

THE AUTONOMY OF MACEDONIAN UNIVERSITIES BETWEEN THE CONSTITUTION AND THE NEW LAW ON HIGHER EDUCATION

Temelko Risteski** 

¹American University - FON Skopje, RN Macedonia, e-mail: temelko_mkd@yahoo.com

Abstract: The paper contains an introduction, three chapters and a conclusion.

The introduction provides a very brief overview of the significance of university autonomy as a condition for the development of creativity in the field of education and science and of the constitutional regulation of autonomy, with a special focus on the Constitution of the Republic of North Macedonia. This is followed by a brief historical overview of the development of the implementation of the constitutionally guaranteed autonomy of universities in the Law on Higher Education of the Republic, starting with the Law on Targeted Education, up to the present day.

The first chapter provides a general overview of the Proposal for Law on Higher Education from the aspect of university autonomy.

The second chapter analyzes the provisions of the Proposal for Law that are contrary to the Constitution of the Republic, namely: the provisions of Articles 43 to 45 - on the significant influence of the Government on the National Council for Higher Education; Article 85, point 2 - on the prior consent of the Government for competitions for the enrollment of students at public universities; Article 86 - on the appointment of four out of eleven members of the university council; Article 117 - on the disposal of the universities with the real estate and other assets in their ownership with the consent of the Government; Article 132, paragraph 10 - on the inability of private universities to organize study programs in general medicine, veterinary medicine, nursing and midwifery, legal studies, defense and security studies and for teachers in primary and secondary education studies; Article 175 - on the granting of consent by the Ministry of Education and Science to the employment agreement of selected persons in another public higher education institution; Article 200 - on the authorization of the Minister to stop the execution of a general act of a university, due to alleged unconstitutionality;

The third chapter analyzes the provisions of the Proposal for Law whose constitutionality is questionable, namely: Article 199 - on the authorization of the Minister of Education and Science to repeal or annul decisions of higher education institutions; Article 201 - on the annulment of diplomas by the Ministry and Article 202, paragraph 3 - on the possibility of inspection supervision over elections for academic titles to encroach on university autonomy.

Keywords: *proposal, university, autonomy, constitution, law.*

Field: Social Sciences

1. INTRODUCTION

The autonomy of the university is one of the greatest civilizational achievements in the normative regulation of higher education. It is the basis of the freedom of education and scientific creativity, and this freedom is the basic, if not the only condition, for the development of the creativity of the spirit in the field of education and science (Risteski, 2026). Only a free spirit can create new, more effective educational methods, only such a spirit can think and research creatively.

A large number of constitutions of states in the world, based on the provisions of international legal acts on human freedoms and rights, guarantee the autonomy of universities and thus the freedom of educational activity and scientific creativity (Roberts, Saliba, Spanagel, 2022). Among them is the Constitution of the Republic of North Macedonia. It, in Article 46, paragraph 1, unequivocally stipulates: "The autonomy of universities is guaranteed." In paragraph 2 of this article, it states: "The conditions for the establishment, performance and termination of the activity of the university are regulated by law." This means that the law should represent a normative framework for these conditions, and nothing more. If the law exceeds the framework, if it goes into the details of the establishment, performance and termination of the university's activities, it violates its autonomy.

The legal regulation of higher education in the Republic of North Macedonia has seen ups and downs in terms of respecting the constitutionally guaranteed autonomy of the university.

After the adoption of the 1991 Constitution, for almost a decade - until 2000, the Law on Directed Education from 1985, was applied to higher education. This delay in adopting a law on higher education, according to the constitutional standard for university autonomy contained in the Constitution of the Republic of 1991, suggests the legislator's insufficient care for regulating higher education in accordance

*Corresponding author: temelko_mkd@yahoo.com



with the Constitution of independent Republic of Macedonia because the first law on higher education in the independent Republic of Macedonia was adopted in 2000.

Neither the 1974 Constitution, nor the Law on Directed Education mentioned university autonomy. The long wait for the adoption of a Law on Higher Education, according to the provisions of the Constitution on university autonomy and freedom of scientific, artistic and other types of creativity, was compensated by the adoption of the Law of 2000, which set high standards of academic freedom, in accordance with the principle of university autonomy. This law provides a fairly comprehensive legal elaboration of university autonomy. In short, according to this law, higher education is implemented freely, i.e. independently of the state, in accordance with the constitutionally guaranteed autonomy of the university.

If the first law on higher education in the independent Republic of Macedonia comprehensively covered university autonomy, the second law of 2008 made it more specific. It precisely defines its scope and thus moves it, from a more or less abstract constitutional guarantee, to a concrete system of institutional rights.

After the undoubtedly significant progress in university autonomy made with the laws of 2000 and 2008, a period of its reduction has begun. That period began with the adoption of the Law on Amendments and Supplements to the Law on Higher Education from 2014 and culminated with the announcement of the introduction of an external exam for students during their studies. The reaction to that announcement was the formation of a student and then a professorial plenum, large student protests and the formation of free zones at several Skopje faculties. In early 2015, the legislator - the Assembly of the Republic, ignoring the students' opposition to the introduction of the external exam and the students' demands for preserving the autonomy of the university and its development, adopted the Law on Amendments and Supplements to the Law on Higher Education, with the provisions of which it introduced the external exam. But the government, well shaken by the reaction of the students and undoubtedly afraid of further escalation of the situation, postponed - froze the implementation of those provisions.

During that turbulent period of Macedonian higher education, in two years (2014 to 2016), ten amendments and supplements to the Law on Higher Education were adopted. After it, with the adoption of the current Law on Higher Education from 2018, a new democratic wave came in the legal regulation of this education. This law, viewed as a whole, clearly emphasizes that higher education is based on autonomy, the basis of which is the intellectual freedom of the members of the academic community and the creative nature of the educational and research process (Article 7, paragraph 4).

In 2026, a dark cloud hung over the autonomy of Macedonian higher education in the form of the Proposal for Law on Higher Education, which is in parliamentary procedure. Despite efforts to propose a new Law aligned with European standards for higher education, this proposal contains several violations of the constitutionally guaranteed autonomy of the university, which are analyzed below.

2. GENERAL OVERVIEW OF THE PROPOSAL FOR LAW ON HIGHER EDUCATION FROM THE ASPECT OF THE AUTONOMY OF UNIVERSITIES

The initial version of the Proposal for Law was published on ENER in early February 2026. Its publication was followed by public debates in university centers, as well as a broad debate in which interested citizens participated. At the end of March 2026, a corrected version of the Proposal was posted on ENER. Based on the comments on the corrected version, the Ministry of Education and Science drafted the current Proposal and submitted it to the Assembly of the Republic of Macedonia in early July 2026.

The Proposal for Law places university autonomy in first place among the sixteen basic principles of higher education. According to the extensive glossary in Article 2 of the Proposal: "Autonomy of a university and other higher education institutions is academic freedom, the right to independent and autonomous decision-making and management of organizational, financial and personnel issues, as well as the management and inviolability of the academic space."

There is nothing to note about this definition, considering the fact that the autonomy of the university is one of the greatest civilizational achievements of the modern world (Dimić, 2019). It is based on the provisions of international legal acts on human rights and freedoms, which guarantee freedom of opinion and expression and the right to education to citizens of the world (Universal Declaration of Human Rights – Article 19, International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights – Article 13, International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights – Article 19, European Convention on Human Rights – Article 10). These provisions are the basis for subsequent international acts that specify the autonomy of the university as a guarantee for free, unhindered and scientific achievements-based higher education and free, creative scientific research work (UNESCO Recommendation on the Status of Teaching Staff from

1997, Magna Charta Universitatum from 1988 and 2020, Bologna Declaration from 1999, Council of Europe Recommendation on Academic Freedom and University Autonomy, No. 1762 from 2006, and the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union from 2000 and 2009, which places academic freedom in the rank of fundamental rights).

Unlike other principles, the Proposal for Law, in a separate chapter, with Articles 7 to 15, elaborates normatively, in detail the autonomy with all its elements. In this chapter, a separate article is dedicated to each of the elements of autonomy. Thus, academic freedom is regulated by the provisions of Article 8; management autonomy - by the provisions of Article 9; financial autonomy - by the provisions of Article 10; personnel autonomy - by the provisions of Article 11 and the inviolability of the academic space - by the provisions of Article 12.

In the Proposal for Law, the autonomy of higher education institutions is supported by two additional articles: Article 13 - on the inviolability of autonomy and Article 14 - on academic integrity as an ethical category. The integrity of the university as a legal entity, and thus a legal subject, of course, and the integrity of other higher education institutions is based on preserving the dignity of the profession, adhering to ethical values (Šopar, 2015), protecting the values associated with the creation and transfer of knowledge, raising awareness of the responsibility of all members of the academic community and promoting human rights and freedoms.

There is nothing objectionable about the above provisions of the Proposal for Law in terms of their being based on the principle of the constitutional guarantee of university autonomy from Article 46 of the Constitution of the Republic. However, unfortunately, the provisions of the Proposal are in conflict with these provisions and, therefore, in conflict with the provisions of the Constitution on university autonomy and on the freedom of scientific and artistic creation.

The Constitution of the Republic of Macedonia of 1991, following the highest civilizational achievements for human rights and freedoms, with the provision of Article 46, paragraph 1 which reads: "The autonomy of universities is guaranteed," strongly and unequivocally guaranteed the autonomy of Macedonian universities. In paragraph 2 of the same article it stipulates: "The conditions for the establishment, performance and termination of the activity of the university shall be regulated by law." Then, in Article 47, paragraph 1, the Constitution guarantees freedom of scientific, artistic and other types of creativity. The legislator - the Assembly of the Republic of North Macedonia, in regulating higher education, should inevitably follow the unambiguous and, therefore, strong provision of Article 46, paragraph 1, of the Constitution, on the autonomy of the university and the other listed provisions of the Constitution by which it is supported. As a legislator of a member state of the Council of Europe and a participant in the European higher education area, it should also follow the standards for academic freedom and university autonomy contained in the above-mentioned Recommendations. But, unfortunately, it has not consistently done so until now. Precisely because of this, the Government, as the proposer, proposed a Law in which several provisions are not in accordance with Articles 46 and 47 of the Constitution. The proposer, apparently expecting that those provisions "will pass," submitted the Proposal for Law on Higher Education to the legislator in early July of this year. The Proposal is in parliamentary procedure.

3. PROVISIONS OF THE PROPOSAL FOR LAW THAT ARE NOT IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE CONSTITUTION

We will analyze the disputed provisions according to the order in the Proposal for Law.

3.1. In the provisions of Articles 43 – 45 of the Proposal on the composition and influence of the Government on the National Council for Higher Education, it is disputed that, out of the 15 members of the Council, six professors are proposed by the Interuniversity Conference; six professors by the Government; one member is proposed by MANU (MASA - Macedonian Academy of Sciences and Arts), one by the chambers of commerce and one by the students. According to this, the Government has the right to propose 40% of the composition of the highest national expert body for higher education. Taking into account the fact that, in addition to the Government, one member is proposed by the chambers of commerce and one member by MANU, more than 50% of the members of the Council are not proposed by the academic community. This raises doubts about the dominant influence in the decisions of the Council by persons who do not belong to the academic community. The problem is even greater because the Council has very significant regulatory powers. He, among other things, drafts and proposes to the Minister of Education numerous by-laws on higher education (decrees; rulebooks, guidelines, etc.). The question arises whether, with such provisions, the state does not move from a normative framework of the regulation of higher education activity, to actual management and influence on the academic sphere.

3.2. According to the provision of Article 85, item 2 of the Proposal for Law, the rector's office of a

public university determines and announces the competition for enrollment in the first, second and third cycle of studies, upon prior consent of the Government.

This provision is problematic from a constitutional and legal perspective because the number and structure of students are directly related to: organization of teaching; personnel policy; development of study programs, internal organization and academic planning.

The state, without a doubt, can determine the method of financing and determine public interest and financial frameworks. It is up to the university to decide whether it will manage within these financial frameworks, taking into account the number of enrolled students. However, prior consent of the Government for each admission competition, without a doubt, represents an intrusion into the autonomous management of the university (Leisute, Matquina, Jones, 2025).

3.3. One of the most problematic provisions of the Proposal for Law, from a constitutional legal perspective, is the provision of Article 86, paragraph 2, according to which, out of a total of eleven members of the University Council, three members are proposed by the Government from among the associate and full professors from public universities, upon the proposal of the minister responsible for higher education affairs, and two members are appointed by the chambers of commerce in the Republic of North Macedonia. The remaining members are appointed by the Senate of the university – five members and the student assembly – one member. Therefore, five out of 11 members are not elected by the university community. This provision is controversial from a theoretical and a constitutional legal perspective. The University Council is a body of the University. The University is a legal entity – a legal person. The state is also a legal entity – a legal person. In civil law, legal entities are equal. It is incomprehensible for a legal entity to appoint members of a body of another legal entity. In law, this is violence. If the Proposal for Law is adopted and the Law is enacted, we will have the appearance of “legalized” violence that is legally inadmissible and, as such, unconstitutional.

Seen through the prism of Article 46 of the Constitution, this provision can very seriously question the autonomy of the university in management. The Constitutional Court has already expressed the view that autonomy is not only a declarative category, but also encompasses the management and decision-making of the university. In one case, the court emphasized that autonomy in management is also expressed through the election, appointment and recall of the bodies of the higher education institution (Constitutional Court, 172/2009).

3.4. Article 117 of the Proposal for Law regulates the ownership of real estate and other assets of higher education institutions. According to paragraph 1 of this article, real estate and other assets of a higher education institution and assets acquired from legacies, special-purpose contributions, gifts, bequests and other assets acquired in accordance with the law, are property owned by the higher education institution; and according to paragraphs 4 and 5, a public higher education institution may alienate real estate only upon prior consent from the Government. The funds obtained from the sale of the property are used for investments, investment maintenance and equipment, upon prior consent from the Government. The provisions on the consent by the Government contained in these paragraphs directly attack the autonomy of the university because autonomy, among other things, also implies independent management and use of the property in accordance with the purpose for which it was obtained (Leisute, Matquina, Jones, 2025). In addition, these provisions grossly violate Article 30, paragraph 3 of the Constitution, according to which “no one may be deprived of or restricted from ownership or the rights arising from it, except in the public interest established by law.” Paragraph 3 of this article of the Proposal restricts the right to dispose of real estate, which is contrary to the cited provision of the Constitution, and paragraph 4, in addition to restricting the right to dispose of funds obtained by selling real estate owned by a higher education institution, also establishes control over the use of those funds, which is contrary to Article 46 on the constitutional guarantee of university autonomy.

3.5. We will dwell a little more on the provision of Article 132, paragraph 10 of the Proposal for Law, according to which “Study programs for general medicine, veterinary medicine, nursing, midwifery, legal studies, defense and security studies and for studies teachers in primary and secondary education are study programs of public interest and can be organized only at public higher education institutions.” This means that private and public-private higher education institutions cannot organize higher education studies according to the stated study programs because they are supposedly of public interest. The question arises of what interest are the study programs for economics, sociology, psychology, and architecture, construction, mechanical engineering, electrical engineering and informatics that can be organized at private higher education institutions. Everyone, even a layman in law, will say that they are also of public interest. There is no doubt that this division of study programs that can or cannot be organized at private higher education institutions does not correspond to substantive law and as such is absurd.

In this regard, we go further. The Constitution, in Article 9, paragraph 1, states that the citizens of the Republic of North Macedonia are equal in freedoms and rights, regardless, among other things, of their property and social status. In paragraph 2 of the same article, it is decisive and says: "Citizens are equal before the Constitution and the laws." In this regard, let's go a little to the Introduction to Law that law students listen to and take in the first year of their studies. Citizens, there is no doubt, are subjects of law. They, as subjects of law, appear as natural persons or organized into legal entities. A legal entity is a set of natural persons who have joined together, with the help of law, to achieve some common interest. Private and public-private higher education institutions are legal entities, just like state ones. Their members are natural persons - citizens, not ghosts. That is why they, just like natural persons, are subjects of law. Given that they are composed of natural persons – citizens, the provisions of Article 9 of the Constitution also apply to them. Accordingly, their exclusion from organizing higher education studies according to the stated study programs because they were allegedly of public interest is contrary to the constitutional principle of equality of citizens. In higher education, there are no study programs of public and private interest. Study programs are organized because there are social – public needs for higher education of personnel who, after completing their studies, will be included in social life to satisfy the needs and interests of citizens. Therefore, all study programs are of public interest.

In addition, by preventing private and public-private higher education institutions from organizing the stated study programs, the state will also violate the autonomy of the university – a principle guaranteed to the citizens of this Republic by Article 46, paragraph 1 of the Constitution.

Finally, the aforementioned provision of Proposal is not in accordance with the provision of Article 44, paragraph 2 of the Constitution, according to which "education is available to everyone and under equal conditions."

3.6. Article 175, paragraph 2 of the Proposal for Law provides for the possibility for a person elected to a teaching-scientific, scientific, teaching-professional, teaching and associate title who has established an employment relationship at a public higher education institution, i.e. a public scientific institution, to transfer and establish an employment relationship at another public higher education institution, i.e. a public scientific institution, if he/she meets the prescribed conditions. The transfer is carried out upon a decision of the teaching-scientific council, i.e. the teachers' council, and on the basis of an agreement concluded between the two public higher education institutions and the person transferring. The agreement is approved by the ministry responsible for education and science. The Ministry's approval of the agreement is in conflict with the provision of Article 46, paragraph 1 of the Constitution on the autonomy of the university. Then it is in conflict with the provisions on the personnel autonomy of higher education institutions from Article 11 of the Proposal for Law, which is an element of the autonomy of the university guaranteed by Article 46, paragraph 1. of the Constitution. Furthermore, it is in conflict with the provision of Article 32, paragraph 1 of the Constitution, which guarantees the citizens of the Republic the right to free choice of employment and with the provision of paragraph 2 of the same article, which guarantees citizens access to any job. So, this provision of the Proposal for Law violates three provisions of the Constitution and also violates the provisions of Article 11 of the Proposal.

3.7. Article 198 gives the Minister the right to determine that a higher education institution is operating contrary to the law and to instruct it, within a given deadline, to eliminate the illegality. In the case of a public higher education institution, if it does not act upon the indication, the Minister may propose to the Government to initiate a procedure for adopting a law for the termination of the institution.

There is no doubt that the control of legality is not unconstitutional. But the problem lies in the boundary between the control of legality and the control over autonomous academic decision-making (Roberts, Saliba, Spanagel, 2022),. The Constitutional Court, in its practice of controlling constitutionality and legality, warns that the limits of autonomy must be respected when supervising universities (Constitutional Court, 171/2009). Therefore, this provision would have to define the limits of ministerial supervision much more precisely. The principle of university autonomy, as stipulated in the Constitution, does not allow the Minister, without prior legally binding determination of the factual situation by an expert body, to submit a proposal to the Government to initiate a procedure for adopting a law for the termination of a higher education institution.

3.8. According to the provision of Article 200, paragraph 1 of the Proposal for Law, if the Minister considers that the general act of a higher education institution is not in accordance with the Constitution or a law, he may suspend its execution, and then initiate proceedings before the Constitutional Court.

In this regard, a very important constitutional legal dilemma arises. Can the Minister independently suspend the act of an autonomous higher education institution only because he considers it to be unconstitutional, before the Constitutional Court has decided on it. This provision is particularly controversial because it gives the Minister, as an organ of the executive branch, temporary power of constitutional

legal intervention, which is inadmissible considering the fact that a decision to suspend the execution of individual acts or actions based on the general act whose constitutionality is being assessed, according to Article 27 of the Constitutional Court Act, is adopted by that Court. The Law with this provision actually gives the Minister the powers that the Constitutional Court has.

4. PROVISIONS OF THE DRAFT LAW WITH DOUBTFUL CONSTITUTIONALITY

4.1. From the perspective of the constitutionally guaranteed principle of university autonomy, the provisions of Article 199 of the Proposal for Law are questionable. These provisions prescribe the procedure in the event that a higher education institution has made a decision contrary to the law. This article stipulates that if the Minister, upon the report of a five-member commission formed by him, determines that the decision was made contrary to the law, he may revoke or annul it by a decision.

In this regard, a fundamental question arises: can a member of the executive authority annul a decision of an autonomous university (Constitutional Court, 201/2020-1) only on the basis of a report of a commission he formed. The report may be incorrect, incomplete, biased, etc. Therefore, a higher education institution should be given the right to object to it. Then, depending on the decision following the objection, the Minister could apply his control powers. From a civil law, or theoretical perspective, this question would be posed differently: Can a member of the legal entity - state annul decisions of the legal entity autonomous higher education institution - a university or its unit? The answer is: "Of course not." Accordingly, this is one of the most serious constitutional and legal problems in the Proposal for Law. In this regard, the Constitutional Court has emphasized that the autonomy of the university also implies the independent exercise of its powers. The Proposal for Law, as can be seen, goes very far in violating the autonomy of the university: it gives the minister direct power, based on an invalid report of a commission formed by him, to intervene in the decisions of the university. Given the above, these provisions should be further specified.

4.2. Article 201 of the Proposal for Law stipulates that the Ministry, if it determines that a higher education institution has issued a diploma or certificate contrary to the law, shall adopt a decision to annul the diploma or certificate.

Here too, a distinction should be made between the administrative control of whether the diploma or certificate has been legally issued and the academic assessment of whether the person meets the academic requirements for their issuance.

If the Ministry were to interfere in the academic assessment of the higher education institution, this would be directly problematic from the point of view of autonomy. Therefore, this provision must be interpreted very narrowly – only as a control of the legality of the formal issuance of a diploma, and not as the right of the Ministry to review academic decisions related to the assessment of the quality and quantum of the knowledge of the person to whom the diploma was issued. In order for this interpretation to be made, this provision needs to be further clarified. Stipulated in this way, from the point of view of the constitutionally guaranteed autonomy of the University, it is of dubious constitutionality.

4.3. Article 202, paragraph 3. of the Proposal for Law provides that the State Educational Inspectorate shall supervise the legality of the procedures for election into teaching and teaching-scientific and associate titles and the fulfillment of the conditions for election into titles and may initiate proceedings against the allegedly illegal selection, even within five years of the selection.

According to paragraph 4, if the State Educational Inspectorate, when performing the supervision referred to in paragraph (3), establishes irregularities or illegalities, it shall adopt a decision by which:

- orders the elimination of the irregularities and/or
- orders the repetition of the procedure.

The control of the legality of the procedure, in itself, may be justified. However, when it comes to the fulfillment of the conditions for election into titles, there is a danger that the inspection supervision will turn into a substantive review of the academic assessment – the scientific value of the candidate, the quality of the papers, the expert assessment of the reviewers, etc., which, in accordance with the principle of university autonomy, may not be carried out by the inspectorate. Supervision of legality must not turn into an unlimited encroachment on academic autonomy (Constitutional Court, 171/2009). Therefore, this article should be further specified regarding the irregularities or illegalities in the determination of which the Inspectorate may be involved.

5. CONCLUSION

The Higher Education Laws of 2000, 2008 and 2018 and their amendments and supplements, with the exception of the amendments and supplements from 2014 to 2016, have gradually progressed in the implementation of the principle of university autonomy in the higher education legislation of the Republic of North Macedonia in accordance with the standards of the European Union. The current Proposal for Law on Higher Education was made with the intention, at least declaratively, to take another major step in that direction. This is supported by the quality definition of autonomy and its placement on the highest pedestal among the principles of higher education activity, not only by the fact that it is placed first in their enumeration, but also by the fact that it is elaborated in detail in all its elements, even more broadly, in a separate chapter dedicated to it, which covers Articles 7 to 15 of the Proposal.

But, as Professor Škarić rightly notes in one of his works in the field of constitutional law, in our legal system, there are not only conflicts between individual laws, but also between provisions of the same law (Škarić, 2014). Such is the case with the provisions of Articles 43 to 45, Article 85, point 2, Articles 86, 117, Article 132, paragraph 10, Article 175, paragraph 2, Articles 199 and 200, which are clearly in conflict with the provisions on the autonomy of universities contained in the Proposal for Law, and thus in conflict with the provisions of Articles 46 and 47 of the Constitution. The provisions of Articles 199, 201 and 202, paragraph 3, are in doubt in that regard.

It is worrying that the bulky working group for drafting the Proposal for Law included professors from the "Justinian I" Faculty of Law who, with their formal, if not factual expertise (which they should have), stand behind the Proposal, and apparently did not prevent extremely unconstitutional provisions from being found in it.

To put it figuratively, as it is, the Proposal resembles a city observed from an airplane that looks beautiful, with beautiful buildings, wide boulevards, landscaped parks, etc.; but if a person descends to the ground and walks through its streets, he will see many deviations from the impression he got from looking at it from the air.

Given that the Proposal for Law on Higher Education is in parliamentary procedure and has so far only passed a reading before the relevant committee, let us hope that the aforementioned inconsistencies with the constitutional principle of university autonomy contained in the Proposal will be removed in the next three readings before the competent committees and at the plenary sessions, and that we will receive a new, modern law on higher education, created according to the highest standards for its legal regulation.

REFERENCES

- Constitutional Court of the Republic of North Macedonia, (2025), Decisions on the constitutionality of the Laws on Higher Education from 2000 to 2025, www.ustavensud.mk (Macedonian).
- Dimić, Z., (2019), Birth of the Idea of a University, Zoran Stojanović Publishing House, Sremski Karlovci (Serbian).
- Draft, (2026) Law on Higher Education, www.sobranie.mk,
- Kivisto, J., Velamo, T., (2023), Higher Education Policy: Autonomy and Accountability, Finnish Public Administration: Nordic Publish Space and Agency, Palgrave Macmillan, Cham.
- Law, (2018), Law on Higher Education, ("Official Gazette of the Republic of Macedonia," No. 82/18) – (Macedonian).
- Law, (2008), Law on Higher Education, ("Official Gazette of the Republic of Macedonia," No. 35/08) – (Macedonian).
- Law, (2000), Law on Higher Education, ("Official Gazette of the Republic of Macedonia," No. 64/00) – (Macedonian).
- Law, (1985), Law on Targeted Education, ("Official Gazette of the Socialist Republic of Macedonia," No. 16/85) – (Macedonian).
- Leisute, L., Matquina, M., Jones, G. A., (2025), University Governance, Management and the Academic Profession: Transformation and Challenges, Springer, Cham (Switzerland).
- Marić, B., & Petković, V. (2025). Vision of Education for Future Teachers In The Era of Artificial Intelligence Challenges of A New Reality, *Science International Journal*, 3(2), 133-137.
- McNeely, Ian F., (2025), The University Unfettered: Public Higher Education in an Age of Disruption, Columbia University Press, New York.
- Mitrović, D. M., (2018), Autonomous Law: Autonomy and Law between Society and State, Faculty of Law, University of Belgrade, Belgrade (Serbian).
- Proposal for Law on Higher Education, www.sobranie.mk,
- Risteski, T. (2022). The Principle of Responsibility as The Supreme Legal Principle in The Work of Public Organs., *Science International Journal*, 1(1), 33-39.
- Risteski, T. (2026). The Autonomy of the University Between science and Politics *Knowledge International Journal*, 77(6), 629-634.
- Risteski, T. (2020). Functional Analysis of the Constitutional Court of the Republic of North Macedonia Institute for Human Rights, Skopje (Macedonian).
- Roberts, L. K., Saliba, I., Spanagel, J., (2022), University Autonomy Decline: Causes, Responses and Implications for Academic Freedom, Routledge, London/New York.
- Stevanović, M., Velkovski, Z., Korobar, V., Zdraveva, N., (2019) University Autonomy in Macedonian Higher Education, Open Society Foundation, Skopje (Macedonian).

Škarić, S., (2014), Scientific interpretation - Constitution of the Republic of Macedonia, Culture, Skopje, (Macedonian)

Šopar, V., (2015), University Autonomy - Ethical or Legal Right [http:// respublica.edu.mk/blog/2015-10-06-13-02-54](http://respublica.edu.mk/blog/2015-10-06-13-02-54) (Macedonian).