

Piotr W. JUCHACZ, Karolina M. CERN

In Defence of the Diversity of Faculty Talents

CPP RPS Volume 60 (2013)

Correspondence to the Authors:

Dr Piotr W. Juchacz
Institute of Philosophy
Poznan University
Ul. Szamarzewskiego 89
60-569 Poznan, Poland

Dr Karolina M. Cern
Institute of Philosophy
Poznan University
Ul. Szamarzewskiego 89
60-569 Poznan, Poland

A list of the Center for Public Policy Studies „Research Papers” and other currently published publications is available online at the CPP website
<http://www.cpp.amu.edu.pl/publications.htm>.

Hard copies of the research papers are available upon request

The Center for Public Policy Studies (CPP) is an autonomous research unit of Poznan University, Poland, founded in 2002. It focuses on research in social sciences, mostly through large-scale comparative European and international research projects. Its major areas of interest include: higher education policy and research in national, European and global perspectives; research and development policies; university management and governance; reforming higher education and its legislation in Central and Eastern Europe; higher education and regional development; public services; the processes of Europeanization and globalization; theories of the welfare state; theories of democracy, as well as political and economic transition in European postcommunist countries. See <http://www.cpp.amu.edu.pl/htm>.

The CPP Research Papers Series is intended to disseminate the findings of work in progress and to communicate preliminary research results to the academic community and the wider audience. Papers are subject to further revisions and therefore all comments and suggestions to authors are welcome.

PIOTR W. JUCHACZ, KAROLINA M. CERN

IN DEFENCE OF THE DIVERSITY OF FACULTY TALENTS

„The richness of faculty talent should be celebrated, not restricted. Only as the distinctiveness of each professor is affirmed will the potential of scholarship be fully realized.” (Boyer 1990: 27)

Ernest Boyer

I. Introduction - *The issue of the faulty time*

We would like to introduce this article with a delicious quotation from a piece by Ronald Barnett, emeritus professor of higher education at the Institute of Education (IOE) of the University of London, one of the most recognized British educational scholars. In his article *Being an Academic in a Time-Impoverished Age* Barnett picturesquely describes the time constraints experienced by contemporary academics:

“Today’s academic moves in multiple time frames... There is a class to teach... still some preparation was undertaken the previous evening... in our academic’s mind, too, are insistent thoughts about the deadline in a fortnight’s time by which a research proposal has to be submitted... Prior to that is a further deadline in the next week by which some thoughts on the departmental learning and teaching strategy will have to be put down on paper... Put to one side and half forgotten is a *proforma* to all staff requiring that an assessment be made under more than twenty categories of activity as to how our academic has spent her time during the past time. In addition, our academic is working on a paper for submission to a journal and has committed herself to submitting it in two months’ time... Over a much longer time frame still, our academic harbours thoughts of... a sabbatical term in the Antipodes to help to frame that agenda” (Barnett 2008: 7-8).

This quotation transfer us to the very heart of the current debate on what activities of the professoriate should be most highly prized, namely *the issue of the faulty time* (Boyer 1990: XI). Different obligations described by Barnett generally fall within one of three categories of

faculty activities: research, teaching, or – the most unwelcomed - administrative burdens. But the abovementioned activities by no means exhaust the list of duties conducted by the members of a contemporary faculty. Counselling and advising students or service to the public can be mentioned as additional ones between many others. In this article we undertake the problem of the broad range of faculty activities and the issue of the contestable measures of their evaluation within the institutional framework of a university, which can be summarized by two questions: *What it means to be a scholar at the beginning of the twenty first century? What is the meaning of scholarship itself?* (Boyer 1990: XII, 1)

II. The backdrop of analysis

In 1990 there was a book published, that during the last twenty years has become a classic in the field of higher education research and a source of inspiration for a growing number of scholars around the world developing, broadening and clarifying ideas presented for the first time in this “widely read and widely quoted book in recent years” (Wergin 2006: 37). The book, entitled *Scholarship Reconsidered. Priorities of the Professoriate*, was written by Ernest Leroy Boyer (1928-1995), „a leading proponent of this movement” (Van de Ven 2007: 6) and “major leader in higher education” (Kezar 2005: 44). Although his writings are not well known in Poland, it’s worth emphasizing that at the time of the publication of the abovementioned book Boyer was recognized in the United States as an influential educational public intellectual, and who was connected both with his professional work and public speeches and writings during the previous twenty years. In 1970 he was named chancellor of the State University of New York (SUNY), where he worked for seven years. Already during this time his ideas concerning the disparate role of a faculty and the importance of different kinds of academic scholarship were developing. For example, as chancellor he ”created the rank of ‘Distinguished Teaching Professor’ to emphasize the importance of teaching and learning, not merely research” (Glen *et al.* 2002). In 1977 he was nominated by President Jimmy Carter to become the U.S. Commissioner of Education, which allowed him to gain experience in issues of public education. At the end of 1979 he took up the position of president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching¹, which he served till

¹ The Carnegie Foundation starting in 1973 developed – and subsequently regularly updated - The Carnegie Classification of the Institutions of Higher Education widely used in the studies of higher education institutions: see: <http://classifications.carnegiefoundation.org> ; For an interesting introduction to the history of Classification and its development over the last forty

his death in 1995. During his time at the Carnegie Foundation he initiated research and published several very influential reports on American preschool, primary, secondary and higher education, such as *High School: A Report on Secondary Education in America* (1983), *College: The Undergraduate Experience in America* (1987), *Campus Life: In Search of Community* (1990), *Ready to Learn: A Mandate for the Nation* (1991), *The Basic School: A Community for Learning* (1995), and the last mentioned, but not least *Scholarship Reconsidered. Priorities of the Professoriate* (1990), where he “challenged the current views of faculty priorities and the true meaning of scholarship” (Glen *et al.* 2002). The wide range of interest represented by his writings concerns all levels of education. “His speeches and writings conveyed ideas on education, and are a testimony to the impact that he had on the nation's education system” (Glen *et al.* 2002).

In the present article we will focus only on one dimension of Boyer’s research and writings, namely the issue of different domains of faculty activities within higher education institutions. Although he writes in the context of the American system of higher education, the problems he raises are universal, and especially important in Poland, when the discussion on the evaluation of the performance of the professoriate in different domains of academic activities is just beginning to spark off.

What should be plainly expressed and strongly stressed at the beginning of our presentation of Boyer’s proposal is that his considerations are rooted in the National Survey of Faculty (1989) and numerous findings from that survey not only form the basis for his theses, but are also quoted and presented in the book (over forty pages of appendix contain the results presenting answers to forty two questions sent to nearly 10,000 faculty members, with useable returns numbering 5,450 questionnaires) (Boyer 1990: 127-128).

years, including a short analysis of important changes in classified categories and their labels made in the 2000 edition: see: McCormick *et al.* 2005: 50-57; and The Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education, 2000 Edition, with a Foreword by Lee S. Shulman, The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Menlo Park 2001, retrieved: 5-02-2013:
http://classifications.carnegiefoundation.org/downloads/2000_edition_data_printable.pdf.

III. Boyer's short journey into the history of American higher education: *teaching, service and basic research.*

Boyer while examining the history of American higher education singles out three phases of its development. *The first phase* embraces a model of the colonial college, as for example Harvard College, founded by the puritans in 1636, “with its strong British roots (...) focused on the student - on building character and preparing new generations for civic and religious leadership” (Boyer 1990: 3). During this initial stage of development institutions of higher education were fully dedicated to *teaching*, regarded as the central task of the professoriate, and scholarly achievements played only a background role. Boyer quotes the declaration of Charles W. Elliot from his address during the ceremony of assumption of the presidency of Harvard College in 1869, according to which “the prime business of American professors ... must be regular and assiduous class teaching” (Boyer 1990: 3).

The second phase, still overlapping the first one, started in the first decades of the functioning of a newly established, independent country in 1776. Boyer stresses the shift which took place, from the shaping of characters and developing intellectual and moral abilities to the touched by the faith in tomorrow's “building of a nation” (Boyer 1990: 4). The important changes in the institutional panorama of higher education happened. Firstly, from the beginning of the nineteenth century new kinds of technical schools were founded, namely polytechnics, which openly and clearly defined their role as “the service of business and economic prosperity” (Boyer: 1990: 4). Secondly, a remarkable change took place as an effect of enacting in 1862 by the U.S. Congress of the Land Grant College Act. The land-grant colleges played a crucial role in creating a new mission of the higher education institutions, namely *service* to the common good of the whole country and of all its citizens. Even nowadays, land-grant universities are still in the vanguard of public scholarship that is “scholarship that philosophically and operationally reflects the engagement ideal” (Alter 2005: 462). When numerous land-grant colleges came into existence then access to higher education spread over the broader groups of citizens filling them with a democratic spirit. The second phase was developing during the whole of the nineteenth century and the first four decades of the twentieth century. Boyer stresses that that was a time when *applied research* was spreading and “the faculty's role was energized by determined efforts to apply knowledge to practical problems” (Boyer 1990: 7), but also that this dedication to service was filled by a

moral meaning, because “the goal was not only to *serve* society, but *reshape* it” (Boyer 1990: 6).

The third phase of development of American higher education connected with the third dimension of scholarly activity, namely *basic research*, visibly sprang on the stage during the Second World War, when the professoriate declared “the help of the universities in bringing victory to the nation” (Boyer 1990: 10). As an effect, in the following years the era of federal research grants was launched by the newly established Office of Scientific Research and Development, which operated between 1941 and 1947. Its influence on taking by the universities a decisive *research turn* was crucial. Boyer notices that from the end of the 1940’s to the 1990’s it’s possible to observe - by analyzing national surveys of the faculty - a tendency showing the systematically growing difficulty to achieve tenure without publishing, even in comprehensive and liberal art colleges, where a faculty *hired as teachers* suddenly found themselves in the a position of being *evaluated as researchers* (as put it Theodore Caplow and Reece J. McGee in their book *The Academic Marketplace* from 1958, quoted by Boyer (Boyer 1990: 11)). He calls it *the research climate*, which caused that research “academic priorities that had for years been the inspiration of the few now become the imperative of the many” (Boyer 1990: 10). The changes in universities after the Second World War was more profound and far-reaching, because paradoxically the research turn in faculty evaluation took place during the time of massification of the system of higher education.

But one of the most important decisions was made already three years earlier, when The Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944², known informally as the GI Bill, was enacted. It guaranteed every man and woman who served at least 90 days in the U.S. Army during the Second World War covering the costs of tuition, living expenses and books necessary to enable them to continue education at all needed levels, including higher education. “Within the following 7 years, approximately 8 million veterans received educational benefits. Under the act, approximately 2,300,000 attended colleges and universities, 3,500,000 received school training, and 3,400,000 received on-the-job training. The number of degrees awarded

² The act’s official title: “An act to provide Federal Government aid for the readjustment in civilian life of returning World War II veterans, June 22, 1944”.

by U.S. colleges and universities more than doubled between 1940 and 1950”³. According to the information provided by The United States Department of Veterans Affairs “in the peak year of 1947, veterans accounted for 49 percent of college admissions. By the time the original GI Bill ended on July 25, 1956, 7.8 million of 16 million World War II veterans had participated in an education or training program”⁴. Boyer describes the GI Bill as a watershed act, because it sparked *a revolution of rising expectations* (Boyer 1990: 12), in consequence of which “what was for GIs a privilege became, for their children and grand children, an absolute right. And there’s no turning back” (Boyer 1990: 12).

IV. The Idea of Four Domains of Scholarship

A) Boyer’s fundamental thesis

There are at least three profound statements in Boyer’s book broadly discussed in the state of art. We would like to present and elucidate them in the following section because we find them crucially important for the understanding of what scholarship is, and further, our claim is that Boyer’s three thesis deserve recognition also in the Polish system of higher education.

First, the concept of scholarship should be redefined in the sense of broadening it. More precisely, as incisively articulate is the thesis of John M. Braxton, William Luckey and Patricia Helland, “scholarship should [also] have objectives other than the discovery of new knowledge” (Braxton *et al.* 2002: 14). Such an extension of the concept of scholarship should be understood in terms of the *legitimation* of three other – no less basic neither essential – *objectives* of academic activity instead of circumscribing it to the traditional understanding as solely discovery (Boyer 1990: 16). Thus, Boyer indicates three more sorts of scholarship, equal of discovery in the significance, notably, scholarship of *teaching*, scholarship of *application* and scholarship of *integration*. In other words, he hardly conceives of anything extraordinary new when he refers to academic work, but quite on the contrary, the compelling move in his claim consists in recognizing these four activities as equal to one another. In fact,

³ Quotation from [the](#) webpage ‘The Our Documents’ administrated by The National Archives of the United States where [there](#) are photocopies, transcripts and [a](#) commentary to 100 milestone documents of American history [presented](#), see: <http://www.ourdocuments.gov/doc.php?doc=76> , retrieved 01-02-2013.

⁴ See [more](#) information [on](#) the webpage of The United States Department of Veterans Affairs http://www.gibill.va.gov/benefits/history_timeline/index.html ; retrieved 01-02-2013.

what is quite new is his proposal it is addition to the “trilogy of teaching, application and discovery” the fourth kind of scholarship, that is – integration.

Second, these four forms of scholarship which designate four equally meaningful objectives of professorial work constitute a premises for insisting on the necessary “flexibility in the assessment of faculty scholarly performance” (Braxton *et al.* 2002: 14) which is to be understood as a thesis that the criteria for tenure and promotion should also embrace the breadth and scope in which the realization of the three more academic objectives – teaching, application and integration – than merely discovery proceeds. Put it another way, “in order to recognize discovery, integration, application, and teaching as legitimate forms of scholarship, the academy must evaluate them by a set of standards that capture and acknowledge what they share as scholarly acts” (Glassick *et al.* 1997: 20).

With that regard, crucial in this second of Boyer’s move indicating the necessity for extending a system of rewards and promotion is the distinction he makes between *outcomes* of academic activity and the *processes* that lead to those outcomes, namely scholarly activities themselves which are in need of institutional recognition, too. Paying attention exclusively to measurable outcomes – whichever of the four sorts they are – gets lost in this measurement itself that is blind for the often long and time-consuming, hard and reach in sacrifices ways that skilful and a well prepared, well equipped in knowledge faculty must run through in order to reach these outcomes. Therefore, those criteria that serve for evaluating a faculty that submit to tenure, promotion or reward *should* take into account (i) realization of the four basic objectives of academic work and moreover (ii) include clear recognition of both scholarship (outcome) and scholarly activities (involvement of professional knowledge and skills (Braxton *et al.* 2002: 17-18)), so at the end of a publication it should not be the only nor primary yardstick of any faculty evaluation (Boyer 1990: 34).

Third, stating that at the time he wrote *Scholarship Reconsidered* too narrow a comprehension of the concept scholarship rendered faculty performance and academic institutions imitative (Boyer 1990: 2) instead of letting them be creative and distinctive (Boyer 1990: 54), Boyer acknowledged that the only – or the most fruitful – chance to invert it was to make every institution of higher education proclaim its own scholarly mission (Boyer 1990: 53). This third thesis of Boyer neatly articulates KerryAnn O’Meara in the following words: “colleges and universities and their faculties should emphasize the forms of scholarship most

appropriate to their mission and not try to emulate the faculty roles and rewards at research universities in a quest for prestige” (O’Meara 2005: 257). This thesis entails that although *all* four forms of scholarship and the prescribed to them objectives are recognized as equally important in general and a faculty should be encouraged to undertake *each* of them at each institution (Glassick *et al.* 1997: 10), nevertheless, as it is impossible to perform all of them equally well at least at the same time, so each institution should proclaim its own specific mission with regard to four kinds of scholarship and work out its own specific documents on promotion, tenure and rewards with respect to the declared mission. Here we are: the same cluster of problems is facing faculty in Europe, including Poland, in present times (Kwiek 2013: 97).

Boyer’s invention though does not stop there. Strictly with the idea of an institutional mission is correlated the idea of “a flexible career path” – the idea “to sustain productivity across a lifetime” (Boyer 1990: 51). The same idea is being now clearly stressed in the European context of HE: “attractive higher education system should be able to offer academics competitive career opportunities” (Kwiek 2013: 85). The crux of the matter consists in this case in the appreciation of individual autonomy in defining the career path which may take different turns of interests, accordingly to four kinds of scholarship, as well as to relate on different skills, professional activity and productivity forces during an entire academic lifetime (Boyer 1990: 48). Therefore, Boyer “recommend[s] that colleges and universities develop what might be called *creativity contracts* – an arrangement by which faculty members define their professional goals for a three- to five-year period, possibly shifting from one principal scholarly focus to another” (Boyer 1990: 48). As a result of this proposal, every evaluation of a faculty should be based on the criteria stemming from goals declared in the creativity contract s/he signed up.

The emancipatory force unleashed in this in-depth institutional reform may be understood at least in three terms⁵:

⁵ Of course, changes in the mission must be correlated (and they proceed as such in Europe) by changes in university management and funding (Kwiek 2013: 268). But the issue of **the** kinds of changes is put into question **in** large debates (Olsen 2007; Olsen 2010; Kwiek 2006; Kwiek 2010; Kwiek 2012; Kwiek, Kurkiewicz 2012; Kwiek 2013).

(i) Recognition

Previously performed academic activities – within the trilogy of teaching, discovery and application - accomplished equal general recognition in the sense that what had not been until that time understood nor treated as scholarly activities then, in the early 1990's, occurred to pertain to scholarship as such, so the enhancement of the value of diverse academic performances was observed. It resulted in both dimensions – institutional, wherein assigning a peculiar and unique scholarly mission to the academic institution became much easier; on the other hand for many faculty members all that what they had been doing before not until now obtained the valuable form of scholarship they could be proud of (Bozyk 2005: 95-111)⁶.

(ii) Identity building

Proclaiming a specific mission of the institution released of it and of its faculty too from the imitative or emulate performance of other forms of scholarship than precisely those proclaimed by an institution or/and (as it should be correlated), than those really active wherein, in the sense of those forms of scholarship that used to be practiced within a faculty. As one of the main purposes of Boyer's reform was *dissemination of prestige* into four legitimized kinds of scholarship (and four main objectives), institutions did not have to pretend they were of the sort that they were not in fact. This resulted in institutional / individual differentiation that shed more light on faculty commitments and a valid reward structure and finally on the expected template of scholarly performance⁷.

⁶ Recovering recognition, like in the case of Madonna University described by Dennis Bozyk (Bozyk 2005), occurs to be a quite relevant and urgent problem in the Polish system of HE, too. As Marek Kwiek puts it: "For the time being, most non-elite and demand-absorbing institutions in Europe (and especially private institutions in Central and Eastern Europe) are already teaching-oriented while traditional elite research universities are still able to combine teaching and research. (...) At the same time, institutions are expected to be far more student-centred. Students as university stakeholders are becoming increasingly powerful, also through being reconceptualised as 'clients' by institutions and as a future well-trained graduate labour force by governments" (Kwiek 2012: 39; see also on the issue of those new stakeholders: Kwiek 2010: 106-123; see also Kwiek 2013: 65, 82-83). In further steps Kwiek observes that (i) teaching and research missions are delinking and (ii) in fact only top universities are still capable of really combining the two said missions, (iii) what for basically teaching-oriented universities may signify only constant diminishing in recognition. The point here is, that scholarship of teaching, based on high quality standards, when they do not pretend what it is not, performed by keeping-in-touch with the current findings scholars may recover its recognition as well. But this, in fact, excludes moonlighting in that field (Kwiek 2012).

⁷ In this context Kerry Ann O'Meara presents compelling findings referring to the outcomes of such reforms. She notices that "publication productivity counted more than previously [in general view at all kinds of universities] in institutions that had made formal policy reform,

(iii) Quality of performance improvement

Conceptually four kinds of scholarship have undergone analytical specifications and were correlated with empirical findings achieved in specially designed research projects and served as a tool kit for each sort of scholarship qualitative improvement that, accordingly to Boyer's claims, should be also recognized in setting up criteria for promotion, tenure and rewards in each academic institution.

The abovementioned changes could run only in the aftermath of widely-held discussions and elaboration of four mandates, as named by Boyer, and which are strictly assigned to his thesis.

(i) The first of them we find especially indicative of the profound and professional understanding of the concept of four scholarships by Boyer. He emphatically states that „all faculty should establish their credentials as *researchers* (...), every scholar must (...) demonstrate the capacity to do original research, study a serious intellectual problem, and present to colleagues the results” (Boyer 1990: 27). Such a guarantee of scientific competence each academic researcher gets – at least within the American system of higher education - with writing and defending his dissertation. In the context of the contemporary Polish system of higher education, we could add, it would be obtained with the successful defence of a habilitation thesis. According to Boyer it would be enough to verify the scientific credibility of an academic. We propose to call this moment in the development of a professional career a *threshold of scientific credibility*, which can be different in disparate systems of higher education. After reaching that threshold it should be possible to diversify ways of professional development during the further course of an academic career, since “it is unrealistic (...) to expect *all* faculty members, regardless of their interests, to engage in research and to publish on a regular timetable. For most scholars, creativity Simply doesn't work that way” (Boyer 1990: 27) (on the contradictions to expectations toward academics see: Lucas 2004; Kwiek 2010: 124-128; Kwiek 2013: 62). Moreover, as Marek Kwiek states “globally the academic profession is becoming a predominantly teaching profession” (Kwiek 2012: 38).

which seems curious, until we consider all the baccalaureate institutions that used Boyer's framework to move from a culture where no scholarship was conducted at all to one where some traditional writing was encouraged and rewarded. This finding is consistent with an increase in writing expectations at institutions that formally encouraged multiple forms of scholarship. While these institutions may have expanded the range of acceptable kinds of writing to include products of engagement and teaching scholarship, nonetheless writing in these areas is still considered a rising expectation”: O'Meara 2005: 266-267.

(ii) Every faculty member may then chose the most suitable career path, moreover, s/he may change it during the academic lifetime what seems to be intended by Boyer whilst his analysis of professional kinds of productivity (Boyer 1990: 43-51) at the academia. Nevertheless, whatever is chosen anytime, the whole faculty – understood in terms proposed in the paragraph above - should “stay in touch with developments in their fields and remain professionally alive” (Boyer 1990: 27). Interestingly and quite unwaveringly, in view of Boyer this “staying in touch” is to be understood in other terms than an exhausting “throw” into research activities, participating in a regular timetable of that sort, but rather as “reading the literature and keeping well informed about consequential trends and patterns” (Boyer 1990: 28). Every faculty member should be familiar with the most current and up to date state of art of his/her field and, furthermore, should have his/her own view on the issues in question in the field what s/he should be ready to demonstrate and justify when asked to write on the most current problems.

(iii) “As a third mandate, every faculty member must be held to the highest standards of integrity.” (Boyer 1990: 28) An important explanation, very relevant, Boyer gives to the reader. “It goes without saying that plagiarism, the manipulation of laboratory data, the misuse of human or animal subjects in research, or any other form of deceptive or unethical behavior not only discredits the work of professors, but also erodes the very foundation of academy itself” (Boyer 1990: 28). It perfectly depicts academia as a definitely democratic institution, as a flagship, and the most prominent institution of this sort.

(iv) “Fourth, the work of the professoriate – regardless of the form it takes – must be carefully assessed. Excellence is the yardstick by which all scholarship must be measured.” (Boyer 1990: 28) This term – excellence – introduced in late 1950’s by Robert Merton, which is understood by Boyer in terms of “high performance standards” (Boyer 1990: 28) that Glassick *et al.* take up and put so much emphasis on in order to boost up most of all teaching as a kind of scholarship. We fully endorse the said move that fits the idea we defend in the following article. Interestingly, however, now this term undergoes contestation as conquering the general understanding of academia performance (compare: Peters 2004) under the rationale of the New Public Management and Post-New Public Management reforms that have been biting the Continent (or even the globe) since the 1980’. As Johann P. Olsen articulates the background of NPM, their “reforms have mainly been ‘market-and management’ recipes inspired by neo-liberal economic theory and private management in an era when the *Zeitgeist*

has been anti-political” (Olsen 2010: 9; no less sharply on the merely economic rationale of NPM see also Olsen 2010: 153, 184, 185; on this issue Olsen 2007: 24 where he highlights that the pure utility and calculation based system of institutions becomes “too contingent on circumstance” and therefore unstable, and furthermore, reforms of the NPM do not play attention “at the ethical and moral dilemmas”: Olsen 2007: 143, on this very topic from the view of university reforms in Australia see: Zipin *et al.* 2004). With regard to that we agree with Colin Bundy who states that “universities can and must link education and democracy. They must, because only they can” (Bundy 2004: 174). Thus, not the excellence (at least not all alone) seems to be the primary yardstick of the academic profession indeed.

B) The elucidation of Boyer’s three theses would not be completed without posing some questions concerning the possible discussion on similar reforms in the Polish higher education system, reforms concerning tenure, promotion and reward policy. As Kwiek clearly puts the problem forward “overburdened, overworked, (relatively) underpaid and frustrated academics will not be able to make European universities in general strong and attractive” (Kwiek 2013: 85; on the state of affairs of the HE system in Poland with regard to the four scholarships see a sad diagnosis Kwiek 2010: 380-390; Kwiek 2013: 247). Therefore, we propose below some hints to further and more in depth discussions on the issue.

Q 1: Should the HE system in Poland be comprised of institutions which mission is defined differently according to four domains of scholarship? In other words, should there be a reform consisting in assigning by each university its particular mission put into motion? Is the diversity of Polish universities on the ground of their autonomously chosen and prescribed missions required/possible? (The full view on possible stances on the issue in question in the context of HE reforms in Poland is given by Osiecka-Chojnacka 2009)

Q 2: Should four forms of scholarship be taken into account in each institution of HE in Poland: scholarship of discovery, teaching, application and integration? If yes, then under which conditions?

Reformers from the USA formulate some indicators for their followers that we find quite relevant in the context of our discussion on similar reforms related to tenure, promotion and reward. One of the most prominent is that “While administrative support, cooperation, and leadership are essential in any initiative to redefine scholarship, the actual deliberative and decision-making process should be placed in faulty hands. (...) The entire academic

community must be involved in the deliberative process from start to finish. In short, this must be a genuine exercise in collegiality and community, and it must be clear at the outset that the results of the process have not been predetermined.” (Zahorski 2005: 63) The same idea of setting the whole faculty into deliberation, argumentation formulation and making proposals for the construction of an institution document also in order to strengthen the sense of the community, is vigorously stressed in the state of art (Olsen 2007: 4), because despite it being time-consuming, it still has, on the other hand - as a typically democratic mode of action taking - a greater transformative power for influencing the identities of those affected (Olsen 2007: 64). Therefore, these kinds of reforms provide nothing else but an imprint of *institutional self-reflectivity* pointing at functional, structural, and most profoundly, normative *re-establishing* within the broader democratic framework doing this way simultaneously demands of a democratic polity and a (quasi)autonomous institution justice. Self-reflectivity here means nothing else as keeping on managing stability and change, institutionalization and deinstitutionalization processes, balancing diversity and unity (Olsen 2007). As Richard M. Diamond says that “major change requires a clear institutional vision; leadership from the top; an agreed-upon, institution-specific mission statement; and sensitivity to the unique culture of the institution” (Diamond 2005: 57). The mission cannot be imposed onto the institution neither from the outside, neither from the top-down perspective and faculty involvement is strictly required in that point.

A similar thesis is stated by Marek Kwiek, however, in relation to current reforms to European HE systems. According to Kwiek “the political economy of reforms suggests, though, that no reforms can be successful without the support of at least some groups of academics” (Kwiek 2012: 31). It is to be seen as a consequence of a thesis presumed on the ground of an organization-theory-based institutional approach, that two parallel effects proceed in public institutions including universities: public office-holders influence institutional functioning and institutional functioning affects office-holders’ identities⁸, so at the end of the day, to put it in a nutshell, no reforms may be provided without not only

⁸ “Institutionalization as a process implies that an organizational identity is developed and legitimacy in a culture is built, processes that are usually slow and difficult to dictate. There is increasing clarity and agreement about: (a) behavioural rules and who does what, when, and how; (b) how behavioural rules are to be described, explained, and justified; (c) common vocabulary, expectations, and success criteria; and (d) conceptions of what are legitimate resources in different settings and who should have access to, or control, common resources” Olsen 2010: 37).

acknowledging some behavioural patterns expected to be performed, but in particular, without the accord on the part of those involved for turning them into standards of institutional performance; otherwise any reforms have to but fail (on the relationship between managerialism and collegiality in European universities see: Bundy 2004; Kwiek 2010: 214-234; Kwiek 2013: 274-290; Olsen 2010: 167n).

Braxton, Luckey and Helland advocate that these kinds of institutional reforms shall proceed on three levels: structural, procedural and incorporation (Olsen singles out similar in the content in this very context: a) structuration and routinization, b) standardization, homogenization and authorization of codes of meaning, ways of reasoning and accounts, c) binding resources to values and worldviews: Olsen 2007: 95). On the first of them a crucial role plays “a basic knowledge of the behaviors with the innovation, and those involved understand how to perform the behaviors” (Braxton *et al.* 2002: 5-6; see also Olsen 2010: 38-39; 39-40). From this follows that a faculty must be well acquainted with the kind/-s of scholarship put forward as the mission of their institution as well as they must be capable of meeting the detailed criteria that would follow from this very mission and later on serve as institutional indicators for tenure, promotion and reward. Moreover, as “at the procedural level, behaviors and policies associated with the innovation become standard” (Braxton *et al.* 2002: 6), the abovementioned acquaintance must involve resources (individual and institutional) and skills and capabilities for action taking in order to undergo a transformation into regular, standard behavior.

“The most in-depth level of institutionalization is incorporation, where the values and norms associated with the innovation are incorporated into an organization’s culture. With this normative consensus comes an awareness of how others are performing the behavior as well as an agreement on the appropriateness of the behavior.” (Braxton *et al.* 2002: 7; on the meaning of the normative consensus compare: Olsen 2010: 100, 126-127). As one may see, institutions could be seen as a source of individual identity building, however only when this thesis is being comprehended in the conjunction with the second one, namely that they are themselves also influenced by their office-holders, in this case by the faculty and administrative staff too (Olsen 2010). In the aftermath of these mutual interdependences, one must acknowledge that after the introduction of any reforms both should engage, at least to a certain degree a certain number of faculty members to support them, and secondly their

proceeding may be simply time-consuming as any reshaping of rules- or standards-following usually is.

For this compound reason Braxton, Luckey and Helland agree with Diamond with no hesitation on five profound roles that central administration (provost, the chief academic officer etc.) is supposed to cast during the projecting, proceeding and implementation of such reforms (Braxton *et al.* 2002: 87-88). Firstly, the reshaping of the award system should go hand in hand with the university mission ascription. Secondly, the process of changes must be put into administrative-procedural motion of which, thirdly, central administration must take responsibility. Fourthly, as it was clearly stressed before, that the whole faculty should be encouraged to engage into the deliberative process of restructuring their institution, which improves the whole morale of the community (Glassick *et al.* 1997: 54). Following Olsen we may say that here “reform is understood as occasion for interpretation and opinion formation as much as decision-making”: Olsen: 2007: 182). Naturally, all the time the central administration should monitor the process in order not to slip out of institutional control and a procedural steps pursuit, and thus having decisions made and changes introduced into an institution.

Having all of this in mind we would like to specify the second question (Q2), concerns taking into account the four forms of scholarship, into three sub-questions for further consideration:

Q2 A: Should all four forms of scholarship deserve *equal* recognition for the tenure and promotion no matter what the mission prescribed?

Q2 B: Should all four forms of scholarship be recognized as equal in the Polish system of HE, nevertheless each institution, accordingly to its autonomously assigned mission be free to evaluate some forms of scholarship more than others?

Q2 C: Should all forms of scholarship be equally recognized, however during an academic career each faculty member may or should sign a (two/three/four/five-years) “creativity contract” (agreement) with the institution on which kind of scholarship s/he is most interested in at the particular moment of his/her career, and then, appropriately to the kind of scholarship chosen in the agreement, on which terms would be evaluated as a faculty member during the time stipulated by the contract?

The said subsequent questions address a similar issue to the more general one that was posed by Kwiek: “How far can the differentiation processes within the academic profession go in

following the differentiation processes in higher education systems themselves?” (Kwiek 2012: 32), processes reflected in, among other factors, mission ascription to a university and differentiation, most basically, into research-intensive and teaching or simply teaching-oriented institutions (Kwiek 2010: 381); further, in “possibly salary brackets depending on national classifications or rankings of higher education institutions, with increased opportunities of academic mobility between them” (Kwiek 2013: 85)? Do institutional autonomy in conjunction with the idea of “a segmented mission” form a sufficient grounding for a positive answer (Nazaré 2012: 68, 70-74)?

Thus, there are some big questions stemming from these issues. Who/what matters more in the last case, a faculty member’s autonomous will or the institution’s mission? Should the mission be prescribed by a university or by each *faculty* (Glassick *et al.* 1997: 52) of a university? Nonetheless, one must keep in mind that “too much power given to the departments may lead to the gradual disintegration of the university as a whole” (Kwiek 2013: 277; Olsen 2010: 171).

These problems turn to be very urgent now especially with regard to the quite often conflicting individual and institutional imperatives and in addition in relation to the restated question of university-funding. Therefore, the question of mission ascription to a university or a department and then, on the other hand, on individual scholarly path-taking (creativity agreements signing) involve other profound questions like “how (...) should they be combined, and based on which funding streams (e.g. mostly public or mostly private) – will become crucial in the next decade” (Kwiek 2012: 39; Kwiek 2013: 64).⁹

References

Alter, Theodore R. (2005). “Achieving the Promise of Public Scholarship.” In Peters Scott J., Jordan Nicholas R., Adamek Margaret, Alter Theodore R. (eds.) *Engaging Campus and Community. The Practice of Public Scholarship in the State and Land-Grant University System*. Dayton: Kettering Foundation Press. 461-487.

⁹ The article was prepared as a part of a European Commission’s 7th Framework Programme grant: EduWel - *Education as Welfare. Enhancing opportunities for socially vulnerable youth in Europe* (2009-2013), Marie Curie Initial Training Network (2009-2013).

- Austin, Ann E. and Melissa McDaniels (2006). "Using Doctoral Education to Prepare Faculty to Work Within Boyer's Four Domains of Scholarship." In John M. Braxton (ed), *Analyzing Faculty Work and Rewards: Using Boyer's Four Domains of Scholarship*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass: New Directions For Institutional Research, Wiley InterScience. 51-65.
- Barnett, Ronald. (2008). "Being an Academic in a Time-Impoverished Age." In Amaral Alberto, Bleiklie Ivar, Musselin Christine (eds.) *From Governance to Identity*. Dordrecht: Springer. 7-17.
- Boyer, Ernest L. (1990). *Scholarship Reconsidered. Priorities of the Professoriate*. New York: The Carnegie Foundation for The Advancement of Teaching.
- Bozyk, Dennis (2005). "Redefining the Culture of Scholarship: Madonna University." In KerryAnn O'Meara, R. Eugene Rice (eds.) *Faculty Priorities Reconsidered. Rewarding Forms of Scholarship. Rewarding Multiple Forms of Scholarship*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, A Wiley Imprint. 95-111.
- Braxton, John M. and William Luckey, Patricia Helland (2002). *Institutionalizing Broader View of Scholarship Through Boyer's Four Domains*. San-Francisco: ASHE – ERIC Higher Education Report, Volume 29, No. 2, Wiley Periodicals.
- Bundy, Colin (2004). "Under New Management? A Critical History of Managerialism in British Universities." In Melanie Walker, Jon Nixon (eds.) *Reclaiming Universities from a Runway World*. Glasgow: The Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press. 160-175.
- Diamond, Robert M. (2005) "Scholarship Reconsidered: Barriers to Change." In KerryAnn O'Meara, R. Eugene Rice (eds.) *Faculty Priorities Reconsidered. Rewarding Forms of Scholarship. Rewarding Multiple Forms of Scholarship*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, A Wiley Imprint. 56-59.
- Glassick, Charles E. and Mary Taylor Huber, Gene I. Maeroff (1997). *Scholarship Assessed. Evaluation of the Professoriate. A Special Report*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Glen, R. Bucher and Amber M. Williams and Ernest Boyer (2002). In: *Gale Encyclopedia of Education*; see: <http://www.answers.com/topic/ernest-boyer> (retrieved: 26-01-2013).
- Kezar, Adrianna J. (2005). "Creating a Metamovement. A Vision Towards Regaining the Public Social Charter." In Kezar Adrianna J., Chambes Tony C., Burkhardt John C. (eds.) *Higher Education for the Public Good. Emerging Voices from a National Movement*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kwiek, Marek (2006). *The University and the State. A Study into Global Transformation*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang Verlag.
- Kwiek, Marek (2010). *Transformacje Uniwersytetu. Zmiany instytucjonalne i ewolucyjne polityki edukacyjnej w Europie*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM.
- Kwiek, Marek (2012). "Changing higher education policies: From the deinstitutionalization to the reinstitutionalization of the research mission in Polish universities." *Science and Public Policy* (2012). 1-14.
- Kwiek Marek (2012). "The Growing Complexity of the Academic Enterprise in Europe: A Panoramic View." In Kwiek, Marek and Andrzej Kurkiewicz (eds.) *The Modernisation of European Universities. Cross-National Academic Perspectives*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang Verlag. 27-60.

- Kwiek, Marek and Andrzej Kurkiewicz, eds. (2012). *The Modernisation of European Universities. Cross-National Academic Perspectives*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang Verlag.
- Kwiek, Marek (2013). *Knowledge Production in European Universities. States, Markets, and Academic Entrepreneurialism*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang Edition.
- McCormick, Alexander C., Chun-Mei Zhao (2005). "Rethinking and Reframing the Carnegie Classification." *Change* Volume 37, Number 5, pp. 50-57.
- Nazaré, Maria Helena (2012). "People and Their Ideas: The Foundation for Inclusive European Growth." In Kwiek, Marek and Andrzej Kurkiewicz (eds.) *The Modernisation of European Universities. Cross-National Academic Perspectives*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang Verlag. 61-77.
- Lucas, Lisa (2004). "Reclaiming Academic Research Work from Regulation and Relegation." In Melanie Walker, Jon Nixon (eds.) *Reclaiming Universities from a Runway World*. Glasgow: The Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press. 35-50.
- Olsen, Johan P. Olsen (2007). *Europe in Search of Political Order. An institutional perspective on unity/diversity, citizens/their helpers, democratic design/historical drift and the co-existence of orders*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Olsen, Johan P. (2010). *Governing Through Institution Building. Institutional Theory and Recent European Experiments in democratic Organization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- O'Meara, Kerry Ann (2005). "Effects of Encouraging Multiple Forms of Scholarship Nationwide And Across Institutional Types." In Kerry Ann O'Meara, R. Eugene Rice (eds.) *Faculty Priorities Reconsidered. Rewarding Forms of Scholarship. Rewarding Multiple Forms of Scholarship*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, A Wiley Imprint. 255-89.
- Osiecka-Chojnacka Justyna (2009). „Spory o habilitację – próba analizy debaty.” *Analizy. BAS* 11 (19). 1-13.
- Peters, Michael (2004). "Higher Education, Globalization and the Knowledge Economy." In Melanie Walker, Jon Nixon (eds.) *Reclaiming Universities from a Runway World*. Glasgow: The Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press. 67-82.
- Peters, Scott (2005). "Chapter One: Introduction and Overview." In Scott J. Peters, Nicholas R. Jordan, Margaret Adamek, Theodore R. Alter (eds.) *Engaging Campus and Community. The Practice of Public Scholarship in the State and Land-Grant University System*. Dayton, Ohio: the Charles F. Kettering Foundation. 1-35.
- Rice, R. Eugene (2005). "'Scholarship Reconsidered'. History and Context." In KerryAnn O'Meara, R. Eugene Rice (eds.) *Faculty Priorities Reconsidered. Rewarding Forms of Scholarship. Rewarding Multiple Forms of Scholarship*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, A Wiley Imprint.
- Schulman, Lee S. (2000) "Forward." In *The Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education*.
http://classifications.carnegiefoundation.org/downloads/2000_edition_data_printable.pdf
- Taylor Huber, Marry, Pat Hutchings, Lee S. Schulman (2005). "The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Today." In KerryAnn O'Meara, R. Eugene Rice (eds.) *Faculty Priorities*

- Reconsidered. Rewarding Forms of Scholarship. Rewarding Multiple Forms of Scholarship.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, A Wiley Imprint. 34-38.
- Van de Ven, Andrew H. (2007). *Engaged Scholarship. A Guide for Organizational and Social Research*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Walker, George (2005). "The Scholarship of Discovery." In KerryAnn O'Meara, R. Eugene Rice (eds.) *Faculty Priorities Reconsidered. Rewarding Forms of Scholarship. Rewarding Multiple Forms of Scholarship.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, A Wiley Imprint. 43-46.
- Wergin, Jon F. (2006). "Elements of Effective Community Engagement." In Percy [Stephen L.](#), Zimpher [Nancy L.](#), Brukhard [Mary Jane](#) (eds.) *Creating a New Kind of University. Institutionalizing Community-University Engagement.* Bolton: Anker.
- Zahorski, Kenneth J. (2005). "Redefining Scholarship: A Small Liberal Arts College's Journey." In KerryAnn O'Meara, R. Eugene Rice (eds.) *Faculty Priorities Reconsidered. Rewarding Forms of Scholarship. Rewarding Multiple Forms of Scholarship.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, A Wiley Imprint. 60-65.
- Zipin, Lew and Marie Brennan (2004). "Managerial Governmentality and the Suppression of Ethics." In Melanie Walker, Jon Nixon (eds.) *Reclaiming Universities from a Runway World.* Glasgow: The Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press. 15-34.
- Land-Grant College Act of 1862*, entry in *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, on-line version, see: <http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/392851/Land-Grant-College-Act-of-1862> , retrieved 28-01-2013.
- 'The Our Documents' administrated by The National Archives of the United States where are presented photocopies, transcripts and commentary to 100 milestone documents of American history, see: <http://www.ourdocuments.gov/doc.php?doc=76> , retrieved 01-02-2013.
- The United States Department of Veterans Affairs
http://www.gibill.va.gov/benefits/history_timeline/index.html ; retrieved 01-02-2013.

*Dr Piotr W. Juchacz
Institute of Philosophy
Poznan University, Poland*

*Dr Karolina M. Cern
Institute of Philosophy
Poznan University, Poland*

Papers in the series include the following:

- Vol. 1 (2006) Marek Kwiek, „The Classical German Idea of the University, or on the Nationalization of the Modern Institution”
- Vol. 2 (2006) Marek Kwiek, „The University and the Welfare State in Transition: Changing Public Services in a Wider Context”
- Vol. 3 (2007) Marek Kwiek, „Globalisation: Re-Reading its Impact on the Nation-State, the University, and Educational Policies in Europe”
- Vol. 4 (2007) Marek Kwiek, „Higher Education and the Nation-State: Global Pressures on Educational Institutions”
- Vol. 5 (2007) Marek Kwiek, „Academic Entrepreneurship vs. Changing Governance and Institutional Management Structures at European Universities”
- Vol. 6 (2007) Dominik Antonowicz, „A Changing Policy Toward the British Public Sector and its Impact on Service Delivery”
- Vol. 7 (2007) Marek Kwiek, „On Accessibility and Equity, Market Forces, and Academic Entrepreneurship: Developments in Higher Education in Central and Eastern Europe”
- Vol. 8 (2008) Marek Kwiek, „The Two Decades of Privatization in Polish Higher Education: Cost-Sharing, Equity, and Access”
- Vol. 9 (2008) Marek Kwiek, „The Changing Attractiveness of European Higher Education in the Next Decade: Current Developemnts, Future Challenges, and Major Policy Options”
- Vol. 10 (2008) Piotr W. Juchacz, „On the Post-Schumpeterian "Competitive Managerial Model of Local Democracy" as Perceived by the Elites of Local Government of Wielkopolska”
- Vol. 11 (2008) Marek Kwiek, „Academic Entrepreneurialism and Private Higher Education in Europe”
- Vol. 12 (2008) Dominik Antonowicz, „Polish Higher Education and Global Changes – the Neoinstitutional Perspective”
- Vol. 13 (2009) Marek Kwiek, „Creeping Marketization: Where Polish Public and Private Higher Education Sectors Meet”
- Vol. 14 (2009). Karolina M. Cern, Piotr W. Juchacz, „EUropean (Legal) Culture Reconsidered”
- Vol. 15 (2010). Marek Kwiek, „Zarządzanie polskim szkolnictwem wyższym w kontekście transformacji zarządzania w szkolnictwie wyższym w Europie”
- Vol. 16 (2010). Marek Kwiek, „Finansowanie szkolnictwa wyższego w Polsce a transformacje finansowania publicznego szkolnictwa wyższego w Europie”
- Vol. 17 (2010). Marek Kwiek, „Integracja europejska a europejska integracja szkolnictwa wyższego”
- Vol. 18 (2010). Marek Kwiek, „Dynamika prywatne-publiczne w polskim szkolnictwie wyższym w kontekście europejskim”
- Vol. 19 (2010). Marek Kwiek, „Transfer dobrych praktyk: Europa i Polska”
- Vol. 20 (2010). Marek Kwiek, „The Public/Private Dynamics in Polish Higher Education. Demand-Absorbing Private Sector Growth and Its Implications”
- Vol. 21 (2010). Marek Kwiek, „Universities and Knowledge Production in Central Europe”

- Vol. 22 (2010). Marek Kwiek, „Universities and Their Changing Social and Economic Settings. Dependence as Heavy as Never Before? ”
- Vol. 23 (2011). Marek Kwiek, „Universities, Regional Development and Economic Competitiveness: The Polish Case”
- Vol. 24 (2011). Marek Kwiek, „Social Perceptions vs. Economic Returns from Higher Education: the Bologna Process and the Bachelor Degree in Poland”
- Vol. 25 (2011). Marek Kwiek, „Higher Education Reforms and Their Socio-Economic Contexts: Competing Narratives, Deinstitutionalization, and Reinstitutionalization in University Transformations in Poland”
- Vol. 26 (2011). Karolina M. Cern, Piotr W. Juchacz, „Post-Metaphysically Constructed National and Transnational Public Spheres and Their Content”
- Vol. 27 (2011). Dominik Antonowicz, „External influences and local responses. Changes in Polish higher education 1990-2005”
- Vol. 28 (2011). Marek Kwiek, „Komisja Europejska a uniwersytety: różnicowanie i izomorfizacja systemów edukacyjnych w Europie”
- Vol. 29 (2012). Marek Kwiek, „Dokąd zmierzają międzynarodowe badania porównawcze szkolnictwa wyższego?”
- Vol. 30 (2012). Marek Kwiek, „Uniwersytet jako ‘wspólnota badaczy’? Polska z europejskiej perspektywy porównawczej i ilościowej”
- Vol. 31 (2012). Marek Kwiek, „Uniwersytety i produkcja wiedzy w Europie Środkowej”
- Vol. 32 (2012). Marek Kwiek, „Polskie szkolnictwo wyższe a transformacje uniwersytetów w Europie”
- Vol. 33 (2012). Marek Kwiek, „Changing Higher Education Policies: From the Deinstitutionalization to the Reinstitutionalization of the Research Mission in Polish Universities”
- Vol. 34 (2012). Marek Kwiek, „European Strategies and Higher Education”
- Vol. 35 (2012). Marek Kwiek, „Atrakcyjny uniwersytet? Rosnące zróżnicowanie oczekiwań interesariuszy wobec instytucji edukacyjnych w Europie”
- Vol. 36 (2013). Krystian Szadkowski, „University’s Third Mission as a Challenge to Marxist Theory”
- Vol. 37 (2013). Marek Kwiek, „The Theory and Practice of Academic Entrepreneurialism: Transborder Polish-German Institutions”
- Vol. 38 (2013). Dominik Antonowicz, „A Changing Policy Toward the British Public Sector and its Impact on Service Delivery”
- Vol. 39 (2013). Marek Kwiek, „From System Expansion to System Contraction: Access to Higher Education in Poland”
- Vol. 40 (2013). Dominik Antonowicz, „Z tradycji w nowoczesność. Brytyjskie uniwersytety w drodze do społeczeństwa wiedzy”
- Vol. 41 (2013). Marek Kwiek, „Przyszłość uniwersytetów w Europie: najważniejsze motywy dyskusji”
- Vol. 42 (2013). Krzysztof Wasielewski, „Droga na studia – fakty, odczucia, oceny”
- Vol. 43 (2013). Krzysztof Leja, Emilia Nagucka, „Creative destruction of the University”

- Vol. 44 (2013). Marek Kwiek, „Reformy instytucji europejskiego uniwersytetu: napięcia, kolizje, wyzwania”
- Vol. 45 (2013). Cezary Kościelniak, „Uniwersytet i aktywizm studencki wobec obywatelskiego nieposłuszeństwa”
- Vol. 46 (2013). Krzysztof Wasielewski, „Zmiany poziomu aspiracji edukacyjnych młodzieży jako efekt adaptacji do nowych warunków społeczno-ekonomicznych”
- Vol. 47 (2013). Krzysztof Wasielewski, „Młodzież wiejska na studiach wyższych – selekcje społeczne, obecność na studiach, uwarunkowania”
- Vol. 48 (2013). Marek Kwiek, Dominik Antonowicz, „Academic Work, Working Conditions and Job Satisfaction”
- Vol. 49 (2013). Krzysztof Wasielewski, „Procedura rekrutacyjna na studia jako mechanizm selekcji społecznej”
- Vol. 50 (2013). Marek Kwiek, Dominik Antonowicz, „The Changing Paths in Academic Careers in European Universities: Minor Steps and Major Milestones”
- Vol. 51 (2013). Cezary Kościelniak, „Polskie uczelnie a Unia Europejska. Instytucjonalne, ekonomiczne i kulturowe aspekty europeizacji polskiego szkolnictwa wyższego”
- Vol. 52 (2013). Petya Ilieva-Trichkova, „Higher Education in Bulgaria in a Historical Perspective: Dynamics of Expansion and Inequalities”
- Vol. 53 (2013). Dominik Antonowicz, „The Challenges for Higher Education Research in Poland”
- Vol. 54 (2013). Cezary Kościelniak, „Kulturowe uwarunkowania uniwersytetu w kontekście kryzysów państw dobrobytu”
- Vol. 55 (2013). Cezary Kościelniak, Robert Roemer, „Sustainable Development as a Part of the "Third Mission" of the Universities”
- Vol. 56 (2013). Kazimierz Musiał, „Strategiczna funkcja polityki regionalnej i umiędzynarodowienia w krajach nordyckich”
- Vol. 57 (2013). Agnieszka Dziedziczak-Foltyn, Kazimierz Musiał, „Kontrolować czy nadzorować? Modelowanie polskiej polityki szkolnictwa wyższego z punktu widzenia reform realizowanych w krajach nordyckich”
- Vol. 58 (2013). Agnieszka Dziedziczak-Foltyn, „Prawo o szkolnictwie wyższym w pryzmacie jakości rządzenia i polityki rozwoju”
- Vol. 59 (2013). Agnieszka Dziedziczak-Foltyn, „Between modernization of society and modernization of education The Polish Higher Education Case”
- Vol. 60 (2013). Piotr W. Juchacz, Karolina M. Cern, „In Defence of the Diversity of Faculty Talents”