

## **A case for higher education managers' career space**

Ludmilla Salonda

### **Abstract**

Universities are complex organizations to govern. The last thirty years of their long evolution has seen some of the most disruptive changes impact the organisation. A new model of leadership is required to manage the now complex open system that was once a closed professional bureaucracy governed by committees of peers that was supported by a weak administration. As the university recasts itself to resemble a corporate organisation it faces the inevitability of adopting a model of governance that is both academic and corporate to respond to new environmental challenges brought on by socio-economic and political ideological shifts. These changes mean that the university has become a shared professional space for career scholars and corporate managers, and administrators, a meeting fraught with tension. Goodwill from academic and non-academic professionals is required to serve the common good of the organisation. However, in one important aspect of organisational life, the university remains largely a career space that privileges the academic professional. Reward and remuneration and career progression policies are based on performance in academic areas of activity, which include learning and teaching, research and professional outreach to community. That criteria and indicators allow academics to measure progress up a career ladder signified by academic ranks from peer tutor to professor. For the professional manager, a career path is at best poorly delineated. Academics engaged in managerial functions, or professional managers find limited opportunity for career growth and advancement. In some universities, academics in managerial functions are assessed by the academic performance criteria and rewarded as academics. In this paper, it is argued that the time is ripe for the university to create a space for career professionals in higher education management with attendant policies on performance and reward and remuneration. It is argued that, in the highly competitive environment that universities operate in, an attractive, well-defined career for managers give universities a competitive advantage as it will enable them to recruit appropriately and retain star performers.

**Key words:** higher education, management, corporate governance, academic career, internationalization, massification, global research, multiversity, globalization, new public management, Rubik's cube

### **Introduction**

Observers of higher education trends today agree that the environment in which universities find themselves is unpredictable and complex. As such, the professional manager has become as vital for the success of the university as

the faculty member involved in scholarly activities of research and teaching. However, despite the manager's elevated status, the university's recognition and reward policies and performance measurement matrices are yet to reflect this reality. What now plays out every year at a university in Papua New Guinea is a case in point. Every October the university looks to reward employee performance through promotions. Staff assess and quantify their performance against a set of indicators for research, teaching and community engagement. On the strength of each section's minimum and aggregate scores, staff are rewarded either with promotion to the next academic rank or granted incremental promotion within the same rank. Significantly, any elevation in rank translates to higher salaries. For staff in managerial positions, some of who are career academics, the scores on the all important scholarly activities of research and teaching may not meet the required minimum considered for promotion up the academic career ladder, which is the only well-defined career ladder. Managerial functions feature less prominently in the performance appraisal matrix. The absence of a distinct career structure and attendant reward system for higher education managers means that their careers are stalled. Therefore, it is argued that the university needs to define an appropriate recognition and reward system for managers in order to attract and retain best talent.

In this paper, it is argued that the academic profession's career progression pathway is an inappropriate career pathway for the university manager's career progress and that a distinct career path needs to be provided to sit alongside the academic career pathway. To argue the case, first the higher education context is scoped to situate the university evolution from Newman's idea of a university, to Kerr's view of the modern university, and finally, the emerging idea of the complex post-modern multiversity that is being conceptualised as the global referencing research university. These shifting concepts of the university are marked by the shaping and reshaping of missions as the organisation responds to a confluence of driving forces. These forces are also outlined for their direct impact and linked to the rise of management within the university and the subsequent desire for a discrete career space for managers. The profession of higher education management is proposed to strengthen the case for legitimizing higher education management as a distinct and important domain of professional practice within the new complex outward oriented university that Massy (2004) refers to as a distinct domain of economic entity.

### **Changing idea of the university**

The argument for a career space for management professionals within the university is situated in the changing idea of the university as an organisation. The university has traversed a long way from the closed system professional bureaucracy that was home to academic or science professionals. Today the organisation is externally oriented and serves global, national, and local interests all at the same time (Marginson, 2008). At the local or organizational level, the once weak overarching structure that served multiple disciplinary fiefdoms has given way to a strengthened governance structure where

managers have become as important for the whole enterprise as the academic teachers and researchers.

### **Newman's idea of university**

Tracing the evolution of the university since Newman (1852) wrote his seminal text: *The idea of a university*, helps in understanding the rise of management within the university today. Management may not have been a concern in Newman's university but the emerging importance of managerial expertise within the university supports the call for the professionalization of management in higher education. To professionalize management would validate the importance and flag that the university is no longer the type of institution that Newman had in mind, as Marginson's (2008) critique of the idea of university shows. The changes the institution has undergone have meant a reconceptualisation of the organization, a redefinition of purpose and practices and subsequently a questioning of deeply established beliefs. The changing mission of the university has at its core the question of what the idea of the university is today. In Newman's idea of a university, the organization has little need for managerial expertise beyond the local scene. A weak administration was all that was needed for the functioning of the closed elitist system that was a locally referenced and focused on teaching and grounded in the mission of liberal education. As such, research did not feature (Marginson, 2008). Multiple fields of knowledge were housed in independent departments that were loosely clustered without a need for higher authority at the organizational level. Newman considered knowledge worth pursuing for its intrinsic worth, without necessarily having utility. Parsons (1971) is a strident defender of this mission of the university. This process-oriented professional bureaucracy depended on the state for sustenance but kept it at arms length. The professoriate was left to do its own thing, believing that knowledge creating and technology transfer would eventually benefit the society. Such an arrangement was based on the belief that the interest of society was best served when scholars had such freedoms (Parsons, 1971).

### **Kerr's modern university**

In his book, *The uses of the university*, Kerr explores the concept of the modern university. This exploration provides the initial context for the entry and rise of management in university governance. Kerr's concept of the modern university is far removed from that of Newman. Unlike Newman, Kerr places research front and centre of scholarly activity. In contrast, Newman's institutional focus is on teaching. The modern university also differs in who has access, mission and knowledge purpose. Access is non-elitist, and knowledge pursued is validated by its utility to state, the nation and the individual. Taking on this external outlook, the university repositions itself from being a closed self-regulating and self-serving system (Birnbaum, 1992), to an open mass education system that is externally referencing and subject to multiple demands from both within and outside the institution. As Marginson (2008:11) writes:

Kerr paints a picture of a university with a very broad range of roles, in service as well as teaching and research, one affected by relations with government, industry and community at many points, while animated also by its own institutional identity and the various disciplinary communities and a campus 'estate' of administrators, students and faculty.

Mayhew (Parsons, 1971) rebuts Parson's defence of Neman's university in support of Kerr's idea of the university. Kerr's picture of the modern university as having both internal and external concerns has become the norm. This view continues to generate tensions between its 'outer' and its 'inner aspects' (Marginson 2008:11) as the belief that the role and qualifications of members of the faculty as 'holding knowledge in trust' for society is questioned by students who 'discover that the knowledge which professors hold in trust is unrelated to the real world of professional practice' (Mayhew, 1971:497).

### **The global research university**

The recent rise of what is referred to as the 'global research university' has situated the missions and functions of the university further beyond what Newman would have predicted. The global research university is an organisation that is globally networked and referenced (Marginson 2008:15), the wide reach subsequently redefining the relationship between state and society of Kerr's modern university. It would also redefine the local, the relationship between the management and academic professionals. Marginson (2008:11) suggests that Kerr did anticipate that such a university would emerge to take a central place in society. Perkin (1991:201) supports this view writing that: 'The competitive production of new knowledge and of knowledge workers has made the university and its offshoots the key institutions of the new [global] society.'

The global research university model is increasingly shaping universities globally (Marginson 2008:15), so much so that any 'denial of utility, Newman style, is not an option' (Marginson 2008:9). However, Marginson (2008) stops short of endorsing the global research university as the ideal model of the organisation. He argues that without agreed criteria for such a university, comparative assessment is made on the basis of Jiao Tong rankings of research performance. Nevertheless, the global engagement and positioning of the university adds more layers of complexities for university leaders to manage, skills of managerial professionals rather than process-focused administrators and scholars would bring.

### **The Rubik's cube of Rubik's cubes**

Sharrock's (2012) imagery of the Rubik's cube of Rubik's cubes best describes the university today. It describes the university as being 'so many things to so many people' and therefore it must, 'be partly at war with itself' as Marginson (2008) quotes Kerr. It is no longer a 'village with its priests', the analogy of the university in Newman's time. It is also more than a single-industry town, with its intellectual oligarchy, the idea of the modern University' that Kerr wrote

about. The university is now a 'city of infinite variety', a multiversity that Marginson (2008:13) describes, an 'inconsistent institution, one that is not really private and it is not really public, and is neither entirely of the world nor entirely apart from it' (p. 12). The Rubik's cube of Rubik's cubes is an institution of multiple risks and multiple and cross-cutting and conflicting responsibilities (Sharrock, 2012). Such complexity may not emerge as 'a full-blown ... truly new archetype of university' (de Boer et al., 2007 cited in de Boer & Goedegebuure 2009:351) but it is a reality that needs a new kind of leadership to manage.

### **Higher education trends**

The evolving models of the university are a response to mix of volatile, heterogeneous, complex, paradoxical, and ambiguous forces that confront today's higher education leaders, leaving them to ask how such challenges could be managed (de Boer & Goedegebuure, 2009; Quinn et al., 2007). These challenges strengthen the argument to professionalise higher education management and legitimise it as an attractive career option. Observations of the responsibilities of deans, for example, show that their functions have 'become more demanding, more senior, more strategic more complex and more managerial in nature' (deBoer & Goedegebuure, 2009:347). To deal with the new expectations, deans require skill sets and knowledge that management professionals are best equipped with. Institutions are not responding fast enough to establish higher education management as a career option. Sharrock (2010) suggests that some institutions have moved to strengthen their management. Training institutions such as Melbourne University's LH Martin Institute and Harvard University's Institute for Education Management have recognised the emergent need for professional higher education managers and offer programs aimed at the higher education manager. The description of the Harvard University program below is a case in point:

Senior leaders in higher education face a daunting set of challenges — fiscal constraints, heightened accountability, new competitors, substantial demographic change and questions about the relevance and effectiveness of higher education. IEM helps you focus on the challenges of organizational change while providing opportunities for personal renewal (Institute for Educational Management).

### **Internationalization and globalization of higher education**

Amongst the emerging issues that need a higher education institutional response are those associated with changes in the social and economic spheres. These forces are encapsulated in the terms globalization and internationalization. Globalization is defined as 'the widening, deepening and speeding up of worldwide interconnectedness' at the economic and social spheres (Held et al., 1999 cited in Santiago et al., 2008:235-236).

Globalization has made it possible for the rise of the global research university as institutions leverage sophisticated information and telecommunication

technologies to establish 'complex electronically networked relations between institutions and between people, creating an open information environment and synchronous communications in real time' (Marginson, 2004 cited in Santiago et al., 2008:235-236).

Internationalization describes another trend observed within higher education, which has risen because of globalization. Knight (2003 cited in Santiago et al., 2008:236), views internationalization as a proactive response to globalization that describes 'the process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions, or delivery of tertiary education'. To Knight, globalisation is the catalyst which institutional networking, collaboration and mobility possible (Santiago, Tremblay, Basri, & Arnal, 2008:15). The behaviours associated with globalization are evident in the global movement of students and academics, a trend which may be leading to a convergence of tertiary education systems and cross-border provision (Santiago et al., 2008:261).

### **Massification of higher education access**

Massification is an element of the confluence of trends that pose a management challenge for the contemporary university. The term refers to the emergence of a heterogeneous body of students who seek higher education, a shift that has changed the elitist character of student access (Deem, 2001; Fullan & Scott, 2009; Marginson, 1995; Massy, 2004; Santiago, Tremblay, Basri, & Arnal, 2008). Up until the middle of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, it was inconceivable that universities were places for women, the working class or racial minorities (Perkins 1991). The reasons for the unprecedented expansion include first, 'the demand of a more complex and highly geared economy for applied sciences and technology and for the social and administrative sciences for managing large institutions and corporate structures; and second, 'the demand in the postindustrial society providing more sophisticated services for highly educated personnel to operate and service them' (Perkin, 1991:199). Massification and market deregulation have seen the entry of private providers of higher education and diversification of models of delivery to include open and distance learning, e-learning and the latest manifestation in Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs) (Santiago, Tremblay, Basri, & Arnal, 2008:260).

### **Global referencing and strategic orientation**

Compounding the challenges that face university leadership is the imperative to engage in the global and competitive open market for scarce financial resources from multiple and shifting supporters, top student and faculty, and increasingly and especially in the case of elite research universities, compete for brand positioning and social prestige (Dill, 1982). These imperatives of market-based businesses behaviour require managerial techniques, knowledge and competencies, requirements which further promote the case for professionalising management within the university. They also highlight the vastly different context for practice for university leadership than the context of practice associated with Newman's and Kerr's models of a university.

University leaders have little choice but to adopt behavior associated with the market sector organizations. These include strategic planning, marketing and management control of resources (Dill, 1982). Strategic planning refers to the organization defining its distinctive competence in such a way that it occupies a special niche in the market and is thereby assured of resources necessary for survival. Marketing refers both to discerning the needs of the market place and advertising the institution's distinctive competence to potential customers and supporters. Management control refers to 'accounting mechanisms such as costs and workload analyses which assure that critical resources are used to attain the strategic plans' (Dill, 1982:305). As academic institutions must engage in competitive market competition and strategic positioning, the argument to professionalize the management function in higher education is further boosted.

### **Reconceptualisation of role of government in public service delivery**

The shift in the model of funding for universities away from public funding adds further pressure and tests competencies of university leaders. The behaviours observed within the sector that are associated with global referencing and strategic orientation, in part, are consequences of the reconceptualisation of the role of government in public service delivery. Since the 1980s, governments have borrowed and embraced the private sector model to deliver public service (Dill 1982). This is an approach which is encapsulated in the term 'new public management' (NPM), (Meek & Davies, 2009; Santiago, Tremblay, Basri, & Amal, 2008). NPM 'puts emphasis on leadership principles, incentives and competition between public sector agencies and private entities to enhance the outcomes and cost-efficiency of public services' (Parker and Gould, 1999, Marginson & van der Wend, 2007 cited in Santiago et al., 2008:260). NPM stresses the centrality of the role of an executive in the decision-making process to the exclusion of the professional scientist, which some see as a threat to the innovative nature of the university as a professional bureaucracy (Meek, 2004; Meek & Davies, 2009). The new management expectations of higher education leaders further support the case for professionalising management.

### **Demands for financial accountability**

The import of NPM into higher education has set in train a number of concerns for universities one of which is financial accountability. Financial accountability translates to maximising output by reducing unit costs, a demand that shifts the onus of accountability for achieving these ends to institutions themselves, many of whom are already experiencing financial stress rising out of diminished public support (Dill, 1982). The survival imperative is forcing the institutions to shift strategies and realign from a position of 'high independence' based on government patronage, scarce expertise, and campus-based seclusion, to one of 'high interdependence', a wider set of clients, patrons and participants, online access to scholarly facilities, diverse income

streams, and decline of academia's 'oligopoly power' (Sharrock 2010:367). Wagner (1995:16) describes the new reality as:

The era of pushing a cheque through the letter-box and walking away was over. Governments and their funding agencies wanted increasingly to first to knock on the door, then to open the door, ask questions, then to expect answers, then to suggest changes and then to change the size of their cheques if the changes did not occur.

### **Rise of quality assurance**

Santiago et al. (2008:260) note that the shift from 'normative conception of the role of government to a market state model' is evidenced in the adoption of NPM, and the need to broaden the funding base are concerns that are tied to concerns about quality of higher education. On top of that, the pressure on institutions to meet national, economic, industry and student needs has further pushed concerns about quality of education to the forefront of institutional agenda. It is argued that these forces seem poised to break down and cast aside remaining resistance grounded in a view that: 'Universities and their professors are trapped by their traditional mindsets and values — the very strengths that have sustained their quality over the years' (Massy, 2011:3).

A change of mind set seems inevitable as the demonstration of quality becomes an imperative for institutions desperate to 'attract students and secure revenue in increasingly competitive environments' (Santiago et al., 2008:260). Even for elite global research institutions, which derive their reputation from outstanding research performance quality teaching, they now sell their prestige to prospective students and academics (Marginson 2004 cited in Santiago et al., 2008:260). The onus is on institutions to account for public funds and show how they were 'spent effectively and that the public purposes for financing tertiary education are actually fulfilled' (Alderman and Brown, 2007 cited in Santiago et al., 2008:260). Parsons (1971:495) stridently contests the recasting of the academic organization in the business model arguing that whilst efficiency is justified and important for business firms or governmental administrative organizations, 'the academic horse is one of a very different color'.

### **The case for a management career in higher education**

The imperatives scoped above demonstrate the need for managerial expertise within universities even as the distinctive nature of this 'old academic horse' is stridently defended (Parson, 1971). They call for the creation and legitimization of a management career space offering an attractive career option for managers as the difference between survival and demise of institutions. Dill (1982:304) defines academic management as the 'rational processes of goal setting, evaluation and cost analysis'. However, this definition seems inadequate to capture the full skill sets required to manage the 'Rubik's cube of Rubik's cubes' created by the expectations of increasing

demands for governance and management of knowledge systems and knowledge workers (Meek & Davies, 2009).

The increasing size and complexity of the university organisation, and the pressure to secure resources from the state and from private or corporate donors alike, make professionalization of higher education management inevitable. Knowledge that previously was adequate to run an internal process-focused professional bureaucracy is found inadequate (Fullan & Scott, 2009; Quinn et al., 2007) as the system is replaced by a larger strategic and bureaucratic system (Perkin, 1991). Writing for the American audience in the early 1980s, Dill (1982) foresaw that the survival of academic institutions in his county would depend on their adoption and application of skills of management. Managers, Dill noted, were strategists, who made long term plans to position the university and adjust these as conditions changed to manage risks or capitalise on opportunities that emerged (Sharrock, 2010; Woolridge, 2010).

The new imperatives demand complex and nuanced leadership responses to deal with potential multiple risks, competing values and an ambiguous mix of tasks. Such leadership for 'competing values' (Quinn et al., 2006) and the multiple management agenda mindset, which include the need for control, collaborate, create or compete (Sharrock, 2012), should have at hand all at once Coleman's (2000) six leadership styles to draw from as the situation dictates. These styles include coercive, authoritative, affiliative, democratic, pacesetter and coaching styles. Having multiple leadership style options to draw from, best enable leaders, as Sharrock (2008) suggests, to mediate change by managing risks whilst capturing the opportunities that arise from the wider technological market or policy settings and managing internal complexity brought on by burgeoning expenditure and accountability demands which exacerbate the bureaucratisation of the university itself.

### **Professionalizing university management**

The multifaceted challenges (and potential opportunities) outlined in this article mount a case for professionalising management as a career option within universities and other higher education institutions. In the new reality, new requisite skills and outlooks need to be acquired formally and applied rather than by chance or informally on the job. Continued dependence on non-professional managers is an organisational risk given the competitive environment. Sharrock (2010:366) highlights the inadequacy of this approach to management stating that: 'Scholars who move from a teaching or research role into a management role often find the transition difficult.'

At one PNG university, the professional managerial core includes the president, vice presidents, deans, executive directors and directors. Though many of them are trained scholars, their work expectations have taken on managerial functions which involve strategic and operational planning, quality assurance, budget planning and workforce planning. Here scholarly activities need to be decoupled from managerial functions.

With the emergence of management as a field of professional practice within a university, the professional scholar, which once was the supreme profession of the institution, has to rethink this space and allow for management professional practice. Part of that rethinking of a professional practice space will inevitably lead to the questioning of the underlying assumptions that university presidents are scholars and organisational functions are the core responsibility of the administration. The university needs to accept and validate that institutional leaders can be imported from outside the university and the academic profession into a discrete professional space and rewarded accordingly. Earlier it was the clergy, but more recently, business, labor relations, and the law seem more fertile soil to produce academic leaders. Besides, even in the old type of university, administration space was occupied by scholars, who when leaving their offices as deans and presidents, did not reenter the ranks of the professoriate but moved on quasi-administrative roles, or became theorists about higher education or left the higher education sector altogether. A well-defined profession for higher education managers may motivate and retain higher education management talent. Even as the importance of scholarly professionals remain, the context seems right to appreciate such a shift as universities dependence on managerial professionals' prowess increases (Sharrock, 2010). No longer will the dean be referred to as 'the unsung professional of the academy' nor will his or her contributions to the academic enterprise remain unrecognised (Rosser, 2004, cited in deBoer and Goedgebuure 2009). Changes that now focus on roles they and others involved in managerial functions undertake should therefore, not come as a surprise (Sharrock, 2010). In his critique, Marginson (2008) concludes that, even if Kerr did not foresee the rise of the internet, he saw that the professionalisation of administration and the strategic functions of the executive would rise as the university grew in size and functions. This would demand an increased role for administration in relation to the faculty, a change that would lead to the displacement of the faculty from governance. Deem, Hillyard and Reed (2007 cited in Sharrock, 2010:366) argue that 'recent scholarly literature represents this trend as an assault on the spirit and independence of the universities as public institutions, and on scholars as autonomous professionals'. Nevertheless, even as they are viewed with suspicion by scholars, the reality is that universities would be hard pressed to survive without the expertise of managers.

Scholars who resist managerial intervention will need a mindset shift to appreciate that the stance and outlook of university management professionals are concerned with the 'enterprise capability' agenda, without which the scholarly agenda cannot be pursued (Sharrock, 2010:373). University managers may not be front-line professionals in the sense of being educators or researchers enacting the institutional mission directly. Nevertheless, they are professionals, concerned with building the capacity of their enterprise to support academic projects. There is a proper 'corporate perspective, concerned with building the quality of the institution's resources (its expertise, assets facilities and finances), relationships (internally among staff and student groups, and externally with other groups and institutions), and reputations

(winning respect and influence among peer institutions and wider constituencies' (Sharrock, 2010:373).

### **The university managers' strategic dilemma**

The strategic dilemma faced by higher education leaders further strengthens the case for a profession with formally acquired management knowledge and skills. Even as their professional space is contested, and managers continue to strengthen their position, they face a dilemma of managing the internal for order and stability and the external for flexibility and responsiveness (Quinn et al., 2006; Sharrock, 2012). Sharrock (2010:373) writes:

Management's most basic strategic dilemma, is that universities pursue an infinite mission with finite means and assume new levels of risk and complexity in a mixed economy setting, since here even the limited financial resources available in any one year are not necessarily guaranteed the next.

Quinn et al. (2007:2) provide the 'competing values approach to management' for the 'master manager' to leverage and manage paradox and redefine what is possible. Clark (1998:8-15) would agree as his study has established that the success of entrepreneurial universities seems to depend on how they are able to balance the demand-response imbalance. Clark identifies five common attributes essential to entrepreneurial university success:

1. a strengthened steering core (focusing on whole-of-institution choices and resourcing)
2. an enhanced developmental periphery (building external relationships and client contracts)
3. a diversifying funding base (enlisting non-government patrons and clients to meet rising costs)
4. a stimulated academic heartland (reconciling academic priorities with strategic outlooks)
5. an entrepreneurial culture (able to adapt institutional agendas to departmental projects)

These success factors imply a greater role for managerial skills and market outlooks. Together with elements of Sharrock's (2010) Hippocratic Oaths for managers and academics, these attributes could help delineate functional and value boundaries of the two professions, academics and managers, to minimize dysfunctional tensions.

### **Suggested course of action and conclusion**

Questioning the legitimacy of management in the governance of the university denies current reality whilst risking the survival of the institution. Managers are as much a part of the university as the scholars who are involved in teaching and research. Whether formerly or informally acquired, managerial skill sets are already being applied by university leaders in managerial functional areas.

However, those who are engaged in managerial functions in many institutions practice in a vacant discreet career space.

A managerial professional space therefore is proposed, which needs to be negotiated and an attendant reward and recognition system developed and formalised in policies such as recruitment, selections, appraisals, promotions, and workload definitions. The only career formally delineated in most university policies is an academic career as defined by a structure of ranks from tutor to professor and their attendant job descriptors and performance expectations. Such career delineation is required for managerial positions whose main responsibilities are management in nature, functions that are contained in Sharrock's (2010) *Two Hippocratic oaths for higher education*.

Higher education professional training schools such as LM Martin Institute of Melbourne University Australia and Harvard University's Institute for Education Management are two of the better known institutions responding to fill this professional niche through offering specialised training in higher education management.

In the absence of a career path for academic managers, academics who are managers, are recognised and rewarded as academic staff engaged in scholarly activities of teaching, research and community engagement. It is argued that the application of this system to reward of performance of managers short changes both managers and scholars.

Therefore, in this paper, a case has been presented as to why managers are as indispensable for university functioning as scholars. It is argued in line with Sharrock (2010), that academic reward has to be specific and tied to performance, and that managers are appraised and rewarded for managerial prowess using tools specifically developed to assess management performance. No longer will they be appraised for managerial prowess and rewarded as academics. The time is ripe to take the proposal to the next level of development and implementation, as it is too big a gamble for universities not to.

## References

- Birnbaum, R. (1992). *How academic leadership works: Understanding success and failure in the college presidency*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Clark, B. (1998). *Creating entrepreneurial universities: Organizational pathways of transformation*. New York: IAU Press.
- de Boer, H., & Geodegebuure, L. (2009). The changing nature of the academic deanship. *Leadership, 5*(3), 347-364.
- Deem, R. (2001). Globalization, new managerialism, academic capitalism and entrepreneurialism in universities: Is the local dimension still important? *Comparative Education, 37*(1), 7-20.
- Dill, D. D. (1982). The management of academic culture: Notes on the management of meaning and social integration. [discussion]. *Higher Education, 11*, 303-320.
- Fullan, M., & Scott, G. (2009). Universities and the challenges of the 21st century *Turnaround leadership for higher education* (pp. 1-24).
- Goleman, D. (2000). Leadership that gets results. *Harvard Business Review, March-April 2000*, 78-91.

- Institute for educational management. Retrieved 28 November, 2013, from <http://www.gse.harvard.edu/ppe/programs/higher-education/portfolio/educational-management.html>
- Marginson, S. (1995). Markets in higher education: Australia. In S. John (Ed.), *Academic work* (pp. 19-39). Buckingham: Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press.
- Marginson, S. (2008). *Global, multiple and engaged: Has the idea of a University changed in the era of global knowledge economy?* (pp. 1-23). Melbourne: Centre for the Study of Higher Education.
- Massy, F. W. (2004). Collegium economicum: Why institutions do what they do. *Change*, 36(4), 27-35.
- Mayhew, L. (1971). The Strange Case of Academic Organization: Comment. *Journal of Higher Education*, 42(6), 495-498.
- Meek, L. (2004, May 13-14). *Policy Development and impact on higher education research: An Australian case study*. Paper presented at the UNESCO Forum on Higher Education, Research & Knowledge 1st Research Seminar for Asia and the Pacific, Tokyo.
- Meek, V. L., & Davies, D. (Eds.). (2009). *Policy dynamics in higher education and research: concepts and observations*: UNESCO/INCHER-Kassel.
- Newman, H. J. (1852). *The Idea of a University*.
- Parsons, T. (1971). The strange case of academic organization. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 42(6), 486-495.
- Perkin, H. (1991). History of universities. In P. G. Altbach (Ed.), *International higher education: An encyclopedia* (Vol. 1, pp. 169-204). New York: Garland Publishing Inc.
- Quinn, E. R., et al. (2006). *Becoming a master manager: A competency framework* (4 ed.). New York: Wiley.
- Quinn, E. R., et al. (2007). *Becoming a master manager*
- Santiago, P., et al. (2008). Assuring and improving quality. *Tertiary education for the knowledge society*, 1, 259-317.
- Santiago, P., et al. (2008). Executive summary. *Tertiary education for the knowledge society*, 1, 13-22.
- Sharrock, G. (2010). Two hippocratic oaths for higher education. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 32(4), 365-377.
- Sharrock, G. (2012). Four management agendas for Australian universities. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 34(3), 323-337.
- Wagner, L. (1995). A thirty-year perspective from the sixties to the nineties. In S. Tom (Ed.), *The changing university* (pp. 15-25). Buckingham: The Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press.
- Woolridge, E. (2010). Rethinking strategic planning for uncertain times. *Engage: You magazine from the leadership foundation for higher education*, 24(Winter), 1-2.

### Author

Ludmilla Luddy Salonda is a senior lecturer and the Director of Academic Quality Assurance at Divine Word University. She holds a PhD in university culture and management from Victoria University in Melbourne; a Master of Arts in English literature from Macquarie University in Sydney; a Graduate Certificate in Higher Education Quality Assurance from Melbourne University; a Bachelor of Arts in English literature from James Cook University; and a Bachelor of Science in Journalism from Kansas University USA. Dr Salonda is the lecturer responsible for the organisational behaviour unit in DWU's Master of Business Administration program. Her research interest is in higher education management. Email: lsalonda@dwu.ac.pg