

University Corporatization

As mentioned in the report “Globalization and corporatization of higher education” of American Association of University Professors [1] term “corporatization” is both useful and unfortunate. It is useful because:

1) a clear element of the problematic of the 21st century university is the influence of corporations on many areas of university administration and on education;

2) this term “corporatization” suggests a broader participation of the university in the transformations toward a neo-liberal capitalism in which corporate priorities infiltrate nearly all levels of social life and individual consciousness;

3) it points us toward globalization, for the major corporations influencing universities do so as participants in global markets.

But on the one hand, to talk of the “corporatization” of the university as something new in the 1980s and 1990s is misleading, especially in the United States. By the early 20th century critics described the university as a corporation that not only imported bureaucratic rationalities and managerial structures from corporate life, but also was becoming itself a corporation.

On the other hand, the term “corporatization” can’t be separated from a context in which its opposite is implied, that a non-corporate university ever existed or could exist. This opposite of corporatization is an idealized vision of the university. Corporatization and globalization are interconnected. Globalization is unimaginable without huge globe-spanning corporations taking the leading role in organizing economic life. The immense size and scope of these corporations is a direct consequence of doing business in the context of global financial markets and intensified global competition. New digitized communications technologies and the increasing speed and volume, as well as the character, of population movements –

two of the central features of globalization. They are creating cultural changes that support neo-liberal forms of globalization. They may provide opportunities to broaden and deepen the democratic project of higher education. Moreover, the profound effects of the decline of the nation-state, taking place on numerous levels (cultural, economic and political) are not limited to deregulation and the reinforcement of neoliberalism.

David Schultz in his article “The Corporate University in American Society” [2] said, that corporate university means that universities use corporate structures and management styles to run the university. Author stated, this includes abandoning the American Association of University Professors shared governance model where faculty had an equal voice in the running of the school, including over curriculum, selection of department chairs, deans, and presidents, and determination of many of the other policies affecting the academy. The corporate university replaces the shared governance model with one more typical of a business corporation. Most decisions, including affecting curriculum, are determined by a top-down pyramid style of authority. University administration, often composed not of typical academics but those with business or corporate backgrounds, has pre-empted many of the decisions faculty used to make. Under a corporate model, the trustees, composed of more business leaders than before, select, often with minimal input from the faculty, the president who, in turn, again with minimal or no faculty voice, select the deans, department heads, and other administrative personnel.

Higher education has adopted corporate practices in terms of its control over curriculum and the movement away from full time tenured faculty. Following American Association of University Professors principles, the traditional university, granted tenure to professors to guarantee academic freedom. This freedom was not simply to guarantee employment for life. It was a reward for academic achievement and to ensure that those engaged in research would be free to explore knowledge and truth, without fear of reprisal from administrators or society. The corporate university sees tenure as an impediment to fiscal restructuring, or the needs to hire and fire faculty to meet changing marketplace needs. Tenured professors are hard to

remove, making it difficult to close down a department or program if it was no longer profitable.

Higher education can be seen corporatized in the increased funding streams from corporations. These funding streams are necessary as a result of decreased public support funding for higher education. Institutions have become more dependent upon private funding by turning to corporate donors either to contribute directly to them, or by way of naming (to give private corporations the right to donate in exchange for naming some part of institution after them). Many business schools have adopted famous names of companies in return for donations or sponsorships.

Another notion to be a corporate university resides in how they are engaging in corporate and market type behavior. The example of the corporate university is the rise of for-profit schools such as the University of Phoenix and Florida Metropolitan University. These schools, whose parent companies' stock are publicly traded, are part of a large and growing college for profit business.

References:

1. Globalization and corporatization of higher education. A report on the changing structure of the university. American Association of University Professors. – URL: <http://uupinfo.org/research/GlobalizationReport07.pdf>.

2. Schultz D. The Corporate University in American Society. – URL: http://www.logosjournal.com/issue_4.4/schultz.htm

УДК 330.46:[336:334.78]

Зінкевич Т.О.

к.е.н., доцент, доцент кафедри корпоративних фінансів і контролінгу

Лісовська В.П.

к.ф.-м.н., доцент кафедри вищої математики

ДВНЗ «КНЕУ імені Вадима Гетьмана»

Фінансове моделювання як засіб формування професійних компетентностей майбутніх фахівців в сфері корпоративних фінансів

Сучасні умови ринкової економіки зробили фінансове моделювання невід'ємною частиною ефективного управління компанією. Основою