

2015-4

The Role of Governance in the Cultivation of University as an Ethical Enterprise

Thomas B. Morrow

University of Ontario Institute of Technology, thomas.mcmorrow@uoit.ca

Follow this and additional works at: <https://arrow.tudublin.ie/st1>



Part of the [Educational Leadership Commons](#), and the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Morrow, Thomas B., "The Role of Governance in the Cultivation of University as an Ethical Enterprise" (2015). *Stream 1: Enterprise and Engagement*. 9.

<https://arrow.tudublin.ie/st1/9>

This Conference Paper is brought to you for free and open access by the Higher Education in Transformation Conference, Dublin, 2015 at ARROW@TU Dublin. It has been accepted for inclusion in Stream 1: Enterprise and Engagement by an authorized administrator of ARROW@TU Dublin. For more information, please contact arrow.admin@tudublin.ie, aisling.coyne@tudublin.ie.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-Share Alike 4.0 License](#)

The Role of Governance in the Cultivation of University as an Ethical Enterprise

Dr. Thomas B. McMorrow

University of Ontario Institute of Technology

Abstract

Universities have always relied on financial and other resources to pursue their goals. Over the last two decades, the percentage of financial support they receive from government has dwindled (Metcalfe, 2010). The expression, “enterprising university”, is generally used to refer to post- secondary educational institutions adopting entrepreneurial approaches to locate new sources and forms of revenue. Invoking the term in a normative register, some adopt a cheerful, triumphant tone (Meyer, 2002), others a gloomy, foreboding one (Lynch, 2006). Certain opponents condemn the “enterprising university” for spelling the end of university as we know it, whereas certain proponents claim being “enterprising” offers universities their last, best chance of survival. I support the characterization of university as an enterprise, but I do not think it should be framed exclusively (or even primarily) as an economic one. Etymologically, the word ‘enterprise’ means ‘undertaking’— that is, an endeavour, an activity, a project through time. This is an apt description of university whose survival and flourishing ultimately rely on the commitment of its members. I argue that framing university as an ethical undertaking informs while being informed by the following considerations: first, the integrity of university as an enterprise; second, the most suitable basis for evaluating the endeavour; third, the purposes of the enterprise; fourth, how the undertaking is governed, and lastly, who we imagine its undertakers to be. In this paper, I examine each subject in turn. My goal is to demonstrate why the university ought to be imagined foremost as an ethical enterprise— a shared project of teaching, learning and discovery, fostering each individual’s pursuit of virtue.

The Idea of a University and the Principle of Integrity

It is fitting that this symposium on *Higher Education in Transformation* would be held in Dublin, Ireland. After all, it was in this city, over one hundred and sixty years ago, that John Henry Newman delivered his lectures to the founding members of Ireland’s first Catholic university. The collection of those discourses bears the title, *The Idea of a University* (1852/1996). It is notable, as Margaret Thornton observes, that “a work produced for the gendered, elitist, colonial and Catholic Ireland of 150 years ago” strikes such a chord with “contemporary postcolonial, egalitarian and secular humanists wrestling with mass education” (Thornton, 2004, p. 491). She suggests this is because Newman was on to something when he stressed the love of knowledge for its own sake as fundamental to the idea of a university.

Of course, Newman was writing in a particular place and time, so it would be unwise to simply transpose his idea of a university whole cloth to the contemporary context. For example, no longer does the division of intellectual labour between academies and universities that existed during the mid-19th exist today. Nevertheless, recognizing a conceptual distinction between teaching and discovery—the sharing and the pursuit of knowledge— presents their relationship as one of interactive complementarity, rather than static identity. When they are seen to serve an intellectual purpose, the discovery and teaching of knowledge appear to operate symbiotically. It was Newman’s characterization of the university’s object as an intellectual one that was crucial to his whole argument. For Newman and his audience, it went without saying that faith in God and his church offers the heavy duty spiritual

machinery necessary to fulfill the Herculean task of overcoming man's (sic) fallen nature (p. 90). By affirming that knowledge is one thing and virtue another, Newman is able to do two things: first, trace the limits to pursuing knowledge in such a way that underscores its ephemeral character in contrast to the supernatural concerns of the Church; and second, demarcate that form of human endeavour that a university is uniquely competent to foster.

Newman shows that the activity of cultivating the mind has its own integrity (p. 7). Accordingly, there must be freedom to pursue that purpose unencumbered by external interference, no matter how well-intentioned or valuable in its own right that outside influence is. Newman acknowledged the authority of the Roman Catholic Church on issues of morality but insisted that the object of a university was “an intellectual not a moral one” (p. 3). In this way he sought to reconcile the institution's Catholic character with its identity as a university. There is an important lesson to be drawn from Newman's approach to conceiving a “Catholic university”, when imagining an “enterprising” university. As profound a role as religious belief would have had for Newman and his co-founders when it came to justifying decisions about their university, now market-based logic has just as strong an influence on the way every dimension of university is theorized and practiced. The lesson for us today, then, is this: Failure to appreciate the purpose of the institution risks compromising its integrity and resulting in a “university” unworthy of the name. This does not mean retreating from the marketplace and rejecting the label of “the enterprising university” out of hand. After all, as Marginson & Considine (2001) wrote over a decade ago, “We live in the age of business and it is plain to everyone that the money-changers have long since mortgaged the temple (p. 2).” The real question is not whether a university should be enterprising, but what kind of enterprise it should be.

The Blind-Spots of a Purely Economic Perspective

Even before the dawning of the age of “academic capitalism” (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997) universities could be seen in competition with one another—for students, faculty, research funding and recognition. The precipitous decline in government funding and concomitant rise in resource-seeking behaviour made the sense of competition within third-level education that much more acute. The mobility of students and professors, plus the number of credit-granting institutions had already been increasing; the advent of online learning platforms has signalled the latest, most dramatic jump in these trends (Mirlees & Alvi 2014).

Moreover, as the amount of money that government agencies were charged with distributing shrank, decisions were made to make markets the primary allocative mechanism by which such funding would be doled out. Its commercial value and/or monetization potential became the chief criteria by which to judge the kinds of research projects meriting public investment. Thus, the conditions continued to ripen for market-based logic to drive university policy. After all, no university wants the 21st century third-level education marketplace to leave it locked out on the wrong side of the door.

Markets are arenas of exchange and therefore represent a certain type of allocative mechanism. The desire (indeed the need) to exchange is so fundamental to the condition of human beings that it provides a basic principle of human association (Fuller, 1969, p.90). But not all forms of human association are exclusively or even primarily transactional in character. While there's no question an economic lens can be brought to bear on any form of human interaction, it can only reveal that which is fungible. Thus, where goods are non-fungible, markets cannot function as allocative mechanisms. To entrust all decision-making to market-based logic is to forfeit the allocation of intangible goods. Because markets function by assimilating all goods into their use-value, the inassimilable are either squeezed out or made to fit in a distorted form. Quantifiability comes to substitute for quality.

The mode of reasoning associated with market analysis is consequentialism. As the word suggests, consequentialism is all about results. Everyone adopts consequentialist reasoning some of the time. It would be utterly foolish not to. Understandably, a point of view trained on the maximization of efficiency or enhancement of utility has a great deal of currency in third-level education. An economic perspective can reveal a lot, but it also has a considerable blind spot, since from this point of view, there is no such thing as quality independent of exchange value. Failing to correctly identify what a practice is good for, however, can lead to it being used for things for which it is not particularly well suited; for example, there are some very good reasons to recommend detailed study of the Bible; understanding the scientific evidence informing the theory of evolution is not one of them.

The problem with adopting market-based logic arises when it is treated as the sole way of thinking about how to act. Given how thoroughly instrumentalist such thinking is, it makes it impossible to grasp the value of any human goal or activity for its own sake. In the last section of this paper, I argued that the real question before us is not whether a university should be enterprising, but what kind of enterprise it should be. Another way to put the question is this: what does it profit a university to have great enrollment numbers, full coffers, and highly esteemed faculty members, if the quest for prestige overwhelms all aspiration to virtue? To the extent that, as a human value, the aspiration to virtue withstands mathematical computation, market analysis is insensible to it. For this reason, an instrumentalist way of thinking about integrity will forever stalk around the conceptual edges of its meaning.

When it comes capturing the meaning of the principle of integrity (either for individuals or institutions), the limited purchase of market analysis is most dramatically displayed by efforts to quantify the reputational benefits that accrue to having integrity. And no doubt, attempts along these lines to quantify the value of integrity are instrumental in demonstrating its utility; they are useless, however, when use-value is not the only thing one wants to show.

University decision-makers who resist total enthrallment to market-based logic may chance their arm on the possibility that the underpinning assumption of economic analysis-- that market actors make all of their decisions according to

self-interest— is actually not true. Or, that because all individual market actors are subject to bounded rationality, a good number will not act the way economic analysis dictates that they are supposed to. Or, finally, that doing things for what are felt to be the right reasons may yield longer term economic benefits. After all it wasn't John Harvard's branding strategy that led to the record sales that t-shirts bearing his college's name have enjoyed. Choices informed by a vision of the university's intellectual object may also end up yielding competitive advantages.

The training to perform a finite set of tasks pales in comparison to an education in the pursuit of lifelong learning. The more adaptable one is, the greater one's potential contribution within a given work environment will be—and the more competitive one will be in an ever-changing job market. The rate of technological change is such that if students emerge from university with mastery over the use of the latest technology—but that's it—it won't be long before their know-how becomes irrelevant. In this section I have been seeking to show the limitations of economic analysis as a way of looking at the world and a basis for making decisions about what one should or should not do. I have not denied the existence of markets or even the desirability of market-based logic. I have just sought to highlight that on both scores, they are contingent, not absolute².

The higher the quality of graduates—the more sharply honed their intellectual skills—the more credit redounds to the university. Metaphorically speaking, intellectual ability is the most fungible asset in a knowledge-based economy. But its potential contribution to market competitiveness only partially accounts for its value. An economic explanation cannot do justice to the meaning of an education—how it contributes to one's experience of the world, one's development of an inner life of the mind and of the heart.

That market analysis is insensible to virtue does not make it bad. The defects of this particular intellectual lens arise from its manner of use by the viewer who either claims whatever cannot be seen in this way is not there or deploys the lens itself in a short-sighted manner. It is heady business trying to predict relations of supply and demand over time. Focusing on the immediate, however, will mean that one's diagnosis and prescription end up obsolete very near after they are made. If one is going to look at benefits of university education for students, one should take the long-term view. Of course, as economist John Maynard Keynes once noted, “[i]n the long-run we are all dead” (Keynes 1923). When thinking about the kind of education universities should offer to their students, the implications of what may seem a rather glib remark nonetheless warrant serious attention.

The End or Ends of University as an Enterprise?

² Markets depend on a given set of institutions to make them viable. The patron saint of neo-liberalism himself, Friedrich Hayek, acknowledged the establishment of legal concepts, rules and institutions regarding property, contract, adjudication, policing etc., as precursors to a “free” market (Hayek, 2013). It makes it difficult, then, to characterize the emergence of markets as “spontaneous” when it appears to depend on an accumulation of deliberate acts (Fuller, 1955, p. 1322)

There is a scene in the novel, *Stoner*, where the eponymous protagonist finds himself completely tongue-tied in response to his professor's question about the meaning of a particular Shakespearean sonnet (Williams 2003). What may appear on its face to be an unremarkable (albeit regrettably all too commonplace) occurrence turns out to be a transformative event for the student. As if confronting his own ignorance, his own unknowing, for the first time, William Stoner experiences a kind of revelation. He never articulates what has changed inside of him but he does end up deciding to switch out of agricultural science and pursue a degree in English instead. He proceeds to do graduate work and ends up as a professor of English at the very university in which his love of the subject began.

Following his anatomy of this scene, reviewer Julian Barnes notes:

Many [readers] will be reminded of their own lectoral epiphanies, of those moments when the magic of literature first made some kind of distant sense, first suggested that this might be the best way of understanding life. And readers are also aware that this sacred inner space, in which reading and ruminating and being oneself happen, is increasingly threatened by what Stoner refers to as 'the world' – which is nowadays full of hectic interference with, and constant surveillance of, the individual (Barnes 2013).

Such a moment of discovery is what many university teachers hope will happen for each of their students. To feel a connection to the subject, to feel personally implicated in its study—that's the idea of what it means to be a student, is it not? The sense of wonder, the pure joy that attends the act of learning—this is the experience that unites the researcher, the teacher, and the student. What Barnes calls "this sacred inner space, in which reading and ruminating and being oneself happen" speaks at once to the very heart of intellectual activity and the sanctum we hope university will provide for this at once shared and personal endeavour. It is lamentable, if albeit predictable, that in an age of rampant consumerist individualism, it is also uncouth to speak of the human soul. But what better metaphor is there in the English language to describe, in the deepest sense, who we are? Without such a conceptual marker, care of the self is blurred with egoism, freedom with license, and responsibility with absolute control. Every prescription of a 'how' is predicated on some idea of a 'why', rooted in a belief about what is good. Hence W.E.B. Du Bois' declaration that "the object of all true education is not to make men carpenters, it is to make carpenters men" (Du Bois, 1903, p. 63). In other words, I would say: no matter the discipline, trade or profession, the educational component does not simply lie in the explicit instruction of what to do; rather, it is bound up in the implicit invitation to reflect critically on how to be.

To conceive the university as an ethical enterprise is to frame the fostering of this activity—what Newman called "the real cultivation of the mind"—as the *raison d'être* of the university. That is not to say that it is either the exclusive purpose of universities or a purpose exclusive to them. The ends of a university are as complex and multiple as those of the people who comprise it.

Moreover, if education represents an enlivening of the human spirit, not a deadening of the soul, it is irrational to suppose that it should, or even could, be confined within the institutional boundaries that human beings themselves transcend. Students pass in and out of university, sometimes attaining degrees, sometimes not. Some students enter university anticipating enlightenment only to end up bitterly disappointed; still others enrol for the specific purpose of getting a degree that will open up employment opportunities and find themselves enriched in a manner they had never expected. What some students seek in a chair in the library, others pursue on a pub stool. Some experience conversations with classmates as far more fruitful and engaging than listening to the drone of a lecture. Others locate intellectually fertile ground either alongside or independently from their formal field of study, organizing charitable fund-raisers, participating in debating societies, or offering tutoring services. Some may see the act of turning inward and away from the world as a chance to escape from reality, while others view it as a way of actually deepening their sense of what is real. Like any site of human interaction, a university offers opportunities for developing all manner of human vice and virtue.

An education, as opposed to mere programming, invites students to recognize, in Barnes' phrase, "a sacred inner space" in which "being oneself" may happen. But of course, it is a pyrrhic victory if one can only be oneself, by oneself. Imagining university as an ethical, as opposed to strictly economic, enterprise reveals that the end of universities does not lie in the endeavour to make ends meet. Moreover, to imagine university as an undertaking is to expose the inadequacy of an enterprise framed "to advance the prestige and competitiveness of the university as an end in itself" (Marginson & Considine, p. 5). The ends of university are potentially as plural as the ways in which human beings seek to invest their lives with meaning. To facilitate the cultivation of the mind is to foster conditions that make associational life within universities rewarding.

Imagining university governance interactively

In Robert M. Pirsig's novel, *Zen and the Art of Motorcycle Maintenance*, the character Phaedrus works at "what could euphemistically be called a 'teaching college'...since you teach and you teach...with no time for research" (1974/2006, p. 182). In the course on rhetoric in which Phaedrus is trying to teach his students quality writing, he delivers a lecture that he calls the "Church of Reason" (p. 183). The title is inspired by a newspaper article he read in which a local priest was interviewed about some people complaining that the church building that had been sold off by the diocese was now operating as a bar. The priest was irritated that those complaining did not recognize the difference between the Church and the physical building in which it had once been located. Phaedrus employs this image to illustrate his idea of the university, which he calls "the real University". The real University is not a material object...The real University is a state of mind. It is that great heritage of rational thought that has been brought down to us through the centuries and which does not exist at any specific location...The real University is nothing less than the continuing body of reason itself (p. 185-6).

According to Phaedruss, that which is called by the same name—the collection of buildings, the formally recognized legal corporation—is really just “the location at which conditions have been made favourable” for the real university to exist (p.187). Grades, degrees, departments, titles, salaries, tuition—these do not of themselves constitute the “real University”. They may be part of those conditions that serve to foster the real university’s existence, but the life of the university is greater than the mere sum of these elements.

Phaedrus’ account locates the soul of the university in teaching, generating new knowledge and evaluating ideas. He is right that absent these animating activities, the formal institutional structure of a university is an empty shell. But such a disembodied account risks relegating inquiry into a completely abstract realm. Locating the university in the endeavours to discover and share knowledge offers an antidote to fetishization of a particular institutional form; it does not, however, inoculate against the implications that any specific choice of institutional design has for the manner in which those activities are conceived and carried out (Salamon, 2002; Eliadis et al., 2005).

Undertaking the iterative, complex, and collective challenge of elaborating the social, political, economic, cultural, and architectural conditions favourable for the university to exist brings one into the realm of ‘governance’. The term, ‘governance’ signifies something more than simply the one-off or repeated direction by the governor of the governed. It is the endeavour of establishing baselines for self-directed human interactions, not the project of micro-managing every single decision that people make (Winston 2001). What is sometimes perceived as the greatest obstacle to governing—namely, the possibility of people not doing as they are told— is actually what makes governance possible. Absent the human capacity to exercise agency, the very notion of a rule as a normative guide for human conduct would be untenable. Indeed, there would be no such thing as normativity in a world where people did not have the ability to recognize it. If people were incapable of basing their decisions on what they view as authoritative reference points for their interactions, then behaviour among people would be determined as it is among a herd of cattle, not by reason-based, inter-subjective communication, but through contamination by fear. The manner in which the ends of governance (i.e. policy goals) are selected, and pursued (i.e. policy tools) may contribute to, or detract from, the degree to which those subject to governance see themselves as implicated in, and responsible for their accomplishment. The fulfillment of governance objectives always depends on participation of the governed.

Sites and modes of governance are plural (Macdonald, 1990; Eliadis et al., 2005). When it comes to the economy, state governments govern, but so too do private multinational corporations. When it comes to universities, markets govern, but so too do university administrations (Jones, Shanahan & Goyan, 2001). At the same time, each university consists not only of a unitary, official normative structure; it is composed of multiple human associations, exercising overlapping and conflicting authority over their various members (Macdonald 1990). Within any institution, it is not just “formal instruments and canonical wisdom...[but] subtle and informal normative orders that make associational

life possible” (p. 419). On first blush, this would appear to further complicate the governance endeavour.

However, such limitations to formal institutional authority are necessary corollaries to its governance potential. The official governing body— defined by its formal institutional structure— does not have to be a faculty association, a student union, a designated research group, a specific kind of student club etc. when these formal or informal institutions are present. At the same time, however, these and many more human associations serve to mediate how their members experience life in a university. One’s sense of belonging to these myriad groups moulds and mirrors one’s normative commitments (Macdonald, 1996). These sites of interaction play an ineluctable role in how students and faculty participate—if not explicitly, then implicitly—in the governance of the university. Every normative institution has implicit and explicit dimensions (Witteveen & Van der Berg, 1999). It is their interplay that governs interactions in ways that serve to either further or to undermine realization of the university’s mission. As incisive as formal, explicit regulation is, the development of the informal and implicit dimensions of relationships is vital.

With this in mind, let us consider a question that appears to be at the centre of the debate over the ‘enterprising university’. How can institutions such as academic senates and professorial tenure—along with principles such as academic freedom and academic integrity— be reconciled with the pursuit of private funding opportunities, the cultivation of corporate partnerships, the generation of commercial reward, the enhancement of market competitiveness, and the satisfaction of consumer interests? At issue would appear to be the notion of a university institution forming relationships with outside, economic actors. Is a university consequently going to develop an entrepreneurial identity for itself? I think this inevitable; however, just as it is possible to identify the sense of meaning one derives through economic exchange with others, as opposed to the maximization of personal profit, as the *sine qua non* of being an entrepreneur, the enterprising activities of a university may be framed within the broader endeavour of the university. In neither case, however, does it flow as a matter of course.

Deploying formal instruments and attending to informal normative orders are vital to avoiding capture by strictly economic interests (Salamon 2002). Thus, when it comes to governing a private-public partnership, for example, the most pertinent formal normative instrument is no doubt the contractual agreement. Terms of a contract lay out a sort of private constitution for the parties (Fuller, 1970-71, 311). At the same time, the wider legislative context to which parties are subject serves to establish parameters for negotiation by providing which provisions will be enforceable before the courts and which will not. Beyond—and indeed, even through—the negotiation of the formal agreement, it is the relationship between the parties that is critical. Indeed, as the eminent contracts law professor, Lon Fuller, once alluded, in some cases, if the process of working out the contract is performed well enough, then once it is signed, it can be put away in a drawer and forgotten about. Now that the parties have been able to communicate and establish their expectations of

each other, the drafting of the contract has served its purpose (Fuller, 1970-71, 326-327).

Fulfillment—as opposed to just court-ordered enforcement—of the legal agreement turns on the parties' understandings of why they are in a partnership: what they hope to contribute as well as get out of it, what their priorities are, and how valuable preservation of their relationship is to them. Furthermore, the view each party has of the relationship—and therefore the manner in which they perform the public-private-partnership— depends on their view of themselves. What are they about? Who are they? What are their purposes? What, for them, is beyond the pale? Only with a sense of their own mission—an idea of their own identity, and certain standards about what it means to keep their integrity— will they know what they want this partnership to be. As an economic actor, then, it is vital for universities to undergo the iterative process of articulating to themselves what kind of enterprise they aspire to be.

In this section I have tried to demonstrate why regaining the ideals underpinning the vision of university as an independent institution (free from government, corporate or religious interference) host to the pursuit of knowledge, discovery and virtue for their own sake (as opposed to their monetization potential) neither does, nor should, mean re-establishing the sites and modes of governance associated with the halcyon days of untrammelled institutional authority. I argue that command-and-control style governance risks undermining its potential to be an ethical, not merely, economic undertaking. I write of governance, not management to stress the facilitation of human agency rather than the exercise of social control.

I argue that the challenge is for those who make up the university to feel a sense of implication in, and responsibility for, the university's mission. To feel implicated in and responsible for the order governing one's life is crucially what all governance should be about. The endeavour that is governance means that by virtue of its collective character, there are going to be conflicting perspectives on, expectations of, and ideals for what such an order will entail. Fundamental, then, are: continual recognition of each individual's stake in the order to which he or she is subject, plus active cultivation of conditions to foster each person's role in making that order what it is, can, and should be.

Treating these as fundamental means that the processes of working through disagreement will be designed in ways that militate against marginalization, alienation, oppression, and denigration of the less powerful. Ultimately, it is through the actions of those formally being governed, as much as those officially doing the governing, that the interplay between patent and latent forms of normativity takes place (Macdonald, 1986). I think the only way the enterprising university can succeed is if those who constitute it are committed to a vision of the university as foremost an ethical rather than an economic enterprise.

Calling all undertakers: student participation in “the enterprising university”

In Canada, tuition payments account for the largest percentage of university funding (Statistics Canada, 2007). Zuo & Ratsoy note that “the financial restraints facing universities may be leading to a governance structure characterized by less participation of students, support staff, and faculty members” (1999, p.20). Nonetheless, they argue that because students account for the largest proportion of university funding, “students are demanding more participation” (p.20). If it is by and through the power of the purse that students develop an outsized influence on faculty decisions regarding curricular development and teaching methods, buzz words of “the enterprising university”—such as “creativity, innovation, and collaboration”—will ring hollow. Economic power, exercised in the marketplace, is a much blunter instrument than political power exercised through deliberative, democratic institutions and processes. Consumerism centres on satisfaction of immediate, individual self-interest—and it is the accumulation of that, which brings market pressure to bear. What markets do not do, however, is offer opportunities for expressions of solidarity or the conscious coordination of goals. The choice of exit that dissatisfied customers have does not represent a meaningful mode of participation in the process of shaping what the institution is.

When universities market themselves as business-type enterprises, it is only natural that students should come to think of themselves as consumers. While pedagogical relationships continue to have a transformational potential, they become weighted down by expectation among students that it is—and should be—purely transactional. The official discourse of the university itself may champion the very ideas one is trying to dispel or at the very least temper among students. For students to see themselves as something more than consumers, they need to have the means to recognize and situate their concerns within the overall mission of the university. When a university employs aspirational language to describe its mission, drawing on ideas and symbols associated with the intellectual and ethical dimensions, it may make it easier to persuade students the education they have the privilege to receive is more than a vocational training program designed to get them jobs, to keep the institution solvent, and to supply the local labour market with workers.

With or without such expressions in the formal documents of the university, it is incumbent on the community as a whole to flesh out a more robust vision for their university. At the end of the day, it is not the words on the university’s website that matter but the actions of those entrusted with working to fulfill its purpose as a university. Framing the idea of the enterprising university as a matter of governance rather than management, exposes the importance of re-examining existing structures, processes, rules, and practices within, and beyond the university, that foster, as opposed to frustrate the agency of students, professors, sessional lecturers, adjuncts, administrators, staff and

any other members of the university³. After all, “the best way to ensure the commitment of stakeholders to the mission of the organisation is to include them in the process of its formulation” (Menon Eliophotou, 2003, p. 239.) And yet, it is not just the cheerleaders but also the doomsayers associated with the enterprising university who oppose the notion of the ‘lunatics running the asylum’, let alone interfering with its administration. They presume students are either uninterested or incapable of exercising a constructive decision-making role. They worry about disruptions in the administrative balance of power, and warn of an erosion of academic standards. They take it for granted that the best students will be concerned about the potentially negative effect of their involvement on their scholastic performance. Moreover, they fear those with a narrow political agenda or the winners of popularity contests will be vaunted into positions of influence where they will surely cause more harm than good.

The substance of these arguments will be familiar to anyone who has looked at historical debates over the extension of the franchise. Democratic reform has very seldom appealed to anyone as strongly as those on the outside of the official corridors of power looking in. There must be recognition that such participation is consonant with the fundamental mission of the university itself. So long as this awareness is missing in the “enterprising university”, there will not be fertile ground for participative democracy to take root. Moreover, there must be a corresponding encouragement, opportunity and support to participate in the governance of these educational institutions. An important role of university is to provide intellectual resources as well as a social environment to inform student perspectives, expectations, values and beliefs. Allocating seats in university senates, on faculty councils and hiring committees offers a step toward formally contributing to a more meaningful, deliberative student role in university governance. By itself, such a move may amount to little more than tokenism.

Conclusion

In this paper, I have attempted to trace the role of governance in the cultivation of university as an ethical enterprise. One only starts to see that university governance is about more than the mere perfection of managerial technique when one rejects the assumption that there is a single best way of doing things, regardless of why one wants to do them. Moreover, the fullness of any idea of a university may only be appreciated once one is disabused of the misconception that, once selected, ends may be achieved unproblematically. I have tried to show why it is important to attend to the implicit dimensions not just of university governance but of university education itself. If doing so has been interpreted as a dodge of setting out explicitly what it means for a university to have integrity or stating canonically the rules each institution must follow to be an ethical undertaking, so be it. The question of integrity and the related question of identity are questions that

³ In doing so, I am trying to advance discussion beyond debate over the merits and demerits of the ‘New Public Management’, which notwithstanding the contemporaneity implied by the neologism, have been taking place for nearly a quarter-century (Robertson & Verger, 2012; Hood, 1991; Savoie, 1995; Borins 1995).

the members of each enterprise, or project through time, must continuously ask of, and answer for, their university, as they must also do for themselves. I believe that by explicitly defining the object of university as intellectual, not moral, Newman was trying to show his audience that the activity of 'faith seeking understanding' would be compromised were religious convictions allowed to smother intellectual curiosity. That universities, like human beings, are economic actors is beyond dispute. That some enjoy longer pedigrees, wider reputations, and deeper pockets than others makes it tempting to call the facilitation of each individual's pursuit of virtue through the discovery, advancement, and dissemination of knowledge, as somehow a luxury, but to say that is to demean a precious gift.

References

- Ball, S.J. (2008). New Philanthropy, New Networks and New Governance in Education. *Political Studies*, 56, 747-765.
- Barnes, J. (2013). Stoner: the must-read novel of 2013. Retrieved from: *The Guardian* <http://www.theguardian.com/books/2013/dec/13/stoner-john-williams-julian-barnes>
- Borins, S. (1995). The New Public Management is Here to Stay. *Canadian Public Administration*, 38(1), 122–132.
- Du Bois, W.E.B. (1903). The Talented Tenth. In *The Negro Problem: A Series of Articles by Representative Negroes of To-day*, 31-76. New York: James Pott & Co.
- Eliadis, P. et al. eds. (2005). *Designing Government: From Instruments to Governance*. Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press.
- Fuller, L.L. (1955). Freedom—A Suggested Analysis. *Harvard Law Review*, 68, 1305.
- Fuller, L.L. (1970-71). Mediation—Its Forms and Functions. *Southern California Law Review*, 44, 305-339.
- Fuller, L.L. (2001). "Two Principles of Human Association" In *The Principles of Social Order: Selected Essays of Lon Fuller*, K. Winston (ed.), Durham: Duke University Press. (Original work published in 1969)
- Hayek, F. (2013). *Law, legislation and liberty: a new statement of liberal principles of justice and political economy*. London: Routledge Classics. (Original work published in 1973- 79)
- Hood, C. (1991). A Public Management for All Seasons? *Public Administration*, 69, 3- 19.
- Jones, G.A, T. Shanahan & P. Goyan. (2001). University Governance in Canadian Higher Education. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 7: 135-148.
- Ker, I. (1999). Newman's Idea of a University: A Guide for the Contemporary University? in D. Smith & A. Karin Langslow (Eds.), *The Idea of a University, Higher Education Policy Series* 51.
- Keynes, J.M. (1923). *A Tract on Monetary Reform*. London: Macmillan.
- Leys, C. (2003). *Market Driven Politics*, New York: Verso.
- Lynch, K. (2006). Neo-liberalism and marketisation: the implications for higher Education. *European Educational Research Journal*, 5 (1): 1-17.
- Macdonald, R.A. (1996). Les Veilles Gardes : hypothèses sur l'émergence des normes, l'internormativité et le désordre à travers une typologie des institutions normatives. In *Le droit soluble : contributions québécoises à*

- l'étude de l'internormativité*, J.G. Belley (ed.), 233. Paris: Librairie générale de droit et de jurisprudence.
- Macdonald, R.A. (1990). Office Politics. *University of Toronto Law Journal*. 40, 419-476. Macdonald, R.A. (1986). Pour la reconnaissance d'une normativité juridique implicite et 'inférentielle'. *Sociologie et Sociétés*, 18(1), 47-58.
- Macdonald, R.A. & T. McMorrow. (2014). Decolonizing Law School. *University of Alberta Law Journal*, 51(4), 717-740.
- MacIntyre, A. (2007). *After Virtue*, 3rd ed. University of Notre Dame Press. (Original work published in 1981)
- Marginson, S & Considine, M. (2001). *The Enterprise University: Power, Governance and Reinvention in Australia*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Marsden, G.M. (1994). *The soul of the American university: from protestant establishment to established nonbelief*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Menon Eliophotou, M. (2003). Student involvement in university governance: A need for negotiated engagement. *Tertiary Education and Management* 9: 233–46.
- Metcalfe, A. S. (2010). Revisiting Academic Capitalism in Canada: No Longer the Exception. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 81(4), 489-514.
- Meyer, H. (2002). The new managerialism in education management: corporatization or organizational learning? *Journal of Educational Administration*, 40(6), 534-551.
- Mirlees, T. & S. Alvi. (2014). Taylorizing Academia, Deskilling Professors and Automating Higher Education: The Recent Role of MOOCs. *The Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*, 45-73.
- Newman, J.H. (1996). *The Idea of a University*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Pirsig, R.M. (2006). *Zen and the Art of Motorcycle Maintenance: an Inquiry into Values*. New York: Harpertorch. (Original work published in 1974)
- Robertson, S.L. & A. Verger. (2012). Governing Education Through Public Private Partnerships. In S. Robertson, K. Mundy, A. Verger and F. Menashy (Eds.), *Public Private Partnerships in Education: New Actors and Modes of Governance in a Globalizing World*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 21-42.
- Salamon, L.M. (2002). *The Tools of Government: A Guide to the New Governance*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Savoie, D. J. (1995). What is wrong with the New Public Management? *Canadian Public Administration*, 38(1), 112–121.
- Shaw, S. & J. Stewart. (2005). *The Corporate University*. Bradford: Emerald Group Pub.
- Slaughter, S., & Leslie, L. (1997). *Academic capitalism: Politics, policies, and the entrepreneurial university*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Statistics Canada. (2007). Education indicators in Canada: Report of the Pan-Canadian Education Indicators Program. (Catalogue no. 81-582-XIE). Ottawa.
- Thornton, M. (2004). The Idea of the University and the Contemporary Legal Academy. *Sydney Law Review*, 26, 481-502.
- Winston, K.I. (ed.) Editor's Introduction. In *The Principles of Social Order: Selected Essays of Lon Fuller* (2d) (Oxford: Hart Publishing, 2001), 1.

- Williams, J. (2003). *Stoner*. London: Vintage Books. (Original work published in 1965)
- Witteveen, W.J. & W. Van der Berg. (1999). *Rediscovering Fuller: Essays on Implicit Law and Institutional Design*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Young, S. J. (2002). The use of market mechanisms in higher education and state control: Ontario considered. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 2, 79–102.
- Zuo, B. & E.W. Ratsoy. (1999). Student Participation in University Governance. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 29, 1, 1-26.