



Public participation in the governance at the higher education in Ukraine

The scope of power of certain university governing bodies primarily depends on the deregulation level in higher education and the university itself. The universities autonomy is divided into several types upon the criteria of power application: academic, administrative and financial¹. Moreover, the cases of completely independent universities are extremely rare – researchers mostly assess the extent to which universities are autonomous.

Academic autonomy is mainly related to the programs content and research programs, in particular, it is about universities' ability to open new programs at own discretion, define programs' duration and develop content, identify quality assurance tools, set criteria for applicants' selection, award diplomas and degrees, and also independently recognize diplomas and degrees received abroad.

Administrative autonomy covers the processes of forming university governing bodies: rector's appointment or dismissal, academic councils, various boards; design and define of university's structure; opportunity to enter into various agreements, establish other legal entities, choose criteria for staff selection, hire or dismiss staff, determine the remuneration packages.

Universities's financial autonomy is mostly associated with the ability to manage funds (public or earned revenues), to sell or lease the property, borrow funds or deposit them, to determine the educational services fees, and in fact prepare the list of such services.

Usually the level of academic autonomy is largely regulated by the educational legislation, while administrative and financial autonomy is often determined not only by the laws on education or science but also by the budget, tax, customs, property,

¹ Sometimes researchers distinguish more types. For example, the European University Association in its reports on autonomy shared administrative component of organizational and personnel. Estermann, T., Nokkala, T., Steinel, M., University Autonomy in Europe II: The Scorecard, EUA, Brussels, 2011



commercial and labor laws as many aspects are described there.

Ukrainian higher education legislation is currently in transition. The new Law "On higher education", which came into force on 1 September 2014, initiated changes in the regulatory field. According to the National Reforms Council, 19 out of 40 regulations envisaged by reform are adopted as of now². The many issues remaining without proper legislative support have created so-called inactive rules. Apart from this, the rules that have full legislative support often diverge from their practical application.

Consequently, implementation of the new legislation is selective and, despite the common legal framework, in practice there are many examples of different levels of universities' autonomy, as well as public involvement in the universities management.

Academic autonomy

Ukrainian universities have legal autonomy to organize the educational process and determine the programs design³. The state reserves the right to determine the state higher education standards. However, these standards mainly describe framework: the total amount of ECTS credits needed to obtain the corresponding higher education degree; list of graduates' competencies; limited amount of normative learning outcomes; forms of students certification; requirements for the internal quality assurance system; professional standards' requirements (if any)⁴. If universities want to obtain state accreditation and the state funding for their programs, they should be guided by the state standards when opening new study programs⁵.

Question of introducing new programs in Ukraine currently lays in a kind of legal vacuum as neither new standards, nor government independent National Agency of

² http://www.centre-reform.org/assets/files/nationalreform_broshura_3.pdf

³ Art. 32.2 of Law on HE

⁴ Art. 10.3 of Law on HE

⁵ Art. 7.6 of Law on HE

Project Funded by the
European Union



Quality Assurance in higher education are created. The last one has to perform an expert assessment of program's ability to meet the standards requirements, achieve stated learning outcomes, and actually establish whether these results were achieved. The old standards regulated not only the framework questions but also determined in detail 60-90% of study programs' content. At this time, the old standards are partly in force being only recommended for use. Hence, now universities have even greater amount of power in determining their programs content and structure, and quality assurance mechanisms, than envisaged by reform.

National Agency is the new public governance body which duties are described in 17-23 articles of Law on Higher Education. It consists of 25 delegates from universities, National academy of science and academies branches, employers association and congress of students' self-governance bodies representatives. Employers delegate 3 members and students elect 2 members. Members of the Agency shall stay in office for the period of three years. The same person may not serve in Agency for more than two terms. Chairs and deputy chairs of the National academy of sciences and academies of sciences branches, private higher education institutions rectors or founders may not be members of the Agency. Members of Agency elect its head and deputies. In addition, students and employers should be presented among members of expert councils formed by Agency. Councils should assess program's ability to meet the standards requirements and Agency should decide whether to give accreditation or not taking into account council analyses. Currently Agency is being formed.

Admission to universities is based on independent external testing results, while universities are allowed to carry out their own selection process only for certain programs (arts, sports, etc.). Higher education institutions set their own admission rules for the entrants, but must take into account specific conditions set by the Ministry of Education and Science (MES): ensure transparency of admission campaign, entrants' compliance

with registration procedure, campaign calendar arrangement etc⁶. Besides, MES determines the total number of students in the program, and the number of places that are financed by the state⁷. Meanwhile universities define subjects, which test results are relevant to apply to the program and set the score for enrolling into the program.

Ukrainian universities have only the nominal right to award research degrees as the National Agency concludes the conditions to award those. The National Agency also authorizes the universities to conduct such activities⁸. In addition, currently universities cannot recognize foreign research degrees on their own. In contrast, the recognition of BA and MA diplomas obtained in other countries is legally regulated and lays fully within the universities competence⁹.

Administrative autonomy

Universities alone choose their governing bodies. However, the elected candidate for the rector's position is approved by the Ministry of Education and Science. Though it is more of a formality, as the Ministry cannot disapprove the candidacy if all the procedures were adhered¹⁰. Universities also have the right to change their own organizational structure and to set up separate educational or research institutions, as well as enterprises for conducting innovative or production activities¹¹. Personnel policy also lays fully within the higher education institutions responsibility and competence, except for the issue of guaranteed wage, which is state determined.

⁶ Art. 44 of Law on HE

⁷ Art. 13, 72 of Law on HE

⁸ Art. 18 of Law on HE

⁹ Art. 32 of Law on HE

¹⁰ Art. 42 of Law on HE

¹¹ Art. 70 of Law on HE



Financial autonomy

Ukrainian state universities have the status of state budget institutions, which imposes on them a number of limitations and the need to coordinate many of their actions with the State Treasury and Financial Control. However, universities can have accounts outside of the Treasury system, including bank deposits, where they are allowed to deposit funds from tuition fees or other fee charging services, as well as the funds from international grants. Universities set the tuition fee level and the fee for other services at their own discretion¹² though the list of such services is defined by the state. Besides this, universities do not have full ownership their property and do not have the authority to sell it freely, but they can lease it¹³. Contrary, private universities do not fall under listed restrictions.

Public governance on the national level

In contrast to the National Agency, which is to be formed there are a number of public governance bodies on the national level, which technically have been existing for quite a lot time.

Rectors Council is NGO, which usually hosts conferences or other events and sometimes issues statements on current educational policy.

Ministry of Education and Science Advisory Board is formed and chaired by the Minister. Board's influence level depends on the Minister policy. Mostly Board decides on issues, which has ceremonial character (awards, competitions, titles etc.). Sometimes Minister consults with the board on some conceptual matters like admission campaign rules or key quality assurance policy steps. Anyhow, it is the Minister who decides

¹² Art. 70 of Law on HE

¹³ Art. 73 of Law on HE



whether to implement Board's decision or not. Currently there is 5 NGO representatives, 1 head of national trade union, Rectors Council Chairperson of among 36 board members, which is mostly formed from ministerial officers¹⁴. In addition, there are no any special laws on participation in higher education governance for Rector's council (like any other NGO) and MES Advisory Board.

Rights and Duties Division in the university

Rector, academic council, supreme collegial body of public self-governance at the university, departmental heads, students' self-governing body, supervisory board, different task forces and temporary commissions are all involved in the HEI management process.

Rector

Of all governing bodies the university rector has the vastest amount of authority and responsibility. In fact, he or she directly controls the higher education institution activities and, unlike other bodies that gather at certain intervals, rector is permanently coordinates administration staff vertical at university.

Article 34 of Law on Higher Education set rector's duties. Within the scope of given mandate rector is responsible for organizing and maintaining current HEI activities, financial and business operations, financial plan implementation, managing property and funds, and for financial discipline in every department. He or she defines the higher education institution structure (with approval of academic council) and staff list, hires and fires any staff or faculty member, outlines their duties and controls the their work quality. Together with trade union organizations rector sets the internal rules and forms a collective agreement, which afterwards signs provided that the supreme collegial body approved them. In addition, university rector guarantees the rule of law and ensures

¹⁴ List of members <http://mon.gov.ua/about/kolegiya-ministerstva/normativna-baza.html>
Project Funded by the
European Union



conditions for public monitoring at HEI, for students' self-government bodies activities, trade union organizations and non-governmental organizations.

As for academic duties, rector ensures the admission campaign conduction and enrollment, organization of control over curricula performance and course syllabi. He or she also takes the final decision for students' expulsion (or resumption), but after it is agreed with students' self-government body and primary students' trade unions.

Under some circumstances rector could share his or her duties with Vice Rectors or deans. Though, in any case it is the rector who is responsible for fulfilling his/her duties and accountable to HEI founder or its authorized body which, in fact, hires him or her after this person is elected at general HEI elections.

Deans essentially perform the same functions as rectors, but within certain structural units (departments, institutes) and within those competencies that do not contradict to rector's powers¹⁵.

Both rectors and deans may be in office no more than two terms up to five years each¹⁶.

According to the Article 42 of Law on Higher education heads of each HEI regardless of their ownership status are elected on direct elections by secret ballot allowing all full-time faculty members, elected staff representatives and elected students representatives to vote. Not less than 75% among voters should be faculty members, not less than 15% - students and not more than 10% - staff. The winner should get 50%+1 vote. Direct elections are fully implemented in practice. More than 40 direct elections have been held since fall of 2014, including at some largest universities such as Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv or Kharkiv Aviation Institute. A direct rector election is a relatively new practice for Ukraine, introduced by the new Law "On higher education". Some link

¹⁵ Art. 35 of Law on HE

¹⁶ Art. 42,43 of Law on HE
Project Funded by the
European Union



its core mission to the raise awareness among newly elected heads about their accountability to academic community and students. However, primary reason for direct elections implementation instead of elections by electors is the aim to increase elected rector awareness that he/she is responsible to academic community itself. So, the efficiency of such instrument depends directly on the level of representative democracy culture. The current experience of direct elections shows that level remains low. For instance, during elections in Kyiv-Mohyla Academy (HEI with relatively high student activity) not all attempt to elect student electors were successful for the first time – sometimes students didn't show any interest for the opportunity to take part in direct elections.

Firstly, most universities lack the healthy faculty and students environment who are eager to make some efforts to hold transparent rector elections. Such people could act as electoral process observers, organize candidates' debates, engage media to cover the process, conduct a parallel vote count. Sometimes candidates do not offer any future activities program. If there are such, then, there is an evident lack of independent assessment of stated promises (activities, timing, resources, indicators), their clarity and feasibility. For instance, whether the program is in compliance with legislation and list of rector duties, or whether the financial, material and human resources are available for the stated promises implementation. Unfortunately, it is a popular practice for candidates to avoid debates or public discussions about their programs. For example during elections in Vinnytsia State Pedagogical University some candidates refused to take part in debates. Finally, in order to maximize the level of participation and spread the culture of conscious choice, the work of informing and motivating students and student electors should be done, as today's Ukrainian universities miss out on it.

Academic council

Academic Council is a collegial university body, which addresses the issues directly related to the educational and research processes, as well as strategic issues. Article 36 of Law on Higher Education prescribes duties of academic council.

It is the academic council which defines the HEI strategy and main areas for the development of educational, research and innovative activities, approves financial plan and annual financial report, as well as elaborates the draft statutes before it is passed for approval to the supreme collegial body of public self-governance.

As for academic duties, council defines the system and approves procedures for internal quality assurance, evaluates structural divisions academic and research performance, outlines study programs termination and requirements for graduates; grants academic titles of professor and in general handles most issues regarding educational process organization. Apart from that, academic council recognizes foreign diplomas, scientific degrees and academic titles when hiring new faculty members or administrative staff or during admission campaign.

Council's authority also complements the rector authority to a certain point. Thus, it approves curricula for each level and study programs, afterwards rector should take control over curricula performance. Academic council elects deans, academic department chairs, professors and associate professors, head of the library, and heads of branches by secret ballot. And then, rector appoints the winners and signs contracts with them. Academic council also makes decisions on department or other structural units establishment, reorganization and elimination based on rector's presentation. Moreover, in case of handling financial resources such as opening deposit accounts in a bank rector should receive the academic council approval of such action.

De-jure academic council could oppose the rector and even has the right to appeal to supreme public self-governance collegial body asking for dismiss HEI rector as a result of his/her laws, charter or rector's contract violation. However, it hasn't got down to it once.

In practice, rector often runs the academic council (even though one should not). The presence of Vice Rectors and some administrative staff representatives in the council provides considerable support for rector among council's members during voting process. Moreover, academic council decisions come into force only after rector's order. Consequently, academic council is not fully independent from the rector's influence.

According to article 36 of Law on HE rector, Vice rectors, deans, academic secretary, director of the library, chief accountant, self-governance bodies heads, heads of primary trade union units (students and faculty) are members of academic council by default. Another part of council is elected once in five years by the supreme public self-governance collegial body that chooses among candidates who are previously proposed by departments' collegial bodies. In addition, students should elect their own representatives in direct elections. If academic council decides so it could include employers' organizations representatives, which is really rare practice. As a result, at least 75 per cent of council shall consist of faculty members (senior administrative staff are also considered as such) and at least 10 per cent shall be elected students representatives.

Supreme public self-governance collegial body determines supreme public self-governance collegial body duties (SCG). It consists of delegates from faculty members, administrative staff and elected students representatives. Faculty members (senior management among them) should represent not less than 75% of this body and students – not less than 15%. Ordinary SCG gathers twice a year for some major activities. It votes for new Charter or amendments to it, listens to rector's annual report and assesses it, elects

committee on labor disagreements. Sometimes SCG is used as a platform for public hearings. Also SCG could dismiss rector, but only if 2/3 of SCG members vote for that.

Students' self-government bodies

Students' self-government bodies (SBB) represent the right and the opportunity for students to influence decisions concerning educational process and every day life, as well as the students' rights and interests defence. It also stands for the possibility to participate in the HEI management process.

Legally students are guaranteed many rights. Most of these rights and responsibilities are related to the access to education and participation in the learning process. Students have the right for free access to learning informational resources, free use of libraries, educational, research and sporting bases, to receive dormitory place, merit-based and social-based stipends, academic mobility, liberal art education (choice of 25% of study program), the right to interrupt education and resume it, etc¹⁷.

At the same time, students should comply with the legislation and HEI Charter and fulfill study program requirements.

In order to protect these rights and interests students are legally guaranteed the involvement in activities of HEI supreme public self-governance collegial body, institutes, faculties, departments, academic council of the university, students' self-government body¹⁸. In addition, the last one can be carried out by students in two ways: directly or through the student government, elected on students' direct election by secret ballot.

Using the last stated principal students elect their representatives to the academic council. The elected representatives are required to be students and together form not less than 10% of the academic council composition.

¹⁷ Art. 62 of Law on HE

¹⁸ Art. 40 of Law on HE

Project Funded by the
European Union



In addition to the academic council, students representatives participate in the SCG, where they make up at least 15% of its composition¹⁹.

Also students elect their representatives to vote on the rector's elections. At least 15% of those who are empowered to elect should be pre-elected by the students and among students by secret ballot. Taking into account that each full-time faculty member has the right to vote that could be quite a big amount of votes. For example, in universities with approximately 1000 full-time professors and teachers there should be 200 pre-elected student representatives among voters.

Apart from that, student annually elect their students' self-government bodies, which should follow 4 main principles: voluntary participation, collegiality, openness; electiveness and accountability; equal rights of students to participate in students' self-government; independence political parties and religious organizations influence (except theological higher education institutions). Article 40 of Law on Higher Education states SBB duties.

SBB may assume forms of parliament, senate, student rector's office, student dean's office, student councils etc. SBB may be registered as a non-governmental organization according to the existing legislation. Self-government bodies duties and rights are exercised to different extent in all three HEI autonomy dimensions. Firstly, they can participate in the decision making on the educational process and research training improvement, participate in quality assurance activities. They can also submit proposals on developing curricula and study program. As for the financial issues, SBBs have the right to be involved in the process of granting stipends, they can handle dormitory related issues, may submit proposals on university facilities development as well as on the procedure forming tuition fee and its level. In the administrative sphere, SBB protects students' rights and interest. The following decisions should be approved by SBB before final verdict: students expulsion and their resumption for study; students transfer from no-fee to tuition fee status; Vice Dean and Vice Rector appointment; dormitory activities,

¹⁹ Art. 39 of Law on HE

granting place in the dormitory and expulsion from the dormitory; HEI internal rules and procedures approval (only where concern students).

The SSB exercises its powers and involvement because their funding is the guaranteed by the university budget and students themselves. Academic council should allocate at least 0,5 % of universities revenues (from services fees) for students' self-government need. Also students' self-government body could charge membership fees. The amount of monthly fee per person may not exceed 1% of minimum living wage. In addition, rector shall ensure proper conditions for SBB activity and operations (provide premises, furniture, office equipment, telephone connection, permanent Internet access etc.). These all should be enforced by special agreement.

SBB members are also members of academic council (along with directly elected students' representatives). SBB also participate in different HEI temporary and permanent commissions. On the other side, higher education institution administration may not interfere with SBB activities.

Most of the time those legislative norms are not fully brought into practice. On one hand, relatively low students' activity and their interest to be engaged in HEI management plays its role. Quite often students do not know their rights and duties. Different monitorings²⁰ confirm that Ukrainian students show vanishingly small academic integrity culture and there is a significantly low demand on high-quality education: interest mainly in obtaining a formal higher education diploma, not knowledge. Under such circumstances the elected students' representatives or students' self-government bodies do not feel proper support and mandate of trust, thus they cannot actively use the most effective tools to influence the university's policies – reputational pressure, as students' environment tolerates manifestation of bad faith.

On the other hand, there are also some system difficulties, which limit even students' self-government activity supported by at least some groups among students. First of all, universities usually try to save on the expenditures intended to support students' governments. Formally, they can meet the requirements of the legislation providing

²⁰ Democratic initiatives (2014) <http://www.dif.org.ua/ua/polls/2015a/visha-osvita-v-ukraini-gromadska-dumka-studentiv-1433936412.htm>; Institute for Education Development (2015) <http://iro.org.ua/ua/main/research/22>



funding for such payments as utility services, and presenting it as SBB's activity support. This problem can be solved by the opening a separate account exclusively for SBB use. However, it will also require additional financial discipline inside SBB, and, for instance, accountant assistance on a paid basis. This way SBB has its financial means and can run its activities. Second of all, university administration tries to restrain students' activity in the areas where it may hurt administration's reputation. A striking example is a mass sabotage of students' questionnaire on the quality of higher education in their HEI launch. Third of all, real lack of funds in most universities often does not allow students to realize their rights during study. For instance, extremely important right to choose subjects granted by principle of Liberal Arts Education. According to preliminary estimates of CEDOS think tank²¹ only 10-15% of universities can guarantee students the right to a real choice of subjects that would allow them to form own educational trajectory.

Employers

According to the law, general state higher education policy should include the needs of an individual, interests of the state, local communities and employers. The last ones should be represented in the earlier mentioned National Agency for Quality Assurance as 3 of 25 members of Agency²². They should be included in new higher education standards development as well as could participate in graduates' final examination (certification)²³. In addition, employers' representatives could participate in academic council, if it decides so²⁴.

In order to supervise institution's assets management and its service to original purpose, supervisory board should be active in HEI. However, it does not have many

²¹ Final results of this monitoring will be published in January 2016.

²² Art. 35 of Law on HE

²³ Art. 6.2; 13.6 of Law on HE

²⁴ Art. 36 of Law on HE

Project Funded by the
European Union



rights or instruments to do its supervision mission. Its members could have advisory vote during supreme public self-governance collegial body meeting. Like academic council, supervisory board could appeal to supreme public self-governance collegial body asking to dismiss rector after he or she violates laws, Charter or contract.

For the purposes of strategy development rector could set up different advisory bodies (employers council, investors council, businesses council, students' council, research council, etc.)²⁵.

The role of such board is very nominal. Firstly, the law does not regulate the conflict of interests issue and does not prohibit university management to form advisory board at their discretion. Most often they include local bureaucratic elite, which could provide useful contacts for possible forthcoming lobby of personal interests. Secondly, there are no effective rotation mechanisms for supervisory board members. Thirdly, supervisory boards doesn't have a lot of powers to conduct effective supervision.

Trade union

The functioning trade unions system in HEI is inherited from the soviet past. That is why despite the fact that there is no such profession as "student", universities have functioning both students' and faculty trade unions. Heads of the unions participate in the academic council work. Faculty trade union agrees upon positions' description, which are approved by the rector. Trade union organizations also approve internal rules and a collective agreement before rector passes them to supreme public self-governance collegial body for final confirmation²⁶.

In reality students' trade union has a role in intermediary procurement of monthly students' travel documents and does not engage in the protection of students' rights. As the matter of fact, the union is often led by a person who is far from being a student. Indeed, contrary to the students' self-government, legislation does not provide trade

²⁵ Art. 38.2 of Law on HE

²⁶ Art. 34.11; 34.18; 56.4 of Law on HE
Project Funded by the
European Union



unions with any effective powers to represent the students' interests. That is why there is a need for cancelling such phenomena as students' trade union.

Similarly, faculty trade unions rarely stand up for the faculty labor rights even though it is their key role. The most common labor law violations (unpaid labor, forced unpaid leave, illegal dismissal, violations during recruitment etc.) are ignored by unions. The problem is that faculty do not actually expect protection from the trade unions. The National university faculty survey show that 71% find the work of trade unions effective, while 42% attribute violation of their rights and inefficient management in their HEI to the major problems of higher education²⁷. It means that the teaching staff does not perceive trade union as a means of influence on the university's management policy, rather as the tool to handle everyday life problems: vacation tickets distribution, payment of financial assistance and others.

Recommendations

In order to improve the public participation in the HEI management process efficiency, the university governing bodies system should be balanced in the first place. The duties should be distributed based on the subsidiarity principle, under which management of higher level takes responsibility and authority only if at a lower level those cannot be implemented or their implementation would be less effective.

For example, rector cannot organize an effective control over curricula performance and course syllabi. In this case rector should become a guarantor of compliance with the state higher education standards. He undertakes these obligations by signing a contract with the Ministry of Education. Instead, the duty of monitoring curricula performance and course syllabi has to be within academic council competency, internal quality assurance system should be done by faculty together with students' studying at program. Rector also cannot effectively supervise the faculty and staff quality of work. These duties should

²⁷ CEDOS think tank (2013) - <http://www.cedos.org.ua/uk/osvita/sotsialno-ekonomichni-ta-profesii-nyi-portret-ukrainskoho-vykladacha>

Project Funded by the
European Union



be delegated to deans and heads of departments. The authority and responsibility of rector should be linked more to the results than to the process. This way an adequate evaluation of HEI Rector work efficiency will be possible, eventually²⁸.

Academic council activities should be free from rector's influence. Firstly, rector should not be the head of academic council, as this way he or she controls its ongoing work and agenda. Besides, it is advisable to withdraw the administrative staff from the academic council, because they often lobby rector's interests during the decision making process.

The culture of representative democracy will appear among faculty and students only if the electors' mandate of trust will become less abstract and more accountable instead. One of the steps that will facilitate this will be the introduction of mandatory programs of candidates' for the rector's position, which in the case of victory should become an appendix to candidate's contract with the Ministry. Thus, failure to meet the pre-election promises will be counted as the contract violation, which in such terms will be the ground for its termination. Moreover, the threshold of votes for rector's dismissal should be reduced – instead of standard 2/3 of supreme public self-governance collegial body a simple majority will be sufficient.

Another problem that needs to be solved is the current supervisory boards weakness at universities. First, it is needed to distance themselves from university management influence. For example, it should be under the university founder direct supervision. They should not include persons who have an active direct connection with the university or relatives of someone who has. In this situation, employers who are interested in the HEI graduates become the most probable potential members of the Supervisory Board. Secondly, the supervisory board needs to be given real power to control the university budgeting, expenditures, payroll and the development strategies implementation. In particular, these authorities should include the possibility to initiate early university

²⁸ For the first time author heard these ideas from prof. Volodymyr Bakhrushyn
Project Funded by the
European Union



management dismissal (not only rector) for the failure to implement development strategies. But first, strategic planning should become an integral part of building a successful university. Experience shows that proper strategic planning is able to present tangible and intangible benefits, improve financial performance, increases opportunities for savings and efficient resources use, helps to determine priorities. It also provides the possibility to predict both future problems and minimize the unfavorable factors impact as well as discover additional opportunities and fully use them. As a result, it leads to faster decision making process, efficient operation, thus the motivation and labor satisfaction increases, and university prestige before the students grows.

Simultaneously with the legislatives changes, it is necessary to create proper work conditions for the supervisory board. First of all, it is about transparency and accessibility of administrative and financial information. However, legislative regulation practice concerning transparency issues happened to be inefficiency as there is no understanding (among management) of openness as an instrument to increase liability and attract additional funds. Open financial statements are the common practice in many Western universities, because they are interested in a transparent institution image, which uses resources in the most efficient way. This helps to build relationship on trust with all possible founders and investors - both state and private donors. Financial transparency is particularly important when collaborating with the last ones helps to establish long-term partnerships: transparency and detailed reporting serve as a guarantee of proper funds usage in the future.

Transparent managerial mechanisms are important both for the university community and the interaction with the governing bodies. Administrative transparency not only allows the university community to know their rights and obligations, but also to use them effectively, to protect the individual and collective interests.

Eventually, available information about program's content, faculty members and expected learning outcomes and skills, which graduates can easily access, helps to develop

a proactive student community. Information about the program and ability to assess this information are the two main conditions for a more conscious and informed choice of university and specialty. As a result, university increases its chances of getting students who are more motivated and more demanding. From the very beginning such students will be more interested in the knowledge, than in a formal diploma.

It is important that during the actual learning this motivation to study does not fade away. Thus, the university should provide students with an active participation in shaping their educational trajectory. In fact, study programs should be based on the graduates final competencies (so called student-oriented program design), and not on the needs to provide faculty with work. This approach requires transparent personnel policy and opportunity for public oversight of how salary rewards and bonuses are formed (which is described above).

The recommendations implementation stated above will require not only the legislative changes. Their viability depends on structural changes, external circumstances (the war, the restoration of financial resources, coordination of the coalition, rule of law and inevitability of punishment), and changes in the higher education system. This, in particular, it includes increasing awareness of reform mechanisms and goals among key stakeholders, decreasing demand for low-quality education among students and faculty, increasing data collection about industry and its quality analysis, and management's quality improvement at all levels.