offends some other members of that community?

Concordia was not the only institu-tion where tensions played out and free speech became an issue. Both Muslim and Jewish students and faculty on several campuses complained of feeling intimidated. A professor at the Université du Québec in Montreal who had written in defense of Israel was blocked from entering his classroom when student protesters chanted anti-Israeli and per-sonally defamatory slogans. Jewish stu-dents felt intimidated to speak their view of the right of Israel to exist. In February 2003, a Jewish student association at York University invited Daniel Pipes, an American academic whose web site lists faculty members reported to him as being anti-Israeli, to speak. The highly politicized visit was rescheduled by uni-versity officials to a venue with tight security. Amid protests, Pipes' presenta-tion sparked extraordinary discussion and debate.

flared up in the following year, this time over tensions between Arab-American and Jewish students concerning the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. In March and April 2002, hostile but non-violent rallies erupted on campus. Two events, however, marred the spring. The dissemination of a flyer containing anti-Semitic language provided a flashpoint for conflict on campus, re-igniting the issue of hate speech at SFSU. Once again, Corrigan was on the front lines, ensuring the removal of the flyers by students and staff and speaking forcefully against hatred. Emotions peaked on May 7, when an event sponsored by students in Hillel ended in a non-violent but threatening confrontation between pro-Israeli and pro-Palestinian students. One faculty member, head of SFSU's Jewish Studies programs, wrote an emotional account of that event that, among other things, described the university as "a place that teaches anti-Semitism, hatred for America, and hatred, above all else, for the Jewish State of Israel." He likened the campus to the Weimar Republic, "with brown shirts it cannot control." The account was sent by e-mail to colleagues around the nation, and soon was posted on a number of widely read web-logs. Corrigan found himself condemned by both sides, for

…higher education is no haven from intolerance and incivility. Indeed, it is a microcosm of the conflicts boiling around it…

either doing too much or too little, deluged by both supportive and threatening e-mails from around the world, and scrutinized by the media. He met with student and community groups, sought to educate the media, and once again, convened a task force on inter-group relations, which he charged with developing a long-term action plan to address the conflict at hand. The task force had a two-month time frame to complete its work.

The process of healing and education began with commencement ceremonies at the end of May 2002, with the invocation delivered by both a rabbi and the president of the Islamic Society of San Francisco. Other initiatives to address campus conflict included a retreat for SFSU student leaders on improving campus climate, and workshops for faculty to help them facilitate classroom discussions on turbulent world issues. At the recommendation of the task force, the following academic year was designated the "Year of Civil Discourse" with a comprehensive schedule of forums on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and related issues concerning inter-group relations, U.S. policy, and workshops on activism and free speech in a climate of civility.

As the events of SFSU illustrate, higher education is no haven from

intolerance and incivility. Indeed, it is a microcosm of the conflicts boiling around it, and students do not leave their passions or prejudices at the door. The SFSU case highlights several lessons that illuminate the complexity of the pluralistic campus.

First, no campus is an island. The concept of campus as forum requires a broad definition of whom the forum serves and who participates. The tensions among student and faculty groups mirror those in the surrounding community and larger society. The campus is a microcosm of society, a laboratory for modeling disagreement, and a parade ground for debaters to demonstrate commitment to their cause. While the spotlight may shine on campus activities, the actors are deeply connected to the world beyond. Furthermore, the university's borders–both physical and virtual–are highly permeable. Thanks to media coverage and the Internet, the SFSU conflicts were hardly a campus matter; they were exposed to the broader community. As technology matured, the hundreds of faxes turned into thousands of e-mails, and it was possible for students, community members, alumni, and the public to follow events and participate in the debate online.

A second lesson centers on the nature of the debate: There are limitations to the "let's agree to disagree" approach that underpins multiculturalism. Can this forum really expect people to set aside their passions, their moral choices, their "urgencies," as Fish put it, and consider them no different from the urgencies of their opponents?[25] The kind of passions and views that fuelled the various explosions at SFSU were hardly the kind that could have been easily tamed into a polite discussion. The challenge for leaders, then, is to understand and manage these paradoxes, neither condoning reprehensible views by silence, nor silencing the debate.

A third lesson, perhaps the most obvious, is that leadership–by presidents and many others–matters. The active presence of President Corrigan played a key role in keeping all parties talking; disseminating accurate information to the campus community and beyond, in an effort to dispel the countless rumors that emerge from such conflicts; and communicating with the media, community groups, and on-campus constituencies. He depended on a leadership team that brought experience in student affairs, media relations, and legal issues, among others. But others must assume leadership roles as well: students, community members, faculty, and staff. The conflict over the Malcolm X portrait might have ended differently had the student leaders worked out a solution that did not force the administration to paint over the mural. At every turn of events, leaders can escalate or de-escalate matters, or they can seek to avoid further conflict.

Clashes around the Arab-Israeli conflict are unlikely to diminish in the near future, although at times they may be quiescent. Thus, the continual challenge for campus leaders is to strive to create an atmosphere that is both open and civil, and to ensure that all students and faculty feel safe to be who they are and to express their opinions. But, to quote SFSU President Robert Corrigan, "Hate speech is not free speech." Campuses are not safe from the pathologies of the societies that created them.

A Pluralistic Higher Education Institution…

respects a search for truth that is pursued by many voices, in many cultures, in several languages, and across the boundaries that too often divide the human family.

PETER MACKINNON, University of Saskatchewan

THE UNIVERSITY AS A CROSSROADS OF CULTURES: BABES-BOLYAI UNIVERSITY

The transformation of Babes-Bolyai University in Cluj, Romania, illustrates how a higher education institution can strive to model an inclusive, multicultural society. Today, the university serves as a crossroads of cultures in a region with a long history of varied ethnic and linguistic groups whose mutual mistrust often created political havoc.

Transylvania is indeed a crossroad region of southeast Europe, where Romanians, Hungarians, and Germans have fought over the centuries to control a mountain region bordering the

Babes-Bolyai University's beginning dates back to 1581, when a university was founded in Cluj.

Ottoman Empire. Jews and Roms (Gypsies) also have long been important minorities in the area. Depending on the ruling group, higher education was conducted in German, Hungarian, or Romanian. After World War II, two universities existed in Cluj, Janos Bolyai for the Hungarians and Victor Babes for the Romanians; these institutions merged in 1956. The Ceausescu regime, however, slowly reduced the importance of the Hungarian section of the merged university, thus allowing the Romanian section to dominate. The December 1989 revolution provided the stage for young Romanian professors to issue a manifesto for university reform, requesting recognition of the rights of the Hungarian community and multicultural activities at the university.

The political changes in Romania created an opportunity for the new rector, Andrei Marga, to lead the institution in new directions, specifically to abandon ethnic quotas that had been supported by a fierce nationalism. This nationalism led to the balkanization of the institution, with each group fighting for its own interests. This internecine warfare provided the government with opportunities to exert the kind of control it had prior to the 1989 revolution. In 1995, the university adopted a charter reorganizing the institution into three languages of study–Romanian, Hungarian, and German. In so doing, the university recognized its inheritance of the academic history of Transylvania as a whole. This opening to a multicultural and multilingual institution led to massive growth–from 5,800 students in 1989 to some 41,000 students in 2003.

The transformation of Babes-Bolyai University highlights the question of how higher education institutions can foster the development of an open and inclusive society beyond their walls by embracing shared norms within them. The University of Bilgi in Istanbul faces this same dilemma; Turkey's secular policies forbid women from wearing the Islamic veil on university premises. Thus, the uni-

versity faces the question of how it can persuade students to set aside such symbols of their religious affiliation to support the shared norms of the community over individual expression. Can this be accomplished, asked Turkish rector Lale Duruiz, by convincing students that this approach is best for society, rather than by pressure or exclusion?

In response, Marga explained that Babes-Bolyai University chose to create a diverse student body not through quotas reflecting the power structure in the larger society, but rather by basing admission on individual merit. Because reform focused on the rights of individuals to access education, group identity was de-emphasized and inter-community conflicts were in fact reduced. All those interested in entering the university and contributing to the province's cultural development—including Jews, Roms, and Ukrainians—made Transylvanian cultural diversity an asset rather than a disadvantage.

To succeed, conditions and procedures also had to change. For instance,

THE ROMA MINORITY IN CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE

According to a March 2004 article in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, "By any standard, the Roms of Central and Eastern Europe are a disenfranchised minority."[26] Roms account for some 10 percent of the population in Slovakia, 5 to 6 percent in Hungary, and 3 percent in the Czech Republic. Hungarian government figures show that while 90 percent of Hungarian students start secondary education, fewer than one-third of Roma children do the same, and only 4 to 5 percent of them complete it. Estimates by the Hungarian Ministry of Education put the number of certified Roma teachers at five to 10, out of a total population of 110,000.

Raising the educational level of Eastern and Central Europe's Roma population is especially important in light of the accession of several countries with significant Gypsy populations to the European Union. Unless the economic and educational prospects of the Roms improve, those countries are unlikely to be included in the EU's agreements for the free movement of labor.

The task is monumental. Roma communities are extremely poor, socially marginalized, and, in some countries, tracked into separate school programs. Six hundred of Hungary's 3,500 elementary schools maintain special Roma programs. While they are designed to provide remedial instruction, these programs have been unsuccessful in raising the educational attainment of their students. Roma students in Central and Eastern European countries are far more likely than other students to be placed in schools for the mentally retarded, often because of their poor skills in the dominant national language.

Thus, increasing the number of Roma university graduates requires a massive effort to address the social and economic issues that prevent them from making it through the educational pipeline. Additionally, the Roma are not a single group; they belong to various groups with different languages. As is often the case in addressing complex problems, one size never fits all.

the Ministry of Education had to grant greater autonomy to the university so that it could develop its identity on its own terms. In 1998, a shift to lump sum budgeting reinforced the institution's ability to be proactive. Moreover, linguistic requirements that once permitted the university to exclude students arbitrarily were replaced by admissions criteria based on students' secondary school marks. The new procedures were easier to accept in light of the overall growth of the university, as the number of places for the traditional curriculum offered in Romanian and Hungarian grew. This also allowed for the development of curricula taught in German and Hebrew. Pluralism was further reinforced by offering tenure to teaching staff from Hungary, Germany, or any other democratic country and by selecting academic leaders according to criteria linked to management and administrative competencies, rather than age and language.

In short, Babes-Bolyai University proposed a reconfigured set of rules for managing cultural pluralism, thus setting an example in a local community still divided by ethnic identification. In a way, the institution was reinventing usual behavior, showing that a multicultural society does not necessarily breed chaos and conflict. A pluralistic culture, it indicated, resulted from trusting—not controlling—citizens. For David Ward, president of the American Council on Education, this was a good example of an institutional arrangement that created *connected* space in which people were free to interact. For Robert Giroux, president of the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, the Cluj

example evoked Canadian codes of conduct for a pluralistic society: freedom of behavior and speech on a personal level, transforming the individual into a responsible citizen.

Of course, the actions of Babes-Bolyai University also had some far-reaching repercussions. A new national law granted autonomy to all institutions and resulted in differentiated institutional missions and profiles. The prospect of such institutional differentiation led to some opposition, mainly from smaller and less enterprising universities, so that in 2002, a new public finance bill was passed that once again reduced institutional autonomy. The new bill required the Ministry of Education to approve universities' financial expenditures, whether government funds or those privately earned. Within the university, some nationalists also sought to block social innovation and the institution's evolution into a multi-polar cultural organization. However, this proved to be a lost cause, because students and professors at Babes-Bolyai had already espoused the new perceptions, processes, and trends of multicultural change. Most rejected the defensive attitudes underpinning monocultural views and promoted multicultural understanding. Today, Babes-Bolyai University encourages members of its community to embrace cultural diversity as an advantage, and to view it as a means of ongoing enrichment and institutional improvement.

In assessing the university's success in fostering a multicultural environment, Marga cited four pieces of evidence. First, the university has increased the size and diversity of its student body. Second, since 1993,

no student or faculty member has filed a complaint concerning ethnic discrimination. Third, the rector described a new climate of multiculturalism, reflected in new academic work and publications. Fourth, a series of external evaluations have corroborated that Babes-Bolyai has become a focus for political change in the region.

For the Salzburg participants, Babes-Bolyai illustrated the ability of universities to serve an *integrative*

function, enhancing cultural identities by considering them from humanistic and individual points of view. At the center of the system is the free and responsible human being, whose attributes–whether Hungarian, Romanian, or German–are secondary to his or her essence as a citizen of the community. Viewed this way, the institution becomes a true *crossroads of cultures*, an autonomous entity that thrives on differences.

THE INSTITUTION AS A PARTNER WITH ITS COMMUNITY: BOLTON INSTITUTE

In his essay on the social responsibility of higher education, background reading for the seminar, William Sullivan noted that, as "advocates of civic engagement remind us, campuses educate their students for citizenship most effectively to the degree that they become the sites for constructive exchange and cooperation among diverse groups of citizens from the larger community."[27] The Bolton Institute in Lancashire in the United Kingdom provided a case study of such an engaged institution. Situated in northwest England, Bolton is a historical center of the first industrial revolution, when Lancashire was a manufacturing area where cotton was woven, cut, and designed for the world markets. Lancashire's development has been deeply influenced by the ups and downs of the textile industry in Britain and Europe. Today, the area supports a low-wage economy, but is open and willing to experiment with new reindustrialization processes.

Higher education represents a key tool for such development. Indeed, from the early 19th century, educational opportunities for working people were considered essential to the prosperity of industrial regions. In 1824, the town of Bolton opened a Mechanics Institute that addressed the needs of the textile economy, enabling workers to upgrade their learning in drawing, weaving, pattern design, and various branches of related fields. A century later, the University of Manchester provided university extension lectures in Bolton, thus enhancing the town's academic status. After World War II, its landscape was further enriched, when a new Training College for teachers of technical and commercial subjects was added to the older Technical College and the College of Art. In 1963, the Technical College established the Bolton Institute of Technology to develop a true university environment, offering a

Bolton Institute includes a home for technical textiles companies on its campus.

wide variety of subjects such as languages, business, philosophy, sociology, mechanical engineering, the visual arts, psychology, and literature.

In 1982, all these institutions merged into the Bolton Institute, which received its "taught degree" awarding powers in 1990 and research degree awarding powers in 1994 (the equivalent of university status).[28] However, the institution remains true to its past by constant cross-fertilization of theory and practice and deep engagement with economic, professional, and social communities.

The Bolton Institute recently adopted a positioning statement that proposes a vision for the institute's role in society and describes a set of strategies to achieve this vision. Faculty members, staff, and students consider being "hands-on" within the community and "innovation-driven" in research and education as the core elements of a new breed of university, in which the pluralism of people, situations, and ideas is the starting point for engagement with the social, economic, and political life of the community. The institute does not claim that the goals it has set are appropriate for all universities, but that they are correct for Bolton and exemplify a new generation of universities that works more closely with their constituencies

and communities to meet their needs. Bolton aims to serve the individual student while developing the capacity to promote change and growth among its stakeholder communities.

As Mollie Temple, the principal at Bolton, noted in Salzburg, "[T]he institute represent[s] the social context in which it finds itself, thus bringing to the community the questions that it may not even raise itself." For example, a recent study conducted by Bolton for the local government authority on the feasibility of creating a cultural zone within the town has presented many challenging and exciting possibilities for the future of Lancashire. The institute is leading a project to provide value-added economic activity within an Innovation Zone across the most disadvantaged districts in the area. Current research also is investigating ways to improve the health and economic status of local minority ethnic communities.

Bolton's student body mirrors the pluralism of the surrounding community. Seventy percent of its students enter the institution without the normal academic A-level qualification. Forty-six percent belong to lower socioeconomic groups. Nearly half are part-time, and more than half are adult students. Twenty percent are non-white, and 11 percent are from countries outside Europe. To serve this diversity, Bolton brings its courses to the community; 20 percent of its full-time students study in the workplace.

In light of Bolton's close connection to community needs, it is no surprise that its curriculum and pedagogy are

grounded in practice. Faculty are actively engaged in research, working with partners to develop knowledge, not simply applying existing knowledge to community problems and issues. This concept of engaged research considerably differs from the traditional model, bringing the community in as active partner rather than mere recipient of the knowledge generated by researchers. For example, a current project of the institute's Centre for Materials Research and Innovation seeks to improve the efficacy of wound dressings by creating "smart" materials that adapt to the healing stage of the wound. The research team, which includes nursing and psychology faculty members, is using the clinical practices of institute staff and students who are in local hospitals to help guide the project.

Another example of engagement with the community is a project of Bolton's Department of Product Design to incorporate the needs of disabled users into the design of household products. The department has a longstanding partnership with Remploy, a respected and well-known furniture manufacturer, which employs mostly disabled workers and is the partner in the current project. Similarly, Bolton's Department for Construction is undertaking a national research project to identify the edu-

cation and training needs of disabled workers in the building industry. This industry has been inaccessible to disabled people in the past and the project has both practical and awareness-raising objectives. Again, the partners include industry representatives, disabled people, and other education providers.

Engagement is central to teaching and research at the Bolton Institute. This engagement permits Bolton to make a real contribution to social and economic development and, at the same time, to be responsive to the "market"—insofar as the market reflects local industry needs and job development. Bolton embodies the values that Sullivan believes to be endangered in higher education today. He is sharply critical of professions that have sought legitimacy by emphasizing the "specialized, expert knowledge and skills they provide in the market" at the expense of "stressing the social importance of the knowledge they provide and the functions they perform of the community."[29] The same values and behaviors can be attributed to institutions, which are susceptible to being increasingly driven by the market, rather than by their own sense of higher purpose. Bolton believes it is possible to be successful in the marketplace while

Bolton aims to serve the individual student while developing the capacity to promote change and growth among its stakeholder communities.

continuing to engage in self-critical, socially useful learning and knowedge creation. Many students and constituent groups have a practical motive for seeking institute services. It is the task of the Bolton Institute to ensure that critical, reflective practice and engagement infuse pedagogic, research, and corporate activities.

Bolton's successes in seeking academic excellence for vocationally oriented education illustrates an important lesson derived from a pluralistic society: There is no single model of excellence. Bolton has not modeled itself along the lines of the classical university, but it prizes excellence in teaching, relevance to the larger society, and research and inquiry that advances its ability to fulfill its mission.

Conclusion

As the lengthy list of the dimensions of pluralism created by the seminar participants illustrated, the Salzburg meeting could have explored many different roles played by higher education institutions in a pluralistic society. Instead, the conversation focused on institutions as organizational actors, communities of students, faculty, and stakeholders, and as models for the larger society.

As institutions, they participate in internal and external dialogues—conversations that are not mutually exclusive, as shown by the three institutional case studies; they complement and support one another. However, the need for common understanding and joint positions inside or outside the university changes according to the issues at hand, the cultural context, and the moment in time.

One dimension of the dialogue and engagement with groups outside the institution that was also pervasive in Salzburg was the international one. For many institutions represented at the seminar, global engagement was essential to education in a pluralist world. The relatively scant attention paid to internationalization in this essay is by no means a reflection of its relative importance. The topic, rich and complex unto itself, has been analyzed in many other publications and venues. But it is worth noting, even in passing, that the Salzburg conversation richly illustrated that fostering pluralism inside the university and connecting to the pluralism of its surrounding community or the larger world require similar approaches. These approaches are characterized by openness and flexibility, a clear sense of purpose, and institutional self-confidence. Openness and flexibility permit institutions to gather people and opinions, problems and programs. One might call this the *inclusive institution*. Purpose and confidence allow the multiplicity of topics, views, and commitments that makes the university more than the sum of its parts, and that gives the institution an individual identity and the capacity to transcend divisions in order to act as a whole—creating the *coherent institution*. Creating an institution that is both inclusive and coherent, that serves its

A Pluralistic Higher Education Institution…

celebrates differences and individualities while strengthening its affiliation with the community and channeling diversity toward common purposes.

Andrée Sursock,
European University Association

people and its purpose, requires inspired leadership, strong institutional autonomy, and clear personal integrity from staff and students.

The challenge to higher education institutions in a pluralist society is both to be responsive to the needs of society while also anticipating those needs and to create a path to new ways of being, doing, and thinking. To do both, institutions must confront their own assumptions and those widely shared in the larger society. They must ask themselves difficult questions about their goals, strategies, and accomplishments, so that they can propose early solutions to the problems emerging from a continually changing and increasingly complex world. If the first few years of the 21st century are any indication of the future, the defining challenge for the globe will be to create and sustain peaceful pluralist communities, nations, and regions. History has shown how daunting that challenge can be, and the astronomical cost of failure. The stakes are high for higher education and for the globe.

Transatlantic Dialogue Participants

Salzburg Seminar
Salzburg, Austria
June 2003

CANADA

Robert J. Giroux, *President and CEO*
Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada

Robert Lacroix, *Recteur*
Université de Montréal

Peter MacKinnon, *President and Vice-Chancellor*
University of Saskatchewan

Bonnie Patterson, *President and Vice-Chancellor*
Trent University

UNITED STATES

Sharon Stephens Brehm, *Chancellor*
Indiana University

Robert A. Corrigan, *President*
San Francisco State University

Augustine P. Gallego, *Chancellor and CEO*
San Diego Community College District

Madeleine F. Green, *Vice President and Director, Center for Institutional and International Initiatives*
American Council on Education

Kermit Hall, *President*
Utah State University

Alex B. Johnson, *President*
Metropolitan Campus, Cuyahoga Community College

Bette E. Landman, *President*
Arcadia University

Juan E. Mestas, *Chancellor*
University of Michigan-Flint

M. Lee Pelton, *President*
Willamette University

Robert A. Scott, *President*
Adelphi University

Graham B. Spanier, *President*
Pennsylvania State University

David Ward, *President*
American Council on Education

EUROPE

Andris Barblan, *Secretary General*
European University Association

Rinaldo Bertolino, *Rector*
Università degli Studi di Torino

Lale Duruiz, *Rector*
Istanbul Bilgi University

Roderick Floud, *Vice Chancellor*
London Metropolitan University

Eric Froment, *President*
European University Association

Andrei Marga, *Rector*
Babes-Bolyai University

Maria Helena Vaz de Carvalho Nazaré, *Rector*
Universidade de Aveiro

Andrée Sursock, *Deputy Secretary General*
European University Association

Mollie Temple, *Principal*
Bolton Institute

Christina Ullenius, *Rector*
Karlstad University

Luc E. Weber, *Former Rector and Professor*
Université de Genève

Lesley Wilson, *Secretary General*
European University Association

Georg Winckler, *Rector*
University of Vienna

Frans Zwarts, *Rector*
Rijksuniversiteit Groningen

HOSTS FROM THE SALZBURG SEMINAR

Jochen Fried, *Director, Universities Project*
Salzburg Seminar

Hélène Kamensky, *Coordinator, Russian Program Universities Project*
Salzburg Seminar

Olin Robison, *President*
Salzburg Seminar

Notes

[1] For a report on the seventh Transatlantic Dialogue, see Green, M., Eckel, P., and Barblan, A. (2001). *The brave new world of higher education: A transatlantic view.* Washington, DC: American Council on Education. http://www.acenet.edu.

[2] Ash, T. G. (2003, February 13). Anti-Europeanism in America. *New York Review of Books*, 50 (2).

[3] The Bologna process refers to a 1999 agreement of 30 European ministers of education to create common degree structures in Europe, enabling European students to move more freely among those institutions, making European higher education institutions more attractive to students outside the continent.

[4] Two cases had been brought against the University of Michigan that challenged its use of racial preferences to achieve racial and ethnic diversity in its undergraduate programs and law school. A decision by the U.S. Supreme Court was pending at the time of the June 2003 Transatlantic Dialogue.

[5] (2002, November 2). The longest journey: A survey of migration. *The Economist*, 5.

[6] Jimenez, M. (2003, November 15). 200,000 illegal immigrants toiling in Canada's underground economy. *The Globe and Mail.*

[7] (2003, July). Pour une immigration réussie. *Agenda Social*, 3-4. http://www.europa.eu.int/comm/employment_social/social_agenda6_fr.pdf.

[8] Ibid., 9.

[9] Beauchesne, E. (2003, August 25). New Canadians find it tougher to join Labour Force. *Calgary Herald.*

[10] *The Economist*, 10.

[11] It is difficult to compare statistics from one country to another because of disparate definitions. In Germany, "foreign" refers to anyone in the resident population who is a non-citizen and not of German descent. In the United States, "foreign persons" refers to all foreign-born persons in the resident population, including both naturalized citizens and non-citizens. See Grieco, E. (2002, July 1). *Defining "foreign born" and "foreigner" in international migration statistics.* Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute. http://www.migrationinformation.org/Feature/display.cfm?ID=34.

[12] Federal Statistical Office of Germany. (2003). Population, by sex and citizenship. Wiesbaden: Author. http://www.destatis.de/basis/e/bevoe/bev_tab4.htm.

[13] An immigrant is defined by the French as a person born abroad and of foreign nationality at birth.

[14] Desplanques, G. (2001, June 12). Facts on France: Population of France. http://www.ambafrance-zm.org/5france/ficheanglais/facts/pop_fr.html.

[15] *The Economist*, 5.

[16] Statistics Canada. (2003, May 13). Immigration population by place of birth and period of immigration. http://www.statcan.ca/english/Pgdb/demo25.htm.

[17] Ray, B. (2002). *Canada: Policy legacies, new directions, and future challenges.* Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute. http://www.migrationinformation.org/Feature/display.cfm?ID=20.

[18] Jedwab, J. (2002, February 26). *Immigration and the vitality of Canada's official language communities: Policy, demography, and identity.* Ottawa: Government of Canada.

[19] Suárez-Orozco, C. (2004). Formulating identity in a globalized world. In M. M. Suárez-Orozco and D. B. Qin-Hilliard (Eds.), *Globalization: Culture and education in the new millennium.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

[20] U.S. Census Bureau. QT-P14. *Nativity, citizenship, year of entry, and region of birth, 2000.* Refer to http://factfinder.census.gov and search for "QT-P14."

[21] U.S. Census Bureau. (2004). U.S. interim projections by age, sex, race, and Hispanic origin. http://www.census.gov/ipc/www/usinterimproj/.

[22] Suárez-Orozco, C., op. cit., 197.

[23] Corrigan, R. (1995, Spring). Diversity, public perception, and institutional voice. *Liberal Education*, 20-31.

[24] See Farr, M. (2003, May 14). When cultures collide on campus: Defending free speech in tense times. *University Affairs*; Statistics Canada. Immigration population by place of birth; and Farr, M. (2003, March). Report aims to protect free speech at Concordia. *University Affairs*, 38.

[25] Fish , S. (2000). What's sauce for one goose: The logic of academic freedom. In S. E. Kahn and D. Pavlich (Eds.), *Academic freedom and the inclusive university.* Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

[26] Ibid.

[27] Sullivan, W. (2000) Institutional identity and social responsibility in higher education. In T. Ehrlich (Ed.), *Civic responsibility and higher education* (p. 20). Phoenix, AZ: American Council on Education/Oryx Press.

[28] Not all U.K. higher education institutions have the right to award degrees, either for courses of instruction (taught degrees) or for research.

[29] Sullivan, op. cit., 25.