CZU 378
DOI https://doi.org/10.52388/1812-2566.2025.1(102).11

ABORDARE COMPARATIVĂ A POLITICII ÎNVĂȚĂMÂNTULUI SUPERIOR ÎN UNIUNEA EUROPEANĂ (Partea I)

Ludmila OLEINIC
Doctor în științe politice, conferențiar universitar, Universitatea Americană din Moldova, Chișinău, Republica Moldova
e-mail: *oleynyckliuda2@yahoo.com*
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5884-9563

Prezenta cercetare științifică se referă la politica UE de învățământ superior ghidată de Declarația de la Bologna, procesul fiind implementat împreună cu alte reforme, inclusiv reorganizarea internațională a universităților. Interesul este manifestat inclusiv pentru adaptarea sistemului de învățământ superior la mediul în schimbare. Aspecte ale organizării universitare, precum și în cadrul mai larg fiind afectate de elaborarea politicilor publice în direcțiile dezirabile. Reflecțiile asupra logicii instituționale a învățământului superior oferă un spațiu de proiectare pentru a experimenta modele și logici organizaționale. Digitalizarea reprezentând un mega trend cu impact major asupra universităților. Tehnologia informației influențând învățământul superior în logistică și administrație, în modul de a preda, ce să predea și ce reprezintă inteligența artificială.

Cuvinte-cheie: *politica învățământului superior, reforme, sistem de învățământ superior, învățământ și predare universitară, digitalizare, curricula.*

COMPARATIVE APPROACH OF HIGHER EDUCATION POLICY IN THE EUROPEAN UNION (Part I*)*

This scientific research is about EU higher education policy guided by the Bologna Declaration, the process has been implemented with other reforms, including international reorganization of universities. Interest being displayed to adaptation of the higher education system to changing environment. Aspects of university organization as well as broader framework of higher education being affected by means of public policy-making towards directions considered desirable. Reflections on institutional logic of higher education offer a design space to experiment with organizational models and logics. Digitalization represent a megatrend with major impact on higher education institutions. Information technology influences higher education in logistics and administration, in how to teach, what to teach, and what artificial intelligence means for higher education system.

Keywords: *higher education policy, reforms, higher educational system, university learning and teaching, digitization, curricula.*

APPROCHE COMPARATIVE DES POLITIQUES DE L'ENSEIGNEMENT SUPÉRIEUR DANS L'UNION EUROPÉENNE (Partie I)

Cette recherche scientifique porte sur la politique de l'enseignement supérieur de l'UE, guidée par la Déclaration de Bologne. Ce processus a été mis en œuvre avec d'autres réformes, notamment la réorganisation internationale des

universités. L'adaptation du système d'enseignement supérieur à un environnement en mutation suscite un intérêt croissant. L'élaboration des politiques publiques influence certains aspects de l'organisation universitaire, ainsi que le cadre plus large de l'enseignement supérieur. Les réflexions sur la logique institutionnelle de l'enseignement supérieur offrent un espace de conception pour expérimenter des modèles et des logiques organisationnelles. La numérisation représente une tendance majeure ayant un impact majeur sur les établissements d'enseignement supérieur. Les technologies de l'information influencent l'enseignement supérieur dans les domaines de la logistique et de l'administration, dans la manière d'enseigner, dans le contenu de l'enseignement et dans l'impact de l'intelligence artificielle sur le système d'enseignement supérieur.

Mots-clés: *politique de l'enseignement supérieur, réformes, système d'enseignement supérieur, apprentissage et enseignement universitaires, numérisation, programmes d'études.*

СРАВНИТЕЛЬНЫЙ ПОДХОД К ПОЛИТИКЕ ВЫСШЕГО ОБРАЗОВАНИЯ В ЕВРОПЕЙСКОМ СОЮЗЕ (Часть I)

Данное научное исследование посвящено политике ЕС в области высшего образования, основанной на Болонской Декларации, процесс был реализован с другими реформами, включая международную реорганизацию университетов. Проявляется интерес к адаптации к изменяющейся среде. Аспекты организации, а также более широкая структура университета подвергается влиянию посредством государственной политики. Институциональная логика университетов предлагает пространство для экспериментов с организационными моделями и логикой. Цифровизация - это мегатренд с большим влиянием, информационные технологии влияют на логистику и администрации университетов, на то, как преподавать, чему преподавать и что искусственный интеллект означает.

Ключевые слова: *политика высшего образования, реформы, система высшего образования, университетское обучение и преподавание, оцифровка, учебные программы.*

Introduction

Higher education policy varies enormously among countries, reflecting a broad spectrum of provision and politico-economic disparity. In some countries, policy is driven solely by economic imperatives; in others, by tradition and culture. In Europe, systemic diversity is decreasing as social and political interdependence grow. In other areas, such as the developing markets of Asia, diversity of provision is increasing in line with economic growth. Everywhere, higher education has become so important to the development of knowledge economies that it has become more directive, more encouraging of the practical and commercial exploitation of research, and more accountable.

Higher education policy in the European Union (EU) and in the countries allied to the European Cultural Convention is driven by the Bologna Declaration signed in 1999, a voluntary agreement aimed at harmonization of higher education architecture across Europe. Further intergovernmental meetings – in Prague (2001), Berlin (2003), Bergen (2005), London (2007), and Louvain (2009) – have reaffirmed the Bologna process. The basic three-tier framework aligns mainland European and American higher education, although in many ways it represents a subordination of the former, and is closely allied to the World Trade Organization General Agreement on Trade in Services. The process has been implemented concurrently with other reforms, including international reorganization of universities in France under the Universities' Freedoms and Responsibilities law.

Reflections on institutional logic of higher education

Few themes in the study of human affairs are as enduring as the origins and functions of public in-

stitutions. Classic perspectives including those pertaining to collective action, the division of labour, and Weber's bureaucratic model of organization have been complimented by more modern economic and behavioural theories and assorted theories of the political economy of organizations. All of these perspectives, and many more, are united by a common recognition that society requires public institutions. And yet today, in practice, there are few examples of industries that are purely public. Accordingly, to account for the dynamic influences of economic, social, and political forces that shape so-called 'public' institutions, today's scholars and institutional designers rely on contingent frameworks including those related to publicness, public-private hybrid organizations, and public-private partnerships. With this background, the logic of 'academic enterprise' recognizes the practical and theoretical significance of the dynamic and changing nature of public higher education.

Universities are important within the context of public organizations. In a simple legal sense, many universities are public as a consequence of their constitutional or legislative charters. The social functions of universities as instruments of knowledge production and dissemination amount to a clear public purpose. Yet, these organizations experience are widely different on levels of government control relative to other public organizations: some universities are able to set their own goals and priorities while others are able only to determine methods for achieving organizational goals set by other governance structures [1]. Thus, universities are legally, structurally, and functionally public but may offer a design space to experiment with organizational models and logics.

There are currently a variety of organizational models and institutional logics in higher education. But if the public nature and function of a university is inherent, the reliance on any particular model is a design choice. As with any design choice, there are limits to its relevance and effectiveness. The predominant academic bureaucratic model - characterized by rigidity, formalization and specialization - has proven to be useful in many instances, but it is increasingly seen as a barrier to the enhanced social and economic impact many universities aspire to realize. As Anthony Downs argues, public bureaus in general are inclined to an organizational logic of self-preservation rooted in dependency upon the state. Once the users of the bureau's services have become convinced of their gains from it, and have developed routinized relations with it, the bureau can rely upon a certain amount of inertia to keep on generating the external support it needs. Universities, even as they are often legally or functionally public, need not operate according to a bureaucratic institutional logic. One alternative operational paradigm is that of the academic enterprise. Turning to the academic enterprise model can empower universities to achieve new levels of excellence in teaching and discovery while providing greater economic and social value. Scholars have identified several institutional logics in higher education that structure behaviours and expectations of actors both in and outside of higher education organizations. The table builds on and extends the currently conceptualized academic logics, academic bureaucracy logics, and market logics introduces the academic enterprise model. Although these are idealized types that are rarely, if ever, observed in practice, they are still relevant to the extent to which they guide administrative behaviour, constructions of organizational performance, and policy agendas.

The academic model views the autonomous, self-governing organization as the organizational ideal and prioritizes the traditional, higher-education values of elitism and excellence. For generations, universities operating in this model have benefited from generous state support and large endowments that

subsidize niche learning experiences. Accountability is ensured by the professionalism of the faculty. These universities are characterized by low acceptance rates, high tuition rates, and a small scale.

Most public universities operate in the academic bureaucratic model. Although this organizational logic is familiar to government principals overseeing executive and legislative agencies, there are significant drawbacks when this logic is deployed in the context of higher education. First, academic bureaucracies operate according to a narrow and sometimes misplaced interpretation of efficiency. Efficiency for a bureaucracy is a managerial undertaking within the context of a self-imposed institutional conserver mandate. Second, academic bureaucracies are often overly concerned with the external political environment, striving not only to comply or over-comply with the law but also to ensure that their actions do nothing to change their relationships with external stakeholders. Often, the focus on maintaining stakeholder relations comes at the expense of improving or reinventing these relations. Third, academic bureaucracies are generally risk averse, seeking to conserve a scarce allotment of resources, even at the expense of quality in teaching, learning, and research. More specifically, a consequence of being accountable to assorted external stakeholders including legislators, regulators, and donors, academic bureaucracies tend to adopt conserver mentalities when using resources instead of investor mentalities. All the shortcomings described here are interrelated.

By defining their publicness as a function of their legal status or source of resources rather than by a higher mission to achieve beneficial social outcomes in spite of political constraints, the operations of public universities sometimes adopt some of the more vexing attributes of public bureaucracies. Many have become hierarchical, rigid, rule-bound, and change-resistant. More concerning, many public universities have lost their way by becoming responsive primarily to the narrow mandates prescribed by external stakeholders and by privileging a narrowly defined conceptualization of managerial efficiency rather than the maximization of social impact. The consequences include a limited capacity to respond to emerging social and technological changes, which, in turn, result in lower-quality learning and discovery outcomes. While a small number of public universities are able to maintain or enhance excellence in teaching and research, they often do so at the expense of accessibility while succumbing to the magnetism of rankings and relative institutional status.

In recent years, governments have designed policies that inject market mechanisms into higher education in the hope of ultimately changing organizational logics and increasing performance. These policies, often focus on transforming students into consumers by subsidizing their purchase decisions and turning universities into providers that attract student consumers. These policies have had broad implications at existing universities such as altered faculty-administration relationships, but have also coincided with the emergence of for-profit organizations that seek to use public funds to capitalize on new student markets. Theoretically, these market-driven organizations are held accountable by the forces of student choice. Unfortunately, organizations operating in this logic expend considerable sums on advertising and often offer lower quality, commodified education [2]. However, underperforming for-profit organizations are seldom pushed out of the market, undermining the argument that a market functioning on subsidized student choice can provide meaningful discipline or accountability. Academic bureaucracies, in contrast, often combine access with efficiency at the expense of innovation and excellence. They largely opt against defining their own outcomes and respond first and foremost to accountability mechanisms dictated by the state.

In this context, the challenge for ambitious public universities is to define and achieve differentiated outcomes, regardless of the political and financial constraints with which they must contend.

Core values of higher education

Typically, as higher education institution, university provide undergraduate and postgraduate education. The university is an autonomous cultural institution at the heart of societies that for reasons of historical tradition and geography is organized in different ways. It seems that the very wording of this first principle ('morally and intellectually independent of all political authority and economic power') and the way it is wrapped in a statement of purpose ('to meet the needs of the world around it') as well as a description of international diversity ('societies differently organized because of geography and historical heritage') reveals the considerable wisdom on the part of the drafters.

The very concept of autonomy refers to the practice of self-rule in lawmaking and decision-making. A country or an institution is autonomous if it sets its own rules and can determine its own future. This shows that autonomy implies them. Autonomy refers to an activity, to self-rule rather than to the condition of those who are being spared the demands and directives of others. Stakeholders (be they citizens; governments; political, religious or ethnic groups; businesses; or private owners) should realize that without autonomy, universities cannot properly function and deliver what they should deliver. Autonomy must be granted. And in reverse, universities should realize that they are partners in the social contract. But autonomy doesn't represent a formal, legal privilege. And it is not carved in stone, once and for all. The social setting of higher education is a dynamic one, changing over time and defined by the power, interests, and trust of a good number of stakeholders. It is from these dynamics that a social contract, on which autonomy depends, emerges. So universities should fully, courageously, and continuously engage with all relevant stakeholders to update and uphold this contract.

Universities set their own rules and enjoy a high degree of independence. The Magna Charta Universitatum clearly and simply states: 'to meet the needs of the world around the university. Autonomy is a practice serving a purpose, a means to an end. The same, values are important for an organization's identity as well as for its inner coherence and external legitimacy. A new balance must be struck between independence and interdependence of university and society. Universities ought to show more courage in making their own policy choices while at the same time taking much more seriously what they could and should contribute to society. This could be put as follows: less compliance, more service. In this regard analyses of the societal trends that have an impact on higher education are: trends in the global economy and in politics, such as the global shift and a changing balance between state and market in our current neoliberal climate; technological trends, in particular the rise of information technologies and their multiple effects on education; social trends such as polarization and increased civic disengagement. The effects of such trends that are already visible in higher education makes reasoned guesses about what will happen next when these trends continue to make an impact.

The university in the digital age

In EU the issue of digitalization revolutionizes thinking about the education. Higher education academics ideas about the university is that because of computerization and rapid progress in artificial intelligence (AI), very soon there might be few jobs left that require proof of academic ability. And with no students to teach, universities would have no future. Others predict that technology will 'land' in univer-

sities in productive ways but not change anything substantial, or that lectures and seminars will again become key because they help to sharpen analytical skills - the skills needed most in the ever-changing labour market. Also are those who believes that devices will replace academic faculty, campuses will disappear, and year-round learning will replace the traditional academic calendar with its semesters. All ideas about higher education futures can be made plausible to an extent through the art of selecting relevant trends or sources.

Information technology (IT) influences higher education in logistics and administration, in how to teach, what to teach, and what digitalization means for the higher education system. The effects of digitalization are clear in the logistics and administration of higher education. It is almost impossible to imagine student registration, classroom and timetable planning, or tuition administration without digital means [3]. In thorough understanding of the digital world is necessary to prepare students not only for a career but also as citizens who understand the world around them and who can critically reflect on the possibilities and dangers that digitalization offers. It is clear that universities have a role in this. Finally, digitalization deeply affects the higher education system.

Throughout history, universities have had no serious competition from outside their sector, but the emergence of online possibilities has created disruptive, for-profit competitors who can offer education at a lower price. It is easy to see what this could mean: many higher education institutions, notably those with high tuition fees and mediocre education - i.e. low value for money - will face serious competition from the private sector and face a shortened life expectancy. That is why universities have to find innovative, less expensive ways to carry out higher education. In this sense the digitalization holds opportunities as well. Universities can showcase their top teachers and top educational materials online and improve their visibility worldwide. It also makes it easier to cooperate nationally and internationally and innovate education with partner universities. Digitalization enables universities to expand their educational portfolio efficiently by sharing online courses with partner universities and including those of their partner institutions in their own programmes for credit.

Higher education institutions' role in 'real life' is growing as they have become much more permeable, open not only to students and academics but also to companies, start-ups, and with the cities and regions in which they are located through community engagement programmes. This means that their 'community' role has become stronger. It seems only logical that they do not only open up in 'real life' but also online. They have the connections and the data, and with that the possibility to play their 'community' and 'social' role online as well. Van der Zwaan describes digitalization as a megatrend that will have a major impact on higher education but not as one that will threaten the existence of the system: for sure campus education will still be around in 2040.

Competition in the higher-education sector has intensified, which makes the landscape of educational offerings for students ever more complex and difficult to judge in terms of quality. In this fast-changing higher education context, the evidence-based development of degree programmes becomes more and more relevant. The evidence-based discipline-specific development of teaching and learning is a key principle at the university to enhance the quality of students' learning outcomes. Learning and teaching processes take place in real-life environments and are therefore very complicated in nature. Researches can help identify factors that contribute to high-quality teaching and learning. Digitalization is considered as a tool to enhance quality, not a goal in itself. In addition, digitalization provides students

and teachers with more flexibility to organize learning and teaching without losing the important face-to-face interaction. Finally, the university education will become more and more modular in nature as the demand for lifelong learning increases. Modularization enables each student to select individually those parts of the curriculum in which he or she is interested. When students are studying for a bachelor's or master's degree, it is not possible to only select courses on the basis of personal interests. Different courses of the study programmes complement each other, and as studies in specific programmes proceed, students' expertise of the discipline will gradually deepen and broaden [4, p. 215-224]. This guarantees that graduates can successfully work as competent academic experts in different areas of society.

Diversifying the university learning and teaching

Universities in order to survive in the future, they should diversify their activity and offer a mix of proven and experimental approaches to teaching and research. Currently training students for future jobs that, to a large extent, do not even exist today, many current jobs will be taken over by self-learning intelligent machines, and new jobs may require a range of skills that cannot even imagine right now. Diversifying the education ecosystem is indeed an important precondition to train workers to keep training themselves.

Already today can be witnessed how technology companies are increasingly taking over parts of the learning trajectory from schools and universities; digital courses and online training programmes often serve to select the brightest minds from the sea of talents. European universities will likely no longer have a patent on learning and credentialing systems, as alternative credentialing mechanisms will arise to assess and accredit the skills that people acquire along the way. Where campuses once used to be the place for scouting young talents, tech campuses have themselves turned into places of continuous learning. In the campus model of the future, there will be a coming and going of students, employees, faculty, and personnel in high-density brainports. University campuses may still be the primary playground for young adults, and yet these campuses will increasingly also cater to learners of all ages and all levels of experience. If switching careers two or three times during a professional lifetime becomes the new norm, universities need to be adapting rapidly to new contingents of learners. Some tech executives dream of a future university campus where students each follow their own personalized learning trajectory, buoyed by their own digital personal assistants. It is easy to imagine how, by the year 2030, each student will have his or her own AI tutor and mentor - an app-voice who personalizes each student's learning experience. Such an encouraging AI assistant may be equipped to review statistics assignments while also engaging in dialogues to test a student's understanding for example of Plato's Republic. A scenario in which the 'automated' part of learning is taken over by algorithms and the basic part of teaching is taken over by programmers may be regarded as a welcome reduction of teachers' workload to some, while others think it signals the beginning of the displacement of teachers. In whatever form, personalized digital environments are going to be part of the university's offerings in 2040, if only because large numbers of working professionals are in need of constant training upgrades. Indeed, the diversification of education does not mean that the university should give up on its proven methods of learning. On the contrary, the old-style monologue lecture by the erudite teacher in front of 200 students will still be part of the menu for next few decades from now. Students can still learn from the eloquent professor with her voice. One thing that should never disappear from a student's diet is the opportunity to engage in the social activity of learning with their

peers. In a world that is inundated with data and information, interpretation and rational arguments are more important than ever. And the best contexts in which to learn such skills are small college classes where students are not just beneficiaries of expert knowledge shared by their teachers but where they also acquire the necessary social skills to engage in dialogue with each other. As much as digital tutoring can help students become better learners, education is fundamentally a social activity where students and teachers need to interact.

Much has been said about the need for students to become experts in one specific discipline or one type of knowledge; at the same time, though, they need to be trained more generally in various subject areas. So universities need to offer both highly specialized education and broader training. The so-called T-shaped professional will be the best insurance for future employability. Ideally, the expertise and skills a student acquires in college would be transferable to other applications in the workforce. The ability to adapt easily to new areas of expertise is something students need to learn at universities. Therefore, it is important to pair off disciplinary training with interdisciplinary learning and dialogue. Over the past ten years, professors have increasingly become engaged in cross-disciplinary research projects. Exposing students to, and engaging them in, such efforts will prove crucial to strengthening students' adaptability. Collaborations across disciplines not only prepare students for future professions, they also help them become better problem-solvers.

Finally, the most crucial asset that makes most university-based curricula still relevant and valuable today is an emphasis on Bildung (a German word for education, personal formation, moral development and maturation combined) and on basic academic skills such as critical, independent thinking and analytical acuity. To start with the former, the best colleges have always prided themselves in offering a coherent curriculum. Bildung and digital environments are not necessarily rivalling goods, but it is certainly true that while the former has always been firmly curriculum-based, the latter thrives on the contingency of debundling courses from curricula and decoupling assignments and degrees from institutions. And yet it is important to realize why the latter has been so valuable and effective as an educational experience for many centuries. Perhaps the most crucial ingredient of any future university education will be students' ability to think independently paired off with a curiosity-driven mind-set and a tolerance towards considering new insights and knowledge. Each and every part of a student's education should center on his or her abilities to raise questions, to articulate what kind of knowledge is needed to solve a problem, and to leverage this knowledge without pandering to special interests. There is not one single module or course that can train students to adopt such an academic attitude; instead, it is the primary task of a university to instill an appetite for independent and analytical thinking in every single student's brain during every minute of their education. Training students in how to acquire valuable knowledge, even as the type of knowledge they acquire will certainly change over time, may be the best investment in future wisdom [5]. Whereas knowledge ages, wisdom prepares for rejuvenation.

Connected curriculum: the new higher education curriculum

It is possible to create better synergies between the research undertaken by European universities and students' learning by adopting a connected curriculum. Can be taken a series of practical steps that build on the excellent research already underway, enhance the quality of student education, and in doing so increase the impact that higher education has on society. All this can be done through a joined-up approach that is value-based, directed specifically

at making an even greater contribution to good in the world. When designing taught degree programmes, it traditionally has started with a fixed body of knowledge in a particular discipline or field. Courses have shaped content and then thought about how students can acquire that knowledge. It was as if faculty members held a number of pre-defined items in a mental suitcase, and it was the work of the students to end up with a reasonably similar suitcase full of comparable items of knowledge. Students who were particularly skilled at recalling ideas and facts in timed examinations did well in their degree programmes. In turn, some were to become faculty members of the future, and set out to hand the same suitcase full of knowledge on to the next generation.

But instead of thinking of curriculum as primarily a fixed body of content to be taught, is need to see all of the learning opportunities and methods available to students today as they study for their degree awards. In this regard can be created a series of learning opportunities that are research-rich, engaging students much more richly with research - with its questions and practices as well as with its findings. And this means empowering students to learn though active enquiry and investigation at every level of study, so that they develop vital critical, ethical, and practical skills along with the confidence to apply these in unforeseen contexts.

In digital world, the possibilities are far more numerous and diverse than they were traditionally. In any given moment, a student can access a range of sources and resources that would have been beyond imaginings a generation ago. Students can speak to others in real time across national boundaries; they can collaborate in person or virtually with others who may have quite different skill sets and perspectives. In addition, students can become producers or creators of new communications. One key dimension of the connected curriculum framework is the use of outward-facing student assessments. This involves assessing student learning through 'real world' communications directed at specified audiences. The forms of these communications can vary: examples include articles, podcasts, video documentaries, blogs, reports, multi-media presentations, and policy papers. The joy here is that where students are engaging actively in research and enquiry, and where in doing so they are coming to understand the latest research produced by their institutions, they can also communicate the excellence and the findings of that research to their communities. They are able, through a series of collaborations with peers and with more senior scholars in their institutions, to communicate scholarship to the public and even to draw the public into the research sphere to become participants and partners. They can work towards a curated portfolio of outputs in various forms that showcases the best of what they have achieved, telling the story of their investigations, their arguments, their skills, and their values.

In this regard, Angela Brew propose an inclusive scholarly community. A combination of research-rich learning opportunities and outward-facing student assessments prepares each student for change - changes in the workplace, in society, and in their own careers. But it also promotes collaboration, peer-engagement, mutual respect, and a strong sense of shared endeavor, all of which are so greatly needed in present divisive age. The second is to empower all students, whatever their background, to develop a strong and confident voice. By learning richly through active enquiry from the beginning to the end of their degree programmes, students engage critically with the kaleidoscope of pictures and voices that surround them and confront the importance and limitations of evidence and 'truth'. In doing so, they not only acquire the knowledge, understandings, and skilful practices they need for the future, they also explore and develop their own identities, places, and voices in the academy, in the professions, and

in the world. The final step is that through the artful design of a menu of active learning and assessment activities are forged stronger connections between higher education and communities. Through the creation of outward-facing communications artefacts directed at real-world audiences, all scholars (students, teachers, professionals, and researchers) develop stronger and more confident voices; they also learn to listen more, paying even greater attention to local and global perspectives and becoming even more responsive to community needs and challenges [Ibidem]. The voices of all scholars, including those traditionally silenced, enrich contemporary debate even more loudly and clearly, contributing to a better future for all.

Conclusions

Despite differences in higher education policy around the world, some common themes emerge as a result of globalization, including the importance of quality assurance, digitalization and the fair targeting of government funding, the need to benchmark excellence to internationally agreed-upon standards across disciplines, a diminishing margin of appreciation regarding the importance of higher education to economic success and the funding required to maintain that influence, and the undesirable effects among academics of increased administration as managerialism supplants scholarship across the sector.

The higher education policy decisions were based on deliberations as to the ends and means of policy that were explicitly formulated and acted upon, on time consuming inquiries into the predicament of the higher education institutions looking for some alternatives for the accomplishment of a goal function that may have been very comprehensive but not very confused, and the solutions arrived at were oriented towards the accomplishment of some major value in the political preference function. The rapid growth of the higher education institutions was attended by a decision-making process in which basic higher education aspects were the target of a change attempt, explicit values and resulting in the clear-cut program implementation of central decisions.

Bibliographic references

1. GIRTH, A., HEFETZ, A., JOHNSTON, J., WARNER, M. Outsourcing public service delivery: management responses in non -competitive markets. // *Public Administration Review,* Nr.72 (6), Cornell University, 2012, pp. 887-900.

2. ANDERSON, D., TAGGART, G. Organizations, policies, and the roots of public value failure: the case of for-profit higher education. // *Public Administration Review*, Nr.76(5), Cornell University, 2016, pp. 779-789.

3. MULDER, A. *Dutch universities and technology in education* (in Dutch). - Delft: TU Delft, 2017. See: https://ankamulder. weblog.tudelft.nl/files/2017/08/Nederlandse-universiteitenen-technologie-in-onderwijs-Anka-Mulder-Printversie.pdf.

4. GIBBS, G. *Strengthening teaching and learning in research universities: Strategies and initiatives for institutional change.* London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017.

5. VAN DIJCK, J. *Diversifying the university menu.* Heijnen A., Van der Vaart R., Places of engagement. Reflections on higher education in 2040. A global approach. Amsterdam University Press, 2018.