FOSTERING THE DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF PRINCIPLES FOR MANAGING ETHICS IN HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS: AN INTERNATIONAL COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE [1]

Francisco Marmolejo [2]

I. Introduction

In today's world, higher education faces important opportunities and challenges, many of which are new and unexpected. The increased complexity of higher education institutions themselves is reflected in the expansion of their roles and responsibilities. These roles and responsibilities include: greater demands for regional engagement and other service role activities (the so called Third Role), internationalisation and cross-border education, the requirement that the research component of institutions accommodate and support the emergence of new scientific fields; the need to manage multiple financial resources with an increasing level of sophistication, and the greater risk involved; compliance with the social assumption that the good professional behaviour of individuals is rooted in the quality of the teaching-learning process offered in higher education institutions; responding to the calls for corporate social responsibility as applicable to higher education institutions. In addition, institutions are subject to increased scrutiny and calls for transparency, accountability and dialogue from internal and external stakeholders.

This paper provides a review of some relevant experiences and approaches in different parts of the world and a preliminary analysis of the usefulness of taking an international approach in developing, and implementing guidelines or codes of ethics or of conduct in the management of higher education institutions.

II. Background and Rationale

OECD has conducted extensive work in creating awareness and developing tools on managing ethics in the public service within governments (OECD, 2005), and providing guidance in improving the legal, institutional and regulatory framework for corporate governance in private companies (OECD, 2004).

A significant OECD's effort has been the development of Ethics Principles for governments and companies. However, higher education is a unique case. Institutions have widely varying legal status. Some are clearly public sector bodies, a few are private corporate entities, while many have a hybrid nature, publicly-regulated and funded, but with increasing freedom to act entrepreneurially. Despite this complexity and diversity, and the practical difficulty of implementing codes of good conduct or ethical principles, the idea of establishing them in the higher education sector is not entirely new. In many cases, individual higher education institutions have a Code of Conduct and/or of Ethics. There is, even, a proliferation of codes of conduct in a variety of areas of institutional work such as research activities, purchasing and contracting, recruitment, professors-students interactions, etc. Also, at national and

---

[2] *Executive Director, Consortium for North American Higher Education Collaboration (CONAHEC) (http://conahec.org), University of Arizona, USA. fmarmole@email.arizona.edu*

regional levels, a variety of organisations have also made efforts in this direction although with mixed results. The major umbrella national higher education organisations include frequent references to the importance of ethics in higher education in their annual conferences and reports, usually focusing on the importance of embedding ethics into the teaching-learning and research processes, with very limited mention of ethics as applied to the management of the institutions themselves.

In contrast, at the international level, with the exception of a few experiences outlined below, a similar attempt to study, develop and eventually adopt a set of ethics principles for higher education institutions has not been made.

III. Defining the Concepts: Using the Appropriate Terms

It is common to observe an overlap in the use of terms associated with similar concepts. These include: Ethics Codes, Codes of Conduct, Principles of Good Behaviour, Core Values, and Institutional Values. While strict definitions may be unattainable, distinctions are useful and the framework outlined by Gitman (2005) may be helpful.

TERM	DEFINITION
Values	General moral obligations. The core beliefs we hold regarding what is right and fair in terms of our actions and our interactions with others. Another way to characterize values is that they are what an individual believes to be of worth and importance to their life (valuable). (Navran, 2005) *Example: Integrity.*
Principles	Ethical conditions or behaviours expected from an individual. Principles are derived from values. (Gitman, 2005) *Example: Do not use your public office for private gain.*
Ethics	The study of what we understand to be good and right behaviour and how people make those judgments. (Navran, 2005)
Ethics Code	Document intending to articulate the values and principles expected of decision makers when confronting unclear or ambiguous ethical circumstances. Often conveys organisational values, a commitment to standards, and communicates a set of ideals. In practice, used interchangeably with Code of Conduct. (Gitman, 2005)
Code of Conduct	Document designed to anticipate and prevent certain specific types of behaviours. Can refer to a listing of required behaviours, the violation of which would result in disciplinary action. In practice, used interchangeably with Code of Ethics. (Gitman, 2005) Codes of conduct in the education sector, in accordance with UNESCO's definition, embrace the concept of mutual accountability and the accountability of all those charged with enabling good quality education (UNESCO, 2005)
Code of Behaviour	Term used interchangeably with Code of Conduct or Ethics Code.
Principles of Social Responsibility	A framework of measurable corporate policies and procedures and resulting behaviour designed to benefit the workplace and, by extension, the individual, the organisation, and the community (ISM, 2004).

IV. The Business-Higher Education Model: Attempting to Bring Together Perspectives from Two "Different Worlds"

A number of interconnected, yet disparate forces such as globalisation, the deregulation of companies, the ICT revolution, and the rise of civic societies have combined to undermine trust in business. The emerging global civic society transgresses national borders and demands for corporate sustainability, as well as respect for environment and social and human rights throughout the world. Because of increasing interdependency and changes in the corporate law not only multinational corporations but also small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), public sector organisations, and HEIs must address the demands for transparency, dialogue and systematic reporting.

Recent scandals in the business sector[3] and a variety of episodes of ethical conflict in universities all over the world[4] have motivated calls from a variety of stakeholders to discuss what would be required in order to embed ethics not only in the classroom, but also in the management of higher education institutions. In some cases, those calls arise from the business sector, or from entities which bring together the perspectives of the corporate and university sectors on areas of common interest. In this regard, one significant development has been the work conducted through the "Ethics Initiative" at the U.S. Business-Higher Education Forum, an independent organisation hosted by the American Council on Education.

In a recently commissioned report, the author outlines two main areas of work on this subject: ethics in the classroom, and ethics in the management of institutions (Soule, 2005). The report suggests that the corporate scandals caused by the unethical behaviour of some top executives could have been prevented if solid ethical education had been made available when these executives were university students. In addition, it is considered that strategies for managing ethical performance can be implemented in areas such as intercollegiate athletics, medical centres, and commercially sponsored research and development, as well as in promoting academic integrity, encouraging responsible behaviour in campus social life, instilling ethical values, and, in general, preparing students for the ethical challenges they will encounter in their careers. In encouraging institutional leaders to consider applying corporate strategies for managing ethical performance in their organisations, the report concludes that a university will not have the standing to further the moral development of its students unless it is viewed as having made every effort to conduct its own affairs with integrity –unless the institution is held as a moral exemplar. The report also recommends expressing ethical aspirations as explicit goals, and managing them systematically or in much the same rigorous manner as a high-risk operational area. The Business-Higher Education Forum report, although it highlights important issues, falls short in suggesting concrete action. Nevertheless, it outlines useful suggestions for implementation at the institutional level.

A related effort, which goes beyond the recognition of the problem and provided specific tools for institutions, is the one made recently in the United Kingdom. At the end of 2005, the Council for Industry and Higher Education (CIHE) - an independent organisation aimed at fostering mutual understanding, cooperation and support between higher education and business - published a guide designed to help higher education institutions deal with ethical matters. Entitled "Ethics Matters: Managing Ethical Issues in Higher Education", this document has been widely disseminated among higher education

---

[3] The cases of Enron, WorldCom, Adelphia Communications, Vivendi and Arthur Andersen are among the most widely publicized.

[4] Recent media reports have included reference to mismanagement in the handling of research on embryonic cloning at the National University of Seoul, the alleged fraud in offering non-valid degrees in Argentina based on an agreement with a university in Spain, the ethical dilemma of a university in the U.S. in accepting a donation from an alleged former mob member, the multimillion-dollar salaries of Harvard's top money managers who were forced to leave the institution once the information became public, the periodic boycott that students make of universities selling products being manufactured by companies accused of using "sweatshop labour," in their memorabilia stores, etc. However, there are many other less publicized cases in which institutional leaders face difficult choices in the decision-making process.

institutions, with the expectation that it will help them develop institutional approaches to ethical issues. The framework is designed as a starting point for discussions. An important element of the guide is that it provides specific steps in developing a framework and implementing policies and processes for the handling of ethical challenges in the management of institutions.

The drafting of the guide was done by means of a lengthy consultative process which involved the participation of over 100 institutions, with 90 delegates attending a national consultative conference, supported by the work of an advisory group of 20 people, from both the higher education and corporate sectors, including a representative from Universities UK, the umbrella higher education organisation in the United Kingdom.

As a follow-up, five universities in the UK have agreed to create their own ethics frameworks. In addition, CIHE has created a forum for participating institutions, and it is launching a Web site which will include relevant information, training materials, guides, and updates on institutions implementing ethics frameworks. At the end of 2006, CIHE is considering conducting an assessment of the project to analyze the outcomes at participating institutions in greater detail. Also, it is expected that a major conference will be convened on this topic[5].

V. Fostering Sustainability or Corporate Social Responsibility in Higher Education Institutions: From Global Ambitions to Institutional Realities

Sustainability and social responsibility are related concepts. Based on the idea that emerged in the 1970s of embracing corporations that conduct regular social audits and the work on sustainable development carried out by the Brundtland Commission and the United Nations,[6] the Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) can be defined broadly as the efforts corporations make above and beyond regulation to balance the needs of stakeholders with the need to make a profit (Doane, 2005). In a more schematic way, CSR is defined as categories or levels of economic, legal, ethical and discretionary activities of an organisation or entity as adapted to the values and expectations of society (Joyner, B.E. and D. Payne, 2002) (see Attachment 1 for a more detailed description).

The Development of CSR reporting is lead and directed by Global Reporting Initiative. GRI is a multi-stakeholder process and independent institution and a collaborating centre of UN Environment Programme whose mission is to develop and disseminate globally acceptable Sustainability Reporting Guidelines. The GRI Guidelines (to be revised in 2006) address a broad range of social responsibility issues as well as environmental and social performance. The GRI system is driven by its indicators and the guidelines enable comparison between different types of organisations. Today, about 700 organisations in more than 50 countries engage in systematic reporting on their socially responsible operations. The GRI intends to develop a reporting system for all HEIs worldwide in collaboration with the University leaders for Sustainable Future (ULSF), UNESCO, International Association of Universities (IAU) and Copernicus Campus (a European association of universities concerned with sustainable development.

At a country level too there is a related experience which may be relevant for the purposes of this paper. One of the most recognized sets of principles for corporate social responsibility in the U.S. is the one that the Rev. Leon H. Sullivan developed in 1976, and which currently is being endorsed by more than 200 corporations, including some of the largest companies in the U.S.

---

[5] Telephone interview with Barbara Blake, Employability and Ethics Coordinator, CIHE

[6] In 1987, the World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED), which had been set up in 1983, published a report entitled " Our common future". The document came to be known as the "Brundtland Report" after the Commission's chairwoman, Gro Harlem Brundtland.

As described in their Web site, The Global Sullivan Principles of Social Responsibility (GSP) is a voluntary code of conduct with the goal of having "companies and organisations of all sizes, in widely disparate industries and cultures, working toward the common goals of human rights, social justice and economic opportunity". GSP are intended to be endorsed by corporations, governments, educational institutions and other civic and non-for-profit organisations.

Putting special emphasis on appropriate and equal working conditions for employees, GSP endorsers pledge to be transparent in implementing those principles and in providing information which publicly demonstrates their commitment to them.

In 2002, a formal campaign was conducted to attract the interest and participation of U.S. higher education institutions. A steering committee, composed of the presidents of eight major universities, produced a blue-print for dissemination among institutions, and invitations for participation were issued. Unfortunately, a combination of events including the death of Rev. Sullivan and changes in the leadership of the institutions initially involved, combined to result in the effort's failure. An officer from the Sullivan Foundation[7], recently said that trying to implement GSP in higher education institutions "is not an easy task" due to the complex nature of the institutions and the unique characteristics of their leadership and their decision-making processes. The leadership of the Foundation has decided to concentrate its efforts mostly on the corporate sector, and as a consequence, to put the "higher education initiative" on hold, and, based on their previous experience, to attempt to attract the interest of higher education institutions in the future.

In UK the Higher Education Partnership for Sustainability (HEPS) was established in 2000 by the Forum for Future and 18 universities and colleges across UK to establish a group of HEIs to boost positive engagement with sustainable development agenda and to generate the tools, guidance and inspiration for the HE sector. HEPS has produced sustainability reporting guidelines which apply to HEIs at all levels and a number of other guidelines supporting sustainable activities (e.g. accounting, purchasing, travel planning, construction, resource and asset management, learning and skills development, and communication). The HEPS work has had a focus on demonstration effects through developing green buildings, cutting emissions and improving the curriculum.

Finally, at the institutional level, there are examples of overall strategies aimed at adopting, implementing and evaluating corporate social responsibility in HEIs. The background for such pursuits has been the fact that the HEI leadership has been required to take their social responsibility to a variety of stakeholders more seriously. In Turku University of Applied Sciences (formerly known as Turku Polytechnic) the new trend was effectively encapsulated in Sustainability/CSR programme which is described on detail in Attachment 1.

VI. Ethics in Managing Academic Issues: A Stakeholder Approach

Dealing with academic issues is an area of natural tension in the decision making process at the institutional level. Issues such as academic freedom; shared governance; integrity in the recruitment, hiring and tenure processes; etc. from time to time put the administration at odds with academic staff, creating important dilemmas for institutional decision makers. In the U.S., the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) is a very vocal and politically active organisation which represents the interests of professors and researchers. The AAUP has been successful in developing a set of principles of integrity for the areas of academic freedom and tenure, which is widely accepted throughout the academic community. Since its debut in 1940, the "Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure" has been endorsed by nearly 200 academic professional associations. Although there is no legal obligation for

---

[7] Telephone interview with Sharlie Mello, Program and Operations Coordinator, Sullivan Foundation.

higher education institutions to follow the principles, peer pressure and constant monitoring from AAUP, make it very difficult for institutional administrators to "violate" such a code of conduct. The constant pressure from AAUP, and other related stakeholders, led recently to the issuing of a "Statement on Academic Rights and Responsibilities" by the American Council on Education –the major umbrella higher education organisation in the U.S.- which was endorsed by 25 national higher education organisations including AAUP (ACE, 2005).

Finally, the role of AAUP in monitoring institutional actions has been extended to include guidelines and statements of conduct in a variety of areas including: censure, collective bargaining, discrimination, distance education and intellectual property issues, diversity and affirmative action, ethics in the classroom, evaluation, financial exigency, governance, graduate students, part-time & non-tenure-track faculty, sexual harassment, students, workload and even work-family issues, among others.

VII. Values and Ethics in the Agenda for International Organisations: Not an Issue

Although the ideas of values and ethics in higher education are frequent subjects of debate in the higher education arena, concrete actions at the level of international organisations are very limited, and if in existence, little known. Following a similar pattern to what happens at the national level, international organisations also make emphasis on the relevance of the important contribution that HEIs can make to societal awareness by conducting research and teaching students, but with only indirect mention of the implications for the management of the higher education institutions by themselves.

Umbrella higher education organisations such as the International Association of Universities (IAU) or the International Association of University Presidents (IAUP) have not developed or pursued the development of similar frameworks. Even as a topic for conferences, the issue has been overlooked in favour of others. UNESCO is exploring the topic mainly through the Ethics and Corruption in Education (ETICO) Programme which was created in 2001 with the idea of sharing best practices to promote ethics in schools and to improve transparency and accountability in education systems. At the higher education level, the focus of UNESCO has been devoted mostly to the collaborative work with OECD in developing guidelines for quality assurance in cross-border higher education, and the development of guidelines for the use of university computer networks and the internet (OECD, 2005).

At IAU, 1998 was the most recent year in which the issue of ethics was in some way officially addressed. At that time, an official document was published, entitled "Statement on Academic Freedom, University Autonomy and Social Responsibility". No further specific follow up has been done. With respect to the IAUP, the topic is not formally part of any of their Commissions or Working Groups, and has not been included as a central theme in their recent conferences. Other international regional organisations (including the UDUAL-Association of Latin American Universities, IOHE-Inter American Organisation for Higher Education, and EUA-European University Association) have no formal activity in this arena. Even at the EUA, the issue of ethics and values is no longer part of the Action Plan. On the other side, NGOs don't seem to place much importance on the topic in their agendas. As an example, Transparency International recently organised an event in France entitled "Fighting Corruption: Challenges for Higher Education" in which the emphasis was only on interesting universities and researchers in educating students on integrity and transparency[8].

At a regional level, an important effort in involving institutions in adopting some common principles for responsible management is the one developed in Europe entitled "The Magna Charta". A set of four basic principles on responsible institutional autonomy, relevance of teaching and research, academic freedom, and intercultural openness and tolerance, are the central elements of a formal statement

---

[8] The conference was held in Paris on February 24, 2006. More information can be obtained at: http://www.transparence-france.org

signed in Bologna in 1988, as part of the celebrations for the 900 Anniversary of the University of Bologna, by 388 Rectors of universities from around the world. The signing of this document was promoted by the University of Bologna and the European University Association. Although, the Magna Charta is more of a reaffirmation of the role and fundamental values of the universities, it provides insightful lessons on the development of common international frameworks. It also brings into perspective a discussion on the tensions inherent to the need to preserve institutional autonomy while responding to the increasing calls for appropriate institutional management. Today, the University of Bologna hosts "The Magna Charta Observatory" on its Web site, and a Secretariat. More than 500 institutions from all over the world are listed as signatories. An international conference on related topics is being held annually and proceedings of the event are posted in their web site.

More recently, the Magna Charta Observatory in collaboration with ESIB, the National Unions of Students in Europe, has been studying the issue of academic malpractice in HEIs in Europe. Both organisations released in 2005 a "Statement of Concern" in which they reiterate their preoccupations regarding "academic malpractice" (ESIB, 2005). The document calls for new transparency to ensure the universities' future. This statement has been distributed among all the Magna Charta members. In addition, a survey and a set of papers on the topic are being made and it is expected to hold a future conference which eventually may lead to the development of a code of institutional practices[9].

VIII. Is There Room for Action?

Several countries have national level initiatives under consideration. In reviewing some of them, and focussing on regional and international organisations, a similar pattern is observed: there is proliferation of efforts promoted by organisations or interest groups each with a particular focus (academic freedom, transparent procurement, ethics in research, recruitment practices, financial reporting, teaching ethics, etc.). Nevertheless, few of these efforts report concrete outcomes, demonstrate a sound implementation strategy, or show effective measurement and assessment. Some of those efforts fall down once the main promoters or "champions" are no longer involved, or in some cases, once the public pressure for response to a specific problem has diminished. On the other hand, the abundance of ideas may serve as an indicator of the increased concern for, and awareness of, the issue not only in HEIs but also for internal and external stakeholders.

The limited interest from higher education umbrella organisations at the international level could be seen as a reaffirmation of the assumption that ethical guidelines for the management of higher education institutions are useless or difficult to implement, but rather it can be argued that it is an area of opportunity to further explore the topic and that effort at international level, aimed at developing guidelines for managing ethics in HEIs, may nevertheless be feasible. Those guidelines could include a set of ethical conditions or behaviours expected from decision-makers in higher education institutions, and building on national initiatives. This could be done by learning from the successes and failures, and achievements and limitations of related initiatives not only within the higher education sector but beyond.

---

[9] Telephone interview with Andris Bablan, Secretary General, Observatory of the Magna Charta Universitatum

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ACE (American Council on Education), (2005), *Statement on Academic Rights and Responsibilities*, ACE, Washington, http///www.aaup.org/statements/SpchState/Statements/ABORJointStatement.pdf, accessed 15 March 2006

Albatch, P., (2004), *The Question of Corruption in Academe*, International Higher Education, 34: 7-8

Boland, J. A., (2005), Student Participation in Shared Governance: A Means of Advancing Democratic Values?, Tertiary Education and Management, 11:199–217

CIHE (Council for Industry and Higher Education), (2005), *Ethics Matters: Managing Ethical Issues in Higher Education*, CIHE, London

Doane, D. (2005), *The Myth of CSR*, OnPhilanthropy: Trends/Commentary, http://www.onphilanthropy.com/tren_comm/tc2005-11-04a.html, accessed 15 March 2006

Elkington, J., (1997), Cannibals with forks: The Triple Bottom line of 21st Century business. John Wiley and Sons, London.

ESIB (National Unions of Students in Europe) and Observatory Magna Charta Universitarum (2005), *Academic Malpractice: A Statement of Concern*, working document, ESIB

Felt, U., (2005) "University Autonomy in the European Context: Revisiting the Research-Teaching Nexus in a Post-Humboldtian Environment" in Observatory of the Magna Charta, *Managing University Autonomy*, Bononia University Press, Bologna

Gilman, S.C., (2005), *Ethics Codes and Codes of Conduct as Tools for Promoting an Ethical and Professional Public Service: Comparative Successes and Lessons,* World Bank, Washington, D.C.

Global Reporting Initiative, (2002), Sustainability Reporting Guidelines 2002, http://www.globalreporting.org/guidelines/2002

Guelcher, S.J. and J.J. Cahalane, (1999), *The Challenge of Developing Ethics Programs in Institutions of Higher Education*, Business and Society Review, Vol. 104, 3: 325-346.

Hallak, J. and M. Poisson, (2005), *Academic fraud and quality assurance: Facing the challenge of internationalization of higher education,* UNESCO, Paris

Higher Education Partnership for Sustainability, Forum for the Future (2003), *Reporting for sustainability. Guidance for Higher Education Institutions*, London. http://www.forumforthefuture.org.uk

IAU (International Association of Universities), (2006), *IAU Speaks out: Policy Statements*, IAU, Paris

ISM, (2004), *ISM Principles of Social Responsibility with Accompanying Supply Management Audit for Social Responsibility Principles*, ISM, Tempe

Joyner, B.E. and D. Payne (2002), *Evolution and Implementation: A Study of Values, Business Ethics and Corporate Social Responsibility*, Journal of Business Ethics. 41: 297–311

Navan, F. (2005), *What is the Difference Between Ethics, Morals and Values?,ERC,* http://www.ethics.org/ask_e4.html, accessed 15 March 2006

Observatory Magna Charta Universitarum, (1998), *Magna Charta delle Universitá Europee*, Observatory Magna Charta Universitarum, Bologna

OECD (2004), *Corporate Governance: A Survey of OECD Countries*, OECD, Paris

OECD (2005), *Public Sector Integrity: A Framework for Assessment,* OECD, Paris.

OECD (2004), *Principles of Corporate Governance*, OECD, Paris

OECD (2000), *Trust in Government: Ethic Measures in OECD Countries*, OECD, Paris

OECD (1998), *Principles for Managing Ethics in the Public Service*, PUMA Policy Brief No. 4, OECD, Paris

OECD (2005), *UNESCO-OECD Guidelines for Quality Provision in Cross-border Higher Education*, OECD, Paris, http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/27/51/35779480.pdf, accessed 15 March 2006

Rumyantseva, N., (2005), *Taxonomy of Corruption in Higher Education*, Peabody Journal of Education, 80(1), 81-92

SECODAM (2004), *Códigos de Honor: la creación de una cultura de transparencia y responsabilidad en las universidades e instituciones de educación superior*, SECODAM, México

Social Accountability International, http://www.sa-intl.org

Soule, E., (2005), *Embedding Ethics in Business and Higher Education: From Leadership to Management Imperative*, The Business-Higher Education Forum, Washington, D.C.

SustainAbility, (2004), *Gearing up: From Corporate Social Responsibility to Governance and Scaleable solutions*. Sustainability, London.

Temple, P. and G. Petrov (2004), *Corruption in Higher Education: Some Findings from the States of the Former Soviet Union*, Higher Education Management and Policy, Vol. 16, 1: 83-97

Turku Polytechnic (2004), *Corporate Social Responsibility Report 2004: Working for the Region*, Turku Polytechnic, Turku

UNESCO, (2005), Ethics and Corruption in Education: Codes of Conduct in the Education Sector, UNESCO, Paris, http://www.unesco.org/iiep/eng/focus/etico/conduct1.htm accessed 15 March 2006

ATTACHMENT 1. CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Contribution written by Jaana Puukka [10]

CSR is a concept that encompasses a range of theories and concepts relating to strategic management. Similar ideas are described as good corporate/organisational citizenship, ethical organisation and corporate sustainability. In principle, both sustainable development and CSR are seen as based on the three pillars of economic, environmental and social responsibility. For example, Elkington (1997) suggests that organisations should drive for progress on three bottom lines: the economic, the environmental and the social. The definition of CSR by SustainAbility (2004) illustrates the interdependence of terms and concepts, describing CSR as "an approach …that embodies transparency and ethical behaviour, respect for stakeholder groups and commitment to add economic, social and environmental value."

The CSR movement gained momentum more recently in the year 2000 when the United Nations created an international initiative – the Global Compact – intending to bring companies together with UN agencies, labour and civil society to support universal environmental and social principles in the areas of human rights, labour, the environment and anti-corruption. Today, almost 3 000 companies from all regions of the world, international labour and civil society organisations, including around 50 universities, mostly from Spain, have subscribed to the precepts established in the Global Compact. However, the participation of higher education institutions is based solely on the idea that they can conduct research aimed at understanding corporate citizenship, and that academia plays an important role in shaping future business leaders and educating them on the importance of responsible citizenship. No mention is made of the fact that higher education institutions themselves could implement the same principles for the purpose of their own administration.

CSR involves increased demand for transparency. Regular assessment of social environmental and economic performance and the reporting of the findings to stakeholders play an essential role in a socially responsible organisation. A most notable evolution has been the development of a global standard Social Accountability 8000 by Social Accountability International.

One concrete example of the applicability of CSR in higher education is the case of Turku University of Applied Sciences (formerly known as Turku Polytechnic) in Finland. Turku was the first institution of higher education which launched a systematic reporting on its economic, environmental and social performance based on GRI Sustainability Reporting Guidelines as a means of developing their management and operations.

In 2003 and 2004 the Finnish legislation governing HEIs underwent a change laying down provision for more responsive third role activities. The broadening focus of HE with enhanced demands for regional engagement and societal role meant that social and ethical issues facing HEIs in their strategic planning and daily operations became increasingly important considerations.

---

[10] *Consultant, OECD-IMHE Programme, jaana.puukka@oecd.org*

The first CSR Turku report (for 2003) won national recognition in the Finnish Competition for Environmental and CSR Reporting as the best public sector report of the year. Although the Sustainability/CSR programme was implemented in the context of a Finnish professionally oriented HEI, results suggest that systematic sustainability reporting may have generic significance and value for the HE scene.

The Turku experience suggests that (1) the systematic Sustainability/CSR reporting provides a functional framework through which HEI's third role activities and internal capacity and performance can be systematically developed and managed through continuous improvement. A concrete example is the development of management information systems and processes in response to the demands of socially responsible behaviour; (2) Sustainability/CSR programme facilitates the process of addressing the wide range of and constantly changing set of demands of the stakeholders from which the HEI ultimately gains its "Licence to Operate"; (3) With the help of the GRI reporting HEIs can provide internal and external stakeholders a balanced report on their operations and their economic, environmental and social impacts while the traditional reporting required by the government fails to give an adequately accurate picture of HEIs and their impact; (4) Sustainability/CSR reporting is helpful risk management. Through systematic CSR reporting a HEI can map the risks involved in its operations and identify aspects in need of further development; (5) CSR can be used for attracting, retaining and developing high calibre staff and students. Good reputation, positive employer image and well developed CSR approaches with employee investments are a strong motivating force when recruiting students and highly skilled, high value labour.

All in all, the sustainability/CSR approach involves a shift from short term to long term planning and strategic management as well as enhanced stakeholder cooperation.

ATTACHMENT 2. USEFUL RESOURCES AND DOCUMENTS

1) Organisations:

ORGANISATION	WWW ADDRESS	LOCATION
American Association of University Professors	http://www.aaup.org	U.S.A.
American Council on Education	http://www.acenet.edu	U.S.A.
Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada	http://www.aucc.ca	Canada
Australian Vice-Chancellors Committee	http://www.avcc.edu.au	Australia
Conference Board of Canada	http://www.conferenceboard.ca	Canada
Consortium for North American Higher Education Collaboration	http://conahec.org	U.S.A.
Council for Industry and Higher Education	http://www.cihe-uk.com	United Kingdom
Global Compact	http://www.unglobalcompact.org/	U.S.A.
Institute of Business Ethics	http://www.ibe.org.uk/	U.K.
Institute for Global Ethics	http://www.globalethics.org/index.htm	U.S.A.
Magna Charta	http://www.magna-charta.org/home.html	Italy
National Unions of Students in Europe	http://www.esib.org	Belgium
Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development	http://www.oecd.org	France
Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education	http://www.mcmaster.ca/stlhe	Canada
Sullivan Foundation	http://www.thesullivanfoundation.org	U.S.A.
Transparency International	http://www.transparency.org/	Germany
UNESCO's Programme on Ethics and Corruption in Education	http://www.unesco.org/iiep/eng/focus/etico/etico1.html	France
U.S. Business-Higher Education Forum	http://www.bhef.com	U.S.A.

2) Documents:

TITLE	PUBLISHING ORGANISATION	WWW ADDRESS
Corporate Social Responsibility Report 2004: Working for the Region	Turku Polytechnic	http://www.turkupolytechnic.fi/csr/turku_polytechnic_csr_report.pdf
Embedding Ethics in Business and Higher Education	The Business-Higher Education Forum	http://www.bhef.com/initiatives/embed_read.cfm
Ethical Guidelines for Business–Education Partnerships	The Conference Board of Canada	http://www.conferenceboard.ca/education/learning-tools/pdfs/ethical.pdf?FILTERNAME=%40CHANNEL\&FILTERVALUE=boardwiseii\&FILTERCOMPARE=5
Ethical Principles in University Teaching	The Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education	http://www.mcmaster.ca/stlhe/projects/ethical.principles.htm
Guide on Ethics for Universities and Colleges	The Council for Industry and Higher Education	http://www.cihe-uk.com/ethics.php
Guidelines for Quality Provision in Cross-border Higher Education	UNESCO and OECD	http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/27/51/35779480.pdf
Principles for Managing Ethics in the Public Service	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development	http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/60/13/1899138.pdf
Principles of Corporate Governance	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development	http://www.oecd.org/acrobatebook/2604011E.PDF
Proceedings of the 2004 International Conference on Ethical and Moral Dimensions for Higher Education and Science in Europe	UNESCO – CEPES	http://www.cepes.ro/September/default.htm
Statement about Governance in Higher Education	The Australian Vice-Chancellors Committee	http://www.avcc.edu.au/documents/policies_programs/statements/AVCC_Governance.pdf
Statement on Academic Freedom, University Autonomy and Social Responsibility	International Association of Universities	http://www.unesco.org/iau/he/af/index.html
Statement on Academic Rights and Responsibilities	American Council on Education	http:///www.aaup.org/statements/SpchState/Statements/ABORJointStatement.pdf
The Global Sullivan Principles of Social Responsibility	The Sullivan Foundation	http://www.thesullivanfoundation.org/gsp/default.asp
The Magna Charta	University of Bologna and European University Association	http://www.magna-charta.org/home.html