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Abstract

This thesis is an exploratory study focusing on the tension between managerialism and collegiality experienced by mid-level academic administrators in Canadian higher education. The study is a constructivist analysis of the every day, lived experiences of the participants working in a single, large university. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with 6 academic administrators that report directly to a Vice-President Academic. The analysis of these detailed interviews suggests that collegiality appears to be alive and well at the university included in this study. Administrators described consultative, collegial processes with shared decision making. However, the activity of developing and managing budgets was described by participants as the responsibility of the dean and these processes were neither collegial nor consultative. There is a need for further research on the experience and work of academic administrators in Canadian higher education.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

The post-war era was an extremely important time in the development of the modern university. North American colleges and universities experienced a large influx of students in the years following WWII. During this shift from an elite to a mass system of higher education in the 1950s and 1960s, administrative structures emerged to provide coordination and direction (Chait, 2002; Hardy, 1990). Some scholars argue that increased administrative structures led to greater managerialism in the academy (Rhoades & Sporn, 2002). While others argue the post-war era was a golden era for faculty: a time when the professoriate emerged as a distinct and important profession. Jenks and Riesman labeled this time the ‘academic revolution.’ They argue that the faculty’s central role in curriculum, selection of colleagues and senior administrators, admission and graduation was cemented during this period (Chait, 2002; Freeland, 1997; Jencks & Riesman, 2001). Kerr argued that the faculty collectively gained a great deal of power from the administration during this period which he called ‘The Great Transformation in Higher Education’ (Chait, 2002).

Since the global recession in the 1980s, neoliberal globalization has had an increasing influence on higher education (Levin, 2006). Increasingly, institutions of higher education are expected to do more with fewer resources (Deem & Brehony, 2005; P. J. Gumport & Sporn, 1999; Levin, 2006). Some argue that corporate influence on higher education in the post-1980 emerged in the form of marketisation, commercialization and the creep of managerialism. Some scholars argue that reforms such as New Public Management and increasing academic capitalism have eroded collegiality and faculty power in the academy (P. Gumport, 2000; Rhoades & Slaughter, 2006; Rhoades & Sporn, 2002).
Research Questions

There are four research questions that will help explore this problem. My primary research question is “how do administrators navigate the tension between collegiality and managerialism?” The researcher will examine this tension in the day-to-day work of senior administrators through detailed interviews with a small sample of administrators at one institution. This study will use the management experiences of senior administrators to explore collegial-managerial tensions.

Additional research questions that will help explore the primary research question are:

- In what ways have managers been influenced by the tradition of collegiality?
- Have corporate sector practices become institutionalized in higher education or have new forms of management been developed and negotiated in the environment?
- Are the prevalent management practices influenced by corporate management practice?

This study is focused on one particular medical-doctoral research university in Canada. Senior administrators – in this case defined as those reporting directly to the Vice-President, Academic – were invited to participate in semi-structured interviews. The interviews focused on the collegial-managerial tensions the participants experience in their work, and were constructivist in that the researcher is most concerned about the lived experiences of each participant.

As outlined in Chapter 2, this thesis draws on a body of research focusing on managerialism, collegiality, the external influence on the university and literature focused on administrative practices. However, there is very little empirical research on the topic. Within the limitations of this study the researcher will attempt to make a contribution to the study of managerialism and collegiality and administration in Canadian higher education.
Why is this important?

Although some of scholars described above argue that managerialism is eroding the academy’s long history of collegiality, there has been very little empirical exploration of the topic. This exploratory study will analyse empirical evidence on this collegial-managerial tension. This tension will be examined through discussions with a sample of senior administrators at a single Canadian research university. Although limited in scope to one institution the aim of this study is to test the theories presented in the literature. Much of the literature has examined reforms in the U.K., Australia and the U.S. It is impossible to generalize an entire nation from a study focusing on one Canadian institution. However, another contribution of this study will be testing some of the polemic collegial-managerial discussion against the Canadian experience.

The next chapter of this thesis is an examination of the relevant literature, followed by chapters on research methods, study results and a chapter dedicated to concluding comments.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

Much has been written on the managerial attack on the academy in the age of neoliberal reforms. This study will examine the tension between collegiality and managerialism in the day-to-day work of senior administrators. This chapter provides a review of the relevant research literature and is divided into four sections. The first section focuses on the literature that offers a critique of managerialism. This body of literature is important to this study as it introduces managerial-collegial tension as a problem. The second section is a review of the research literature that investigates the struggles of the collegial model during this period of “professional peripheralization” in which managers have pushed academics to the margins of decision-making in the academy (Levin, 2006; Rhoades & Sporn, 2002). The third section addresses the literature that discusses external pressures on institutions of higher education, specifically the influence of business, industry and government on the administration of university and colleges through reduced public funding, measurements on effectiveness and efficiency, calls for accountability and increased pressure to be entrepreneurial (Bessant, 1995; Deem & Brehony, 2005; Levin, 2006). The fourth section will review the research literature on the roles and responsibilities of senior administrators, predominantly academic deans.

Managerialism in the Academy

In general terms, managerialism or new managerialism defines a situation wherein management practices and values commonly associated with the private sector are applied to the public sector (Levin, 2006). Many scholars have acknowledged the trend of public sector organizations attempting to mirror their private sector counterparts. There is a substantive body of scholarship that questions and critically analyses the assumption that corporate sector
management practices can and should be applied to the university (Bessant, 1995; Deem & Brehony, 2005; Krücken & Meier, 2006; Levin, 2006).

As early as the 1960s, Kerr indicated that, either by force, choice or circumstance, administration was becoming a more prominent force in the university (Kerr, 1982). Historically, higher education administrators were principally drawn from the faculty ranks. The second half of the 20th century however, saw an increase in permanent, full-time, non-academic managers with expanded powers (Rhoades & Sporn, 2002). There has been a particular increase in middle managers. Between the 1970s and 1990s the number of full-time managerial professionals in American universities doubled (Krücken & Meier, 2006; Rhoades & Sporn, 2002). There has also been significant growth in university administrative positions in Canada “as new managerialism took hold in the academy” (Jones, Shanahan, & Goyan, 2002). The introduction of the middle manager is a fundamental shift for academia. Middle managers are an important component of top-down corporate-style management structures in which each lower office is controlled and supervised of the one above it (Bessant, 1995; Mintzberg, 2000 (1979)). This hierarchical model supplanted from business is often associated with authoritarian decision-making in which management divides up tasks and positions (Powell, 1990). Hierarchical models are at odds with the historical collegial tradition (covered in the next section) however, and create a deep divide between faculty and administration (Levin, 2006).

One of the most prevalent practices examined in the literature is strategic planning. As a tool, it is presented as an example of a corporate practice with well documented impact on the academy. Developed in business environments and later introduced into higher education in 1981 by Kotler and Murphy’s article ‘Strategic Planning for Higher Education’. By 1985, 88% of post-secondary institutions in the U.S. were using this corporate management tool within the
academy (Birnbaum, 2000b). Nationally-conducted surveys suggest that nearly half of all American institutions that have engaged in campus-wide strategic planning eliminated academic programs in the process (Rhoades & Slaughter, 2006). Birnbaum also argued that strategic planning, like many of these ‘management innovations’ developed outside of higher education are largely fads “arriving at higher education doorsteps five years after their trial in business, often just as corporations are discarding them” (Amaral, Fulton, & Larsen, 2003; Birnbaum, 2000a, 2000b).

Corporate-style management operates under the assumption that the manager possesses the particular skill set necessary to ensure the attainment of goals (Saravanamuth & Filling, 2004). The legitimacy of these managers is predicated on what Levin described as a “practitioner’s culture” in which there is a unity among the labour (Levin, 2006). An environment which binds individuals together through common goals and values minimizes criticism within the ranks (Casey, 1995; Hardy, 1990; Levin, 2006). Influences such as academic capitalism and neoliberal government philosophies have further legitimized managerialism within higher education.

Corporate metaphors and language have also permeated the academy (Deem & Brehony, 2005; P. Gumport, 2000; Hood, 2000). Top-level managers disseminate the culture by transmitting corporate philosophies through corporate communication channels (Melewar & Akel, 2005). Bessant theorized that the market economy colonizes public policy. He described the effect as a crowding-out of other knowledge and practice, and the destruction of accumulated knowledge developed under a different ideological framework (Bessant, 1995). Gumport argued that market principles are irrelevant in higher education, given that “markets are highly
regulated” through “public subsidies, restrictions in pricing”, while others scholars have suggested that the increased entrepreneurial practices within higher education have been driven by an internal culture, economics and political forces (Rhoades & Slaughter, 2006). The empirical section of this study will attempt to investigate the accuracy of these arguments, and will endeavor to determine whether the traditionally collegial, flat system of decision-making and consensus-building has in fact been impacted by a more hierarchical, top-down managerial system.

**Collegial Tradition**

Higher education has advanced significantly since the time of Cardinal Newman’s “Idea of the University.” In most countries, higher education systems embrace a tradition of collegiality (Kerr, 1982; Rhoades & Sporn, 2002). The model for centuries has been based on a community of scholars, all masters of their respective disciplines, under whom students learned as apprentices. In the collegial model administrators took the form of chairs drawn from within of academic community on a short-term, rotating basis. All academics were responsible for quality, and only professionals held the authority to evaluate the collective performance of the group (Bleiklie, 1998).

Collegiality is central to the history, values and legitimacy of institutions of higher education. It was the prevalent model for hundreds of years, built on a foundation of valuing shared decision-making, trust, and participation (Smyth, 1989). As a tradition, the collegial model has been criticized by some as inefficient and ineffective, however, some scholars argue that it is very difficult for the competing models of collegiality and managerialism to co-exist (Bessant, 1995).
Critics of the increase in professional managers in the academy have mainly been concerned with the effect such changes will have on collegiality. The very nature of collegiality differs greatly from established business models (Bessant, 1995). Even classic examples of collegiality such as Oxford and Cambridge have shown signs of a stronger central administration (Kerr, 1982). For centuries, academics have been left to manage their own affairs “in recognition of the difficulties that lay people would experience in managing an institution characterized by a very strong emphases on professionalization” (Amaral et al., 2003). As managerialism began to gain prominence and legitimacy in higher education, some academics came to recognize the importance of protecting collegial ideals.

Deeply entrenched tensions exist between collegiality and managerialism. Top-down decision-making was increasingly assumed to be more cost effective or administratively efficient than older models, though Bessant (1995) claimed that there is little, if any, empirical evidence to substantiate these assumptions (Bessant, 1995). In fact, some scholars believe that, despite the increasing acceptance of professional administrators within the academy, it is not possible to run a university like a corporation. Bessant believed that academic leaders in the academy must be more consultative, and even consensual. Consultation is very important in academic leadership. It is not surprising that faculty ranked the ability to communicate as an academic dean’s most important quality (Rosser, Johnsrud, & Heck, 2003). Handy suggested that a top-down treatment of people in a university causes resentment suggesting “it cannot be maintained for long periods without such consequences” (as cited in McNay, 1995). Some new administrators experience a distinct internal conflict between the familiar collegial tradition and their new goal-oriented roles.
which require a focus on outcomes, performance and assessment (Bessant, 1995; Deem & Brehony, 2005).

One scholar argued that the term ‘collegiality’ evokes ideas of warm, supportive relationships and teamwork. Collegial organizations have communal tendencies in the form of coherent social rules and common identities. Highly successful organizations such as Honda derive much of their magic from collegial networks (Hardy, 1996). Some scholars believe that the collegial and managerial models are influenced by strong factors from outside the institution, principally government and business, and challenges to the collegial model are described in the literature as primarily coming from external pressures.

An important aspect of collegiality is academic freedom. Shills (1991) described academic freedom as “a situation in which an individual academic may act without consequences that can do damage to their status, tenure as members of institutions.” As professionals they also choose what to “assert in their teaching” and which subject to research. However, Shills carefully clarified that “no single academic has the right to decide the number of hours he or she will teach”, and noted that these decisions should be a “collective academic decision.” Academic freedom as a concept is closely associated with University autonomy which Shills described as freedom from “interference by the state or by a church or by the power of any other corporate body” (Shills, 1991).
External Influence on Managers

Many political leaders regard higher education as a tool for economic development (P. Gumport, 2000). State influence on higher education is not a new phenomenon; this assumption, combined with increasing pressure to run the university like a business, created a unique set of stressors. Kerr (1982) identified Napoleon as the first politician to seize control of a university system. Napoleon fully reorganized the education system in France by integrating pre-existing autonomous universities. Of course, modern politicians must be far more discrete. In some jurisdictions, higher level university administrators are actually civil servants who can be easily influenced or controlled by external parties (Bessant, 1995). The external influence on higher education is not restricted to state intervention. In systems where institutions and administrators are autonomous, arms length direction is often facilitated through changes in funding (Whetten & Cameron, 1985). Some administrators have also reported pressure to be more entrepreneurial from governing boards (Levin, 2006). University governing boards which tend to be dominated by business leaders. In an effort to add to an institution’s prestige, universities and governments will appoint successful business leaders to university governing boards. A 2009 analysis of the composition of governing boards at 3 Canadian research universities found that, on average, 42% of all board members came from the private sector (Nuttall, 2009). This increases the opportunity for corporate influence on the decision making of the university, placing administrators under the influence of not only their fellow board members but also the corporate
sector boards on which these members serve. The phenomenon, known as ‘board interlocks’, occurs when business leaders and university leaders are shown to serve on a number of the same boards. Corporate sector leaders begin to be regarded as colleagues and act as advisors (Rhoades & Slaughter, 2006), and increased interaction breeds similarity: as connections grow between organizations, they begin to resemble one another. DiMaggio and Powell (1991) hypothesized that the “greater the dependence of an organization on another organization, the more similar it will become to that organization in structure, climate and behaviours.”

Some scholars point to an increase in managerial behaviour as actors within higher education begin to adapt to this external pressure. Students are increasingly viewed as consumers in a competitive higher education industry, and there is evidence that some faculty design curriculum for business needs and what student consumers desire (P. Gumport, 2000; Levin, 2006; Melewar & Akel, 2005). Boyko (2009) argues however, that more than 70% of her study participants have not heard or seen any evidence of new managerialism in Canadian higher education. Boyko provides a glimpse into how the Canadian context may differ from other regions (Boyko, 2009).

Neoliberal ideas about higher education are not typically communicated to administrators through training. In fact, a study by Deem and Brehony (2005) revealed that only ⅓ of respondents had received any specific training for their management roles (Deem & Brehony, 2005). The lack of formal training seems to indicate that most administrators learn how to manage on their own, informally, and do most of their learning on the job (Harris, Martin, & Agnew, 2004; Rhoades & Sporn, 2002). It has been argued that the features of new managerialism outlined above, such as more directive decision-making and the introduction of
corporate language, are externally imposed on higher education. Scholars point to government and corporate influence on the academy as one source for managerialism. This empirical study begins where those studies end. How do administrators navigate this collegial-managerial tension? What management practices are being used by higher education administrators? Where have these practices come from: institutional policy, collective decision making or the administrator?

**Academic Administrators and Practices**

There is certainly a body of literature exploring topics related to academic administrators. The researcher found several articles, as well as less scholarly but interesting sources like new administrator handbooks, however not all are relevant to a specific exploration of managerial-collegial tensions. Deans, directors and other administrators have a myriad of responsibilities. Most of these administrators are relative amateurs administrators pulled from the faculty ranks. While performing their responsibilities, these administrators may be constantly negotiating the tension between collegiality and managerialism.

One example of a process which can foster collegial-managerial tension is the widely used tool of strategic planning. As outlined earlier in the section on collegiality, the university has a history of collective decision-making. However, some decisions are often left to central management (Mintzberg & Rose, 2003). Although strategic planning can be a very consultative process, administrators are often responsible for both designing and implementing the planning processes. Planning theorists describe a process whereby strategies are formulated before they
are implemented, however both Hardy and Mintzberg have argued the existence of both emergent and deliberate strategies in the university (Hardy, Langley, & Mintzberg, 1983; Mintzberg, 2000 (1979); Mintzberg & Rose, 2003). An academic leader is usually expected to supplement and complement ideas and strategies gathered during the consultation and information-gathering process (Mintzberg, 1981; Morant, 2009). There seems to be a common definition of planning, best characterized by Lang as “a process of maintaining a continuous fit between a university’s environment, its resources and its purposes as an institution.” Lang went on to identify linking plans and budgets as the greatest planning difficulty (Lang in Holdaway & Meekison, 1990). However, Mintzberg (1981) demands more research into a managers role in planning – and what exactly planning is from an operational standpoint.

The management and planning of budgets can also be a particularly sensitive issue for administrators. In tough economic times, many managers are required to make difficult decisions in order to cut expenditures. Administrators also have to manage departmental opposition to such cuts. Chabotar (1995) described three principal models for collective budget processes, and endorsed the participative model whereby a committee is responsible for the entire process. Other administrators have used crisis as grounds for a directive or prescriptive decision from the top. Some argue that top-down decisions may be quicker, which is beneficial during difficult financial times (Chabotar, 1995; Hardy, 1990; Hardy et al., 1983).

Since the neoliberal reforms described earlier in this paper, the academy has seen changes to the faculty complement. Many more adjunct or contingent faculty are being utilized as a cheaper and more nimble option than traditional tenure-track faculty. Between 1975 and 1993, the number of non-tenure-track faculty appointments in the U.S. increased by 88% (Basil & Basil, 2005; Bland, Center, Finstad, Risbey, & Staples, 2006). In Canada, the number of non-
tenure positions has continued to grow. Contingent faculty now outnumber tenured faculty in the U.S. and Canada (Dobbie & Robinson, 2008; Kezar & Sam, 2011). These reforms have also produced new types of appointment, with some faculty being hired in teaching-only positions. These changes bring up important questions for managers about recruitment, hiring and promotion.

Changes in faculty composition also effect performance evaluation, which is becoming an increasingly important part of an administrator’s job. In the U.S., 45% of faculty work is performed in joint with a colleague, making evaluation particularly difficult. A common model for evaluation of faculty and staff is an annual review centered on a self-produced annual report. When faculty are preparing for promotion and tenure, they synthesize these annual reports into dossiers (Colbeck, 2002). For years research dominated this evaluation process, although recently student evaluations have become more important (Boice, 1985; Centra, 1977; Colbeck, 2002). Boice (1985) discusses the reluctance of deans and chairs to offer professional development or intervene with under-performing faculty by offering faculty development programs. This begs an important question: is the purpose of evaluation to make decisions on promotion or to improve performance? There is clearly a body of literature dedicated to administration in higher education, but there is very little research into collegial-managerial tension.

Summary and Ideas for Further Research

This chapter explored four main threads in the literature. The first was the influence of managerialism in the academy. Lavin (2006) defined managerialism as a situation where management practices and values commonly associated with the private sector are applied to the public sector. There also been a significant increase in the overall number of professional
management positions in higher education both in Canada and the U.S. (Jones et al., 2002; Krücken & Meier, 2006; Rhoades & Sporn, 2002). Birnbaum (2006) suggested that corporate management tools like strategic planning are becoming more prevalent, and dismissed many business-oriented “management innovations” as simply fads (Birnbaum, 2000b). Perhaps the most pervasive aspect of the creep of managerialism into higher education is the increased use of corporate language and metaphors (Deem & Brehony, 2005; P. Gumport, 2000; Hood, 2000).

Historically, collegiality is based on a concept of a fairly flat community of scholars, with chairs drawn from the faculty ranks helping to coordinate the group (Bleiklie, 1998). Some authors suggest that the corporate style of direction is simply not suitable for the university’s collegial environment, describing the approach as too top-down (Handy, as cited in (McNay, 1995). Shills (1991) argued the importance of academic freedom in relation to collegiality, whereby faculty collaborate to make “collective academic decisions.” Many believe managerialism results from an external influence on higher education. Kerr (1982) described state influence on higher education as a common phenomenon dating back to Napoleon. Corporate access to university governing boards is also a source of influence on higher education, with one study revealing that 42% of board members come from the private sector (Nuttall, 2009). What the literature clearly shows however is that managerial ideas are not largely communicated through training. In fact, few administrators had received any training at all (Deem & Brehony, 2005; Harris et al., 2004; Rhoades & Sporn, 2002). There are also examples of corporate sector practices transplanted into higher education. Chabotar (1995) argued that the forms of top-down budget planning that are common in the university would be best replaced with a participative model in which a committee is responsible for fiscal decisions. Again, much of the literature important to this study is drawn from the U.S., U.K. and Australia. The aim of this paper is to
address the relative lack of Canadian-focused studies in the literature exploring managerial-collegial tension in the day-to-day work of senior administrators.

There has been some limited attention given to chairs and academic deans (Boyko, 2009; Boyko & Jones, 2008) in the literature of higher education. Very little has been written about so-called middle-management positions in the history of higher education in Canada (Boyko & Jones, 2008). The literature focuses on academic leaders in connection with new public management reforms and the creep of managerialism in the U.K. and Australia (Harman, 2002; Kogan, Bauer, Bleiklie, & Henkel, 2006).

However, there has been very little written about the actual management practices, and the day-to-day experiences of administrators within higher education. There have been a few articles written about the role of academic deans (Boyko & Jones, 2008; Wolverton, Wolverton, & Gmelch, 1999), the financial management skills of academic deans (or lack thereof) (McBride, 2000) and the essential skills required to be a leader and manager in higher education (Hoff, 1999). Short of a few articles on evaluating deans (Rosser et al., 2003) and faculty (Mills & Hyle, 1999) and the decision-making of academic deans (McCarty & Reyes, 1987), very little attention has been given to just how senior administrators carry out the administration of their departments. Even less attention has been paid to the leadership or management of non-academic administrators. It is also important to note that relatively few articles cited in this literature review address a Canadian context. This study endeavours to fill this gap in the research by providing more insight into the collegial-managerial tensions in the regular duties of higher education administrators, particularly in Canada. Much of the literature related to managerial-collegial issues is particularly polemic. The empirical component of this study will provide an opportunity to field-test some of the theories presented in the literature. The
researcher’s hope is to make a contribution to the body of literature on managerialism and reforms to academic management, as well as to the literature focused on leaders and managers in the academy.
Chapter 3: Research Methods

The objective of this study is to determine how senior administrators navigate the tension between managerialism, collegiality and the external influence from business and government on academic management. The study is constructivist in nature, and centers on administrators’ reflections on the tension between collegiality and managerialism in their day-to-day work. Management experiences will provide real-world examples of the collegial-managerial tensions that are prevalent in the literature.

Chapter 3 is organized into eight sections. Section one focuses on the overall design of the research study. Section two describes the development of the interview questions and protocol. The third section of the chapter introduces the research site and the sample. The fourth section details the invitation process used for the study. The fifth section provides some aggregate demographic information on the study participants. The final sections address the ethical considerations and the limits of the study, and provide some concluding thoughts.

Research Design Overview

The study is built around four research questions. The primary research questions is “How do administrators navigate the tension between collegiality and managerialism?” There are also three sub questions each relating to an aspect of the tension. The first is “In what ways have managers been influenced by the tradition of collegiality?” The second question is related to practices “Have corporate sector practices become institutionalized in higher education or have new forms of management been developed and negotiated in the environment?” The last sub-question is “Are thee prevalent management practices influenced by corporate management practice?” The research questions are core to this study and will be referenced throughout.
This empirical study utilized focused, semi-structured interviews comprised of open-ended questions. The collegial-managerial tension central to this study, and the management experiences and the values associated with management decision-making, are fairly complex. The semi-structured interview method was viewed as the best way for the researcher to dissect these complex issues and probe for clarification. Generalizability is not typically a goal of constructivist research; the very nature of constructivism relies upon the phenomena being time- and context-specific. As such, generalizability is limited by the context-free nature of the generalizations. While this study focuses on one research intensive institution in Canada, the semi-structured questions have been narrowed into particular themes to offer a higher degree of comparison/synthesis across interviews.

Semi-structured interviews were the primary method of data collection, and interviews were conducted using a pre-developed interview protocol (see Appendix F). The interview questions focused on the internal tension between collegiality and managerialism in the professional routines of higher education administrators.

In general, this research study follows the Qualitative Procedures outlined by Creswell (2009) in Research Design:

Step 1 – Participant Invitations (as described in greater detail in section four below).

Step 2 – Interviews: All interviews took place in person, in the participants’ offices, scheduled at a convenient time for the participant. The sixty- to ninety-minute long interviews took place in April and May 2011. Notes were made on the interview protocol sheet during the interviews. However, the interviews were also audio recorded with the participants’ permission, and
professionally transcribed for further analysis. Participants were asked for a current curriculum vitae (CV) before the meeting, which was used to establish context without devoting interview time to an examination of employment history and administrative experience. The CVs were also used to compare the demographic data among participants.

Step 3 – Data Analysis – Interview: In qualitative research, data collection and data analysis begin simultaneously. All participants were asked the same initial set of questions in the same order (see Appendix F). The researcher began interpreting the data during the interview and asking probing and clarifying questions to best understand the participants’ experiences with the topics.

Step 4 – Interview Validity: Within two weeks of each interview, a transcript was sent to each participant for corrections, clarifications and additions. Participants were given two weeks to review the transcript and provide feedback, providing a higher degree of validity, and accuracy and participant confidentiality.

Step 5 – Coding: There were two phases of interview coding. The first used NVivo9 qualitative analysis software. The analysis generally followed Tesch’s (1990) eight-step coding guide.

1. Read all the transcripts carefully. Record some ideas, reflections and interpretations in a research journal.
2. Begin analyzing one source (in this case, the interview transcript) in depth, recording thoughts and interpretations in the research journal.
3. After completing this process for several interviews, make a list of topics and begin to cluster similar topics.
4. Begin coding based on topic.
5. Look for ways to reduce the topic list into broader categories.
6. Make final categories and alphabetize the categories for coding.
7. Assemble the transcription data belonging to each category and begin analysis of each category.

8. If necessary, recode your existing data.

Step 6 – Theming the Data: Themes were generated by combining coding nodes. At this stage of data analysis, it was clear which topics received the most attention during the interviews and what concepts were common among participants.

Step 7 – Interpretation: At this stage, the views of the participants were compared and contrasted. One major limitation of theming was realized at this juncture: The researcher had a good understanding of the most frequently encountered concepts in the interviews, as well as some sense of similarities and differences across the responses. However, the material did not provide clear evidence for the four central research questions. At this point, the researcher repeated the above steps and re-coded the data. This re-coding focused on evidence that would directly answer each of the four research questions instead of similarities, differences, trends or common subjects. The second set of coding linked evidence directly to a research question. Both sets of coding data were used in the final results and interpretation.

Development of Interview Questions

As described in Chapter 1, this study addresses one primary research question and three sub-questions. The interviewees were never directly asked the research questions in the interviews. Instead, open-ended interview questions were designed to gather evidence to answer each research question. An early set of questions were piloted on a senior-level administrator outside of the sample at a different institution. The researcher reviewed the interview notes from this control experiment with the thesis supervisor and made some modifications to the questions.
The following table illustrates how interview questions provided evidence for the corresponding research question. Probing questions were also developed and included in the interview protocol to ensure that interviewees discussed specific issues. The full interview protocol as used in the interviews is included in Appendix F.

**Table 1 – Research Questions with corresponding Interview Questions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Interview Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How do administrators navigate the tension between collegiality and managerialism?</td>
<td>Can you describe a time when you felt this collegial/managerial tension in your work? Planning budgets can be a particularly sensitive activity on any campus. Thinking of your budget process last year – did you feel any collegial/managerial tension?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In what ways have managers been influenced by the tradition of collegiality?</td>
<td>Are there types of decisions that come with an expectation to be more collegial?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the prevalent management practices influenced by corporate management practice? &amp; Have corporate sector practices become institutionalized in higher education or have new forms of management been developed and negotiated in the environment?</td>
<td>Often these collegial/managerial tensions are more prominent when we are faced with an unanticipated operational problem. Can you describe how you dealt with a recent crisis in your operation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>Can you please describe a time when you introduced a new policy (or initiative) and felt the tension between collegiality and managerialism?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>Do you have anything to add? Anything you wanted to share that did not come out in the questions? Any question you would like to go back to?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Research Site and Sample**

This empirical study focused on one large, research-intensive, medical-doctoral university in Canada. Participants were promised anonymity; neither the institution nor the participants will be identified in this thesis. As outlined in earlier sections, collegial-managerial
tensions are more prominent higher in the administrative hierarchy (Amaral, et al., 2003). Therefore, senior administrators were chosen as the participants for this study. Although administrative structures vary from institution to institution, executive teams typically include two important vice-presidents. One is the vice-president (VP) in charge of administration, whose responsibilities include non-academic operations and financial policy. The other is the academic vice-president (or Provost) (Boyko & Jones, 2008). The term senior administrator is particularly colloquial, and this study focuses on those individuals who report directly to the Provost or Vice-President Academic. Jones and Boyko (2008) referred to deans as middle-management, while Scott (1980) excluded deans, chairs and chief librarians from his study on middle-level administrators. At many institutions, this group includes: academic deans, chief librarians, assistant vice-presidents, vice-provosts and more. These senior administrators have the challenge of functioning as liaison between the universities’ central administrations and the faculties and departments, where the pressures of a marketised environment meet daily academic life (Boyko, 2009). According to the research discussed in Chapter 2, the managerial/collegial tensions should be very prominent at this level. Administrators in this sample will be a mix of academics on administrative appointments and professional administrators that rose through the faculty ranks.

The Vice-President Academic of this large, Canadian, research-intensive university has more than two dozen direct reports. The researcher acknowledges that the term direct reports can be particularly problematic in an academic setting. The Vice-President Academic is ultimately responsible for the success of all areas in his/her purview. A list of the Vice-President Academics’ direct reports was divided into established categories. The first category included those individuals working directly in the Vice President’s office: Assistant Vice-Presidents as
well as senior officers and directors. The second category was comprised of the heads of various smaller academic units. The third category contained faculty deans. All deanships are not created equal, and effort was made to include interviews with Deans of single departments as well as large multi-departmental faculties.

**Participant Invitations and Interviews**

Understanding that the administrators invited to participate in this study had busy schedules, it was expected that not all would be open to an interview. The initial round of letters requesting an interview targeted eight participants representing the three categories identified above: two heads of smaller academic departments, two Deans from multi-department faculties, two Deans from single-department faculties and two individuals working directly in the VP-Academic office (Assistant Vice-Presidents, etc.). This initial list of eight was evenly split along gender lines, and the invitation letters were approved as part of the ethical review process (Appendix C).

As invitees accepted a time and place for the interview was coordinated. In all cases the interviews took place in the administrator’s office. For those that did not initially respond, telephone calls were made to their respective administrative assistants to follow-up on the invitation. Scripts for these calls were also approved through the ethical review process (Appendix D). The calls were in no-way coercive and simply ensured that the invitation was received. When interviewees responded as unavailable, an invitation was sent to an alternate. Every effort was made to maintain even representation of all three categories as well as maintain a reasonable gender balance. Four invitees declined participation, three never responded. In the end, seven interviews were conducted. However, one participant withdrew from the study after
the interview had been completed and, in accordance with the ethical protocols, the data from that interview was destroyed.

Table 2 - Participants by Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From the VP-Academic's Office</th>
<th>Head of Smaller Academic Depts</th>
<th>Faculty Single-Department</th>
<th>Faculty Multi-Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample Demographics

Demographic information was obtained from each participant’s CV. Given that the six participants in this study are all senior-level administrators in positions which typically require several years of administrative experience; it is unsurprising that the average interviewee age was 56. These senior level positions typically require several years of previous administrative experience. The average career length was 24.5 years. Participants had an average of eight years of administrative experience, and just less than six years of senior administrative experience. There were three males and three females in the study.

The study participants can be divided into three categories based on the experience. New administrators with fewer than five years of administrative experience had an approximate average age of 54 and an average of less than two years of administrative experience. The Experienced administrators have the same approximate average age as the new group. However, the experienced group have an average of 10 years of administrative experience with just under five years in senior administrative roles. The last group—the Veterans—have an approximate average age of 60 years old. The veterans have an average of 11 years of administrative experience, entirely in senior-level positions.
To maintain the anonymity of the participants in the study, this will be the extent of unmasked demographic information. Further reference to any participants’ experience will refer to the categories named above. In the upcoming section of this thesis, identifying characteristics such as gender and faculty may be changed to further ensure anonymity.

**Ethical Considerations**

All of the interview questions, methods, invitations and even the script for follow-up calls were reviewed by the University of Toronto’s ethical review process. Participation in the study was in no way coerced, and instructions for withdrawing from the study were included in the invitation. The vulnerability of senior administrators is fairly low within this study. However, an important ethical issue does arise when focusing on a relatively small group of administrators at one institution. The institution is not identified and every effort has been made to mask the identity the senior administrators involved. Only the researcher and supervisor know the true identities of the study participants, and the researcher, supervisor and transcription professional have had access to interview transcriptions and raw data. Special care has been taken to conceal demographic details, names, faculties and any other details that could reveal the identity of the participants has been given particularly attention throughout the process. All data was stored securely on a password-protected computer at the researcher’s home and backed up on an encrypted USB drive. All paper records were digitized and will be shredded when the thesis is complete.

**Limitations of the Study**

This study is limited in size and scope, but is a suitable sample size for an exploratory study. Focusing on just a single institution and only six participants does not allow for the
generalizability of findings. The strictly qualitative nature of this study relies exclusively on the interview data for results and interpretation, and there is no triangulation or quantitative apparatus for comparison. The study is also somewhat limited by its promise to maintain participants’ anonymity. There is potential for several great case studies contained within this data and it would be wonderful to provide more context and additional resources to the reader; unfortunately this is not possible within these limitations. Throughout the research process, the supervisor and the researcher discussed interviewing best practice, interpreting data and training and mentorship continued at every stage of the process.

Conclusion

Participants were chosen based on the desire to maintain a balance of positions and gender, as well as on willingness to contribute to the study. An ethical review process was approved prior to any contact being made with potential participants. Open-ended, semi-structured interview questions were developed, as suggested in the qualitative research literature (Creswell, 2009). An interview protocol was established and all participants were asked the same questions in the same order. The analysis generally followed Tesch’s (1990) eight-step coding guide, and the data was also re-coded after a preliminary analysis. For the re-coding the same eight-step process was followed. The ethical considerations of the study were considered throughout the process and the participants’ anonymity was never compromised. This chapter described the set-up and the research methodology central to this study. The next chapter will describe the empirical results and observations of this study.
Chapter 4: Empirical Study Results and Observations

The purpose of this chapter is to share the results of the empirical study outlined earlier in chapter 3. The first section of this chapter will describe the masked identities of the participants that will be referenced throughout the chapter. Each of the four research questions will then be examined with evidence from the participant interviews. Not surprisingly, there were some intriguing emergent findings beyond the scope of the research questions. I have compiled these observations into a section called Dean’s World with some interesting insights in the academic management.

Masked Identities

Aggregate demographic data on the study participants was provided in the last chapter, but in order to maintain their anonymity I have created short, masked identities for each. For the following masked profiles gender, age and administrative position may or may not have been changed to guarantee the anonymity of both the institution and the participants. These profiles were created so I can still describe and cite individual interview data. All reference to the participants in the following section will utilize the masked names and profiles.

Table 3 - Masked Identities of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Masked Identities of Study Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mary Martin</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of small academic unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience: New Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ken Li</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean, single department faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience: New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hannah Wilson</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean, single department faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience: New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amy Clark</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean, multi-department faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience: Veteran</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Evidence to Address Research Questions

Research Question #1: How do administrators navigate the tension between collegiality and managerialism?

The first and overarching question that is central to this study is: “How do administrators navigate the tension between collegiality and managerialism?” The question implies that there is, in fact, a tension and this section will explore evidence from the interviews related to this collegial/managerial tension. This research focus is particularly linked to two questions in the interview: all six interviews were first asked, “Can you describe a time when you felt this collegial/managerialism tension in your work?” This question was followed by: “Planning budgets can be a particularly sensitive activity on any campus. Thinking of your budget process last year—did you feel any collegial/managerial tension?”

Two of the six interviewees asked for clarification on the definitions of collegiality and managerialism, and were provided with the same standard definition as described in the literature review. Each then outlined their thoughts on collegial/managerial tension. Only one administrator—one of the veteran administrators—indicated after a long pause that she felt absolutely no managerial/collegial tension in her work. She went on to clarify:

Sometimes as a Dean you have to make decisions where either there isn't the time or maybe the context that would allow for significant collegial involvement in the decisions. But I've never felt a tension, never. (Clark, Interview)
Later in the interview, Clark shared that although “faculty would like a committee making all the decisions about the budget, at the end of the day I'm the dean, I have to be responsible.” It would appear that in Clark’s case there is no managerial/collegial tension because she has a very clear concept of a dean’s role in running an academic faculty. Although I was initially surprised that Clark was unable to identify a single instance of collegial/managerial tension in her work, it is perhaps to be expected that a veteran Dean would be comfortable enough in her role or appropriately socialized enough to navigate any collegial/managerial tension.

Hannah Wilson, another veteran Dean, had a similar reaction when first asked about the tension between collegiality and managerialism. “I’ve had very little of that to be perfectly honest”, she said, adding, “I can’t think of many situations where they have come into conflict”. Wilson indicated that as Dean “one area we have absolute control over is budgetary” (Wilson, Interview). It would seem from these two interviews with the veteran administrators in the study that little conflict between collegiality and managerialism is experienced by administrators at that level. One could speculate that they have developed tools to deal with the tension, or perhaps they are perhaps very secure with their roles and responsibilities after more than 11 years in administrative roles. Both of the veteran Deans in the study indicated that the budget was absolutely the Dean’s responsibility.

Another interesting point brought forward by Dean Wilson was faculty size. She felt that it was much easier to be collegial as Dean of a relatively small, single department faculty. Wilson argued that there is less conflict and very little collegial-managerial tension in a smaller faculty. “There is not a faculty member I won’t know by name when I walk by them in the
“corridor,” she said, indicating that within a small faculty she is able to maintain an “open door policy.” Contrasting her own faculty with an extremely large faculty on campus, she suggested that it would not be possible for the Dean of a large faculty to know everybody, stating that he would “walk past faculty members that he doesn’t recognize.” Wilson also suggested academics in a small faculty feel more comfortable coming to the Dean with concerns and complaints.

Dean Li, a new administrator from another small, single-department faculty, also credited his faculty size as the reason for relatively little collegial/managerial tension within the faculty. Li did however describe some collegial/managerial tension with the Vice-President Academic that will be examined later. Li observed that it was very important for a Dean to maintain objectivity when approaching collegial/managerial tension, stating, “I am a scientist so I believe you have to try to be objective, and I always do this … and I try not respond with my heart first.”

Experienced Dean Bernard echoed veteran Dean Clark in ascribing the Dean ultimate responsible for the Faculty. Bernard approached the tension very differently, however. Having worked in countries outside Canada, including the U.K., he provided some interesting contrasts between different environments and cultures. Describing the importance of building consensus in the Canadian academic context, he said:

I lived and worked in the U.K. You could use managerial practices to manage the development of a research agenda and research practices of faculty. You cannot do that here (in Canada). Everything here needs to be based on consensus building. (Bernard, Interview)
Bernard described the shock and the adjustment required after relocating to Canada, and no longer being unable to use many of the administrative tools he used in the U.K. He described Canada as “a very different country,” and indicated that Deans hired from outside Canada should be provided with an “anthropology of Canada course” including such topics as: management in Canada, what it is to be Canadian, and how to motivate people to get things done in Canada. He concluded his thoughts on the contrast between Canada and other countries by saying: “Basically, I wouldn’t use managerialism here at all.”

New administrator Mary Martin also made reference to foreign administrators needing to adjust to Canada’s more consensus-driven academic environment. Martin described some academic settings outside Canada as more “autocratic.” Martin, consistent with Bernard, referenced a learning curve for international academics immigrating to Canada, noting that some administrators are “not sure of that culture and may come from a U.S. or international university where maybe that's not the style to consult.”

Erin Jackson is an experienced administrator in the Vice-President Academic’s office. Jackson is not responsible for the operation of a faculty, and felt her work offered limited opportunity for collegial/managerial tension “because [she is] not a line manager.” She described her role in the Vice-President Academic’s office as mostly dedicated to policy development across the university, and recalled having good conversations with Chairs and Deans and acting as a resource for other academic administrators. However, without a reporting relationship and with limited budget responsibilities she felt she avoided most of the managerial/collegial tensions. This observation was unique among the interviews, likely because all of the other participants have line-management responsibilities.
When asked specifically about collegial/managerial tension the administrators in the study generally do not believe that strong tensions exist in their work. Veteran administrators denied feeling this tension at all. Smaller faculty size was cited as a possible reason for relatively low tension, with line management cited as a possible tension source. Two administrators referenced the importance of collegiality in Canada, specifically in contrast to the managerial style of other nations.

*Budget Consultation.*

One topic referenced by all six participants—and which was explicitly raised in at least one of the interview questions in the interview—was budgets. This section of the interview was designed to examine budget development responsibility. How collegial or managerial were the administrators with respect to the budget? Were budget decisions made by committee, by faculty business officers, or even by the Dean?

The interview question regarding the budget was: “Planning budgets can be a particularly sensitive activity on any campus. Thinking of your budget process last year—did you feel any collegial/managerial tension?” Follow-up questions included: “Is there anything unique in your budget process?” and “Who else (if anybody) is involved in your budget planning process?”

Across the sample, several references were made to the budget being primarily the domain of the Dean. New administrator Martin observed that “there is a top down process to budgeting”, while veteran administrator Wilson remarked that the budget is “largely done in this office. Very few people outside the Associate Deans and Assistant Deans have anything to do with the budget.” New administrator Li discussed the importance of sharing the budget with the faculty.
In the fall I decided to show them the budget; this university model and again, so that they would see where the cost are. Where we make money and where we spend money so they understand the pressures that this unit is, and it is not hearsay from other people. They can see the numbers. (Li, Interview)

Although Dean Li assigned importance to sharing the budget, he nevertheless indicated that the budget development process was not consultative. “I work with a financial officer, I have one financial officer and she basically sits down and says okay, this is how we could balance the budget,” he explained, adding, “I trust her; she has been here for seven or eight years so.”

Several Deans stated that there were no policies, rules or expectations that there be any formal consultation related the budget. Martin, Li and Wilson pointed out that they shared the budget annually with the faculty, typically via a presentation at Faculty Council, though Li noted that the previous Dean never shared the budget with the community. Wilson observed that she attempted to share the budget annually with the Faculty Council, but explained that it was purely for informational purposes, as a type of financial update. She described this an optional action, and stated that there was no formal requirement for her to share the budget with the council. Wilson went on to explain that “the only time other faculty members and I will get involved in any budget issues is if they want to do something new and it’s going to cost.” Again, this process was described as largely informal, wherein she employed an “open door policy” allowing faculty to “come to her and ask ‘Can we afford it? Can we find the money to do it?’ That is when more or less I have to decide if we can afford it and where it fits in the priorities of the faculty as a whole.” A more formal or documented procedure for budget requests and
approvals would be more transparent, and the lack of such a formal process here could be problematic. A budget committee for evaluating requests would be a more collegial solution.

Clark shared that, moving forward, the faculty would not necessarily be involved in the budget development process, but that the budget would be developed to support the strategic plan which in turn would be developed with wide community consultation.

If you have a decent plan and you have a great team these sorts of tensions and difficulties tend to be minimal. You need a great team all of whom support the direction of the plan and whatever you've got. Otherwise you fight against one another for every last living thing and I've worked in situations where that was how budget management and planning was done. Here's a cookie, fight over it and divide it up all amongst you. That leads to—at least in my experience—animosity and grudges and faculties are units that think they're hard done by and then nothing works well. So if you have a fairly clear direction, and a decent plan and a team that supports it—I found there are no difficulties, there really aren't. (Clark, Interview)

Clark explained that she is not actually involved in the details of the budget process.

I rarely work much on budget. I know what the big picture is. I know what the big ticket items are. When it comes to the line items this and that and the other, we have lots of people here, I had people at [other institutions] who knew all of that. So my main role in the budgeting process is to make sure that the budget is supporting what it is we want to do academically. (Clark, Interview)

Clark went on to discuss the realities of involving the community in the budget planning process, indicating that it is much easier to involve the faculty in strategic planning than actual budget planning.
I think the faculty would like a committee making all the decisions about the budget, at the end of the day I'm the Dean, I have to be responsible. But that doesn't mean there can't be huge faculty involvement at different levels. And the community wrote the (strategic) plan so we have to budget accordingly now to support the plan. (Clark, Interview)

Although Bernard’s faculty is considerably smaller than Clark’s, he had similar ideas about faculty involvement in the budget planning process. “That’s a long-range vision setting and budget-setting activity,” he said. “The faculty play a significant role in that process; without them it wouldn’t happen.” Bernard gave examples of strategic discussions about introducing an undergraduate program, and increasing student enrolment. He stated that it was essential to get buy-in from the faculty on the long-term plans and observed that at the first mention of any formal processes, it became clear that, “every mechanism the university has is designed to ensure you carry the faculty with you.”

**Historic Budgets.**

Each of the six participants shared slightly different budget information in the interview. A common thread throughout the interviews was that costs are rising faster than revenues, and there are never enough resources. Three of the participants—Martin, Li, and Bernard—noted that the budget process was largely historical.

The budgeting process is not like you start from zero and go to something every given year. You have a budget. It's historical, it's traditional, it's been there for a long time and it goes up or down, so you're talking about managing the pluses and the minuses of it. (Martin, Interview)
Dean Li remarked that the budget model ensured that the faculty budget would not go below a historically agreed-upon base level. Bernard pointed out some misconceptions about the budget process.

There is a general conception that as a Dean that you have a large amount of latitude [with] what you are going to do with the budget. It’s just not true. Most of the budget is already locked into faculty salaries. Planning a year-to-year budget…we struggle to balance it. Faculty who come and ask for resources for this or resources for that. It’s pretty much historic how the money is distributed. (Bernard, Interview)

Although revenues are increasing they are being outpaced by rising costs. A Dean may be asked to do more with less, but budgets generally do not dip below established historical baselines. However, questions raised at the Board of Governors or the Academic Council meeting (if the budget even makes it there) can easily be dismissed by comparing the budget to that of previous years. This fails to acknowledge new priorities, new plans for changes to the environment. As Bernard mentioned, a large share of faculty budgets are tied up in salaries and there is very little flexibility in this portion of the budget. Priorities may change, directions may be shifted and new strategies may be developed, but faculty in Canada are quite protected by strong associations/ unions and more importantly by tenure. Tenure will be discussed in greater detail later.

So who is involved in the budget process? It seems very reasonable to base an annual budget on that of the previous year, since most operations don’t change significantly year to year. Both Wilson and Bernard noted that faculty revenue is typically generated from tuition, which is quite predictable and steady. In order to increase revenue, you must therefore increase
students. Cutting costs can be quite a bit more complicated, Dean Wilson explained that the budget was largely conceived and coordinated in the Dean’s office with little formal consultation with the community.

It’s largely done in this office. Very few people outside the Associate Deans and Assistant Deans have anything to do with the budget. It’s a fairly constant thing. Our biggest expense is the operation of a major clinical facility. That absorbs a very big chunk of our budget. By the time you take off the clinic and salaries, there is not much left to play with. The only time other faculty members and I will get involved in any budget issues is if they want to do something new and it’s going to cost. They will come to me and say “Can we afford it? Can we find the money to do it?” That is when more or less I have to decide if we can afford it and where it fits in the priorities of the faculty as a whole. Very often in that latter part of that conversation I will invite the Associate Dean, who knows more at the ground level of what is going on. Last year, this year, and the last few years there hasn’t been a lot of budget flexibility. (Wilson, Interview)

She did say that the budget is presented at least annually at the faculty council—preferably twice annually—but described this as “generally an update. Not so much a work in progress. At the beginning of the academic year I will report to them where we stand.” In fact, she stated that the budget is introduced as an “informational item” and did not require a vote.

**Budget Overheads.**

Two Deans—Bernard and Li—addressed the significance of overheads in a faculty budget.

There are two significant types of overheads in the administration of a faculty budget: research overheads and institutional overheads. At the major research university included in this study, the budget model is a decentralized model. Each faculty is allocated revenue based on student enrolment, and is essentially taxed for central services. Some faculties have a difficult time balancing their budget under the pressure of large institutional overheads. Li wondered if certain disciplines required protection from the economic realities of running a faculty.
Research overheads can also be difficult for a faculty to swallow. Dean Bernard indicated that an important budgetary factor unique to Canada is the lack of provision for overhead costs by granting bodies and councils. For a small, research-intensive faculty, a large grant could have considerable impact on the faculty operating budget.

Research councils here (in Canada) pay such little overheads on research grants. It actually costs something like 50 cents on every dollar. For every dollar you bring in research money, it costs us another 50 cents to conduct that research. So here (in Canada), the revenue from students is the primary source of revenue you have to run your operation (Bernard, Interview)

**Budget Cuts.**

Deans Martin, Li and Clark each made specific mention of budget cuts. Martin said that, during times of financial restraint, the faculty is generally very helpful and cooperative.

And then in times of deficit the hardest part is when people say well, we've got to trim and we've got to cut, and so this department has been very good at pitching into that process even when one area has a greater challenge than another, the other area says how can I help? So I was impressed when I arrived here. (Martin, Interview)

The challenges of a Dean’s job become quite clear when there is a budget shortfall or there are cuts handed down from above. Clark felt that at such times it is especially important for a faculty to have a strategic plan.

Where it's really hard with a budget is when the axe falls from the top and we have to cut and cut drastically. If the faculty doesn't have a plan, doesn't have a direction it's heading in, then you have no real rationale on which to base these cuts. (Clark, Interview)

A plan helps to identify where priorities lie and which ones require attention. Clark
recalled a time that this was very helpful.

We had a strategic plan and we knew that, in the area of technology for example, we sort of had an antiquated setup, and we really needed to do different things there and that was part of the plan, we all knew that. And so when the crunch came from the top and it did—not last year just the previous year—there were huge cuts all around the university and we had to cut back. I didn't hesitate; I knew where we were going to go. And everyone on the team knew too, and everyone in the faculty knew too. That was a terrible thing to have to do but it wasn't a surprise where we went. And the opposite side of the coin is true too. Think about this, if we got about 10 million dollars in the morning, where would we put it. (Clark, Interview)

Returning to the primary research question related to managerial/collegial tensions, none of the administrators interviewed in the study experienced any internal tensions. In fact, it would seem that Deans feel very comfortable with the budget residing in their offices, with little outside influence. The Deans in this study rely heavily on an Associate Dean or on financial support staff to supply a deep working knowledge of the budget. Very little formal consultation appears to take place, and none of the interviewees felt that it was even required. Some Faculty Councils are presented with informational budget updates, but the faculty ranks do not seem to be otherwise involved in the process. Deans Bernard and Clark did mention the importance of including the faculty in strategic or long-range planning; their rationale is that this would foster community contentment with the budget.

**Research Question #2: In what ways have managers been influenced by the tradition of collegiality?**

The previous section outlined evidence related to the primary research question: “How do administrators navigate the tension between collegiality and managerialism?” Associated with this research question are three sub-questions. The first is: “In what ways have managers been
influenced by the tradition of collegiality?” The interview question used to address this research questions was: “Are there types of decisions that come with an expectation to be more collegial?” Dean Li, the lone interim Dean in the study, suggested that at a very basic level people simply like to be informed. This was the simplest description of collegiality that emerged from the interviews. Contrasting greatly with Li, Jackson argued that faculty should be making the majority of the decisions. Martin noted that there is “always an expectation of consultation” from the faculty.

Dean Wilson again referenced the ease with which collegiality is achieved in smaller faculties. She suggested that decisions related to curriculum should be made collegially and that it was “certainly [her] practice.” However, Wilson seemed to contradict this later in the interview, stating, “I don’t so much consult with them—in fact, I delegate.” Delegating decisions or operations to Chairs, discipline Heads or Associate/Assistant Deans is not the same as making a group decision.

I say “take care of it” and they will take care of it. The only time they have to come to me is when something is happening in that area that involves me or my portfolio. In other words if suddenly they feel it is going to cost a lot more (Wilson, Interview)

The definition of collegial as provided to two of the six subjects at the start of the interview (at their request) was “shared power and authority vested among colleagues, collective and consultative decision making; characterized by or having authority vested equally among colleagues”. I am not sure if delegation would fit in this definition; delegation could be considered more of a managerial practice.
Martin described her experiences in terms of requiring the support of the faculty and creating an environment based on trust. Martin’s form of collegiality differs a great deal to Wilson’s delegation-collegiality. “The collegium means it is a group making the decision,” She noted. She went on to emphasize the importance of consultation in collegial processes: “Consulting means letting people have their opinion on the table … understand what direction the institution is going take.” Martin described this as a two-way exchange of views, and observed that it is human nature for there to be some disagreement in those discussions. As an academic for 20 years and as a new administrator, Martin stated that “I’ve never been engaged at this institution where you receive a memo and it says you will do this and which there has been no forbearing, forewarning, or consultation.” Martin then described a typical collegial process in which she had been engaged in the previous year:

It went from a plan to a committee. A small committee was struck to guide it and then that committee consulted internally, individually with other departments and then brought all that back. Then we went to Academic Advisory Committee, shared all that information there. Took that back and then went to Academic Council, twice to Council about what we were doing and Council vote on it in our last meeting. (Martin, Interview).

Li alluded to a collegial tradition: as a long-time faculty member and new administrator, he stated that the institution has “a certain sort of convention” and that “bottom-up is the best thing” for the faculty. He remarked upon feeling a supportive relationship with his faculty colleagues but not with the university executive—particularly the Vice-President Academic. He described the Vice-President’s behaviour as “top-down”, “directive”, “corporate” and covertly “circumventing the way things were supposed to be done at the university” by dismissing the
practices and traditions of a collegial university. Li also described his relationship with the Provost as “persecutory”. From his perspective, central administration uses any tool possible to implement their agenda regardless of faculty consultation.

Bernard noted that there are times when collegiality could be avoided, but that one should not take those opportunities. “I think consensus is a habit of mind,” he said, drawing an analogy to the experience of a religious convert. “If you really want to make a habit of mind work you need to focus and stand by the principle,” he explained, adding: “It’s not a habit I came with; it’s one I’ve acquired.” Although he said that it is his practice—now that he is in Canada—to be collegial and live by the “consensus habit of mind”, he did identify situations where consensus was particularly important: “long range vision setting and budget setting activities. The faculty play a significant role in that process; without them it wouldn’t happen.” Here, Bernard again contrasted his administrative experience in the U.K. with his administrative experience here in Canada: in the U.K. he had the ability to direct the research agenda of the faculty.

I could shape the direction of their research. I could shape the direction of the teaching. I could shape new programs we are going to have. (Bernard, Interview)

However, after learning the importance of consensus and consultation in the Canadian academic context, he noted that he “wouldn’t dream of walking into a room now and proposing that I was going to do something without first knowing that I have the bulk of the faculty behind me.” Not wishing to appear naïve, he affirmed that some decisions are somewhat unpopular and the full support of the entire faculty cannot be guaranteed, and some faculty are just always
opposed to what the Dean does. “I can offer free ice cream every Sunday and I could never carry all of them with me”, he joked.

Clark pointed out the irony of hearing about the importance of being collegial from even the most dictatorial leaders. Clark described herself as a fan of a collegial “strategic planning process” wherein consultation happened widely with the community so that consultation did not have to occur with every subsequent decision. She spoke several times of a recent strategic planning process where over 500 faculty, staff and students were consulted on the future of the faculty.

Consulting widely is an important aspect of collegiality; however, there is a nuanced difference between collegial decision-making and consultation related to a strategic planning process. Collegiality infers group decisions. It is not clear from Clark’s interview whether the process she described involved consultations or in fact strategic planning. Even the term ‘strategic planning’ is borrowed from the private sector world of management. As a veteran administrator, Clark had no doubt developed a set of tools to move projects along in a collegial environment that sometimes has the reputation for being slow.

Jackson highlighted the importance of collegiality. “I think when it comes to much of that academic decision-making—absolutely faculty need to be involved,” she said. She went on to note that administrators who struggle or even ultimately fail typically don’t communicate enough. “You need to communicate with your faculty; you need to get them to buy in,” she said.

**Research Question #3: Have corporate sector practices become institutionalized in higher education or have new forms of management been developed and negotiated in the environment?**
The third research sub-question central to this study is “Have corporate sector practices become institutionalized in higher education or have new forms of management been developed and negotiated in the environment?” Some evidence of corporate sector practices becoming institutionalized was presented through the interviews. Admittedly this research sub-question requires the most interpretation; not only am I classifying the practices as: collegial, corporate or new form, I am also hypothesizing which practices have become institutionalized. Unfortunately it is simply not possible to fully answer this research sub-question within the limits of this study. However, this next section will present some evidence tied to corporate practices in the university.

It is easiest to start with practices that have been committed to policy, as those practices are clearly institutionalized in the most formal way possible. Jackson described a university-wide workload policy for faculty, and shared that some Chairs felt the policy had been imposed on them, while the university’s executive management claimed the idea had initially come from the faculty union. How the policy developed is not important to this section the paper; what is relevant is that policy exists. As a formal policy of the university, there is no doubt that the practice of managing faculty workload is institutionalized. The question then becomes: is it a collegial practice, a managerial practice or a new form of practice?

Managing faculty workload is inherently managerial. A faculty member’s time has historically been divided between research, teaching and service. However, faculty members have traditionally enjoyed professional autonomy, managing their own priorities and time. In fact, the policy clearly identifies a faculty members’ ‘self-directed’ time as those hours remaining after “teaching and preparation for teaching, and the necessary administrative tasks”
have been completed. This policy could be seen as a departure from collegiality. Dissecting policies of this nature is beyond the scope of this paper however, but I would suggest that further research is required in this area.

Dean Bernard suggested that some faculty have been troubled by the “language of business” in the academy. He went on to draw an analogy between his faculty and the cosmetic counter in a major department store.

I believe the university should be lead by intellectual agendas and not by financial expediency. But this faculty is a bit like the perfume counter in Holt Renfrew and Sears, in that [like] Clinique or Jil Sander, we employ our own staff, we stock our own product—which are courses. We have our own base clientele and we hope to draw some students that are walking by. But we are part of a bigger operation that lays down all kinds of rules about what we can and cannot do, the times we are allowed to be open, what our hiring practices need to be and so forth. But, if as a cosmetic counter we don’t bring in our customers, get our profit and loss balance correct, then you [would] close that cosmetic counter down. Here, the same thing will happen to faculties that fail to manage their budgets. They will re-arrange us and move us somewhere else. (Bernard, Interview)

When asked to “describe a time when you introduced a new policy (or initiative) and felt the tension between collegiality and managerialism?” one Dean of a graduate-only faculty spoke of how hard it is in Canada to make research funding a significant portion of the faculty budget. This Dean in fact suggested that the long-term viability of the graduate-only faculty would be very difficult, and instead proposed a new undergraduate program to generate more revenue. This proposal was met with a lot of resistance, as some faculty had concerns that the development “of these new initiatives appears to arise from financial expediency.”
I think that I would have got more traction earlier if I had kept quiet about the financial issues and the growth issues and focused on the intellectual issues. It took me longer to achieve the breakthrough I need with the faculty. Initially they saw it primarily as a way to generate revenue. They were concerned that I was pushing it initially as a way to generate revenue. (Confidential, Interview)

Ultimately the initiative was largely motivated by a desire to generate revenue. It is difficult to argue that revenue generation is specific to corporate practices, however one could speculate that many programs, school and faculties would not advocate such initiatives if they had adequate funding for their core priorities. Although not specifically an institutionalized practice, this Dean certainly resembled an administrator motivated to make a revenue-based decision that could be characterized as corporate.

**Planning.**

Dean Clark spoke extensively about a strategic planning process in her faculty, one which she described as extremely consultative and collegial. Strategic planning was transplanted from the business environment a number of years ago. Some scholars have questioned the appropriateness of strategic planning in education (Birnbaum, 2000b). Clark mentioned a strategic planning process that was “developed in a collegial way” and “coming from the community”. She went on to say, “At least in my experience…you can work and avoid these tensions 99% of the time.” Clark’s strategic planning process may be more bottom-up than traditional corporate sector strategic planning in order to suit the more collegial environment of higher education.

Specific references to long-term, strategic or academic planning were referenced in four out of the six interviews (Martin, Jackson, Clark, Bernard). There was also a general theme
across all of the interviews that identified budgets as the responsibility of the Dean. When administrators spoke about planning, there were far more references to consensus, collegiality and collective decision-making.

It is long-term budget planning that faculty can have an influence. It’s where that consensus building becomes really important. We have new growth targets for our students. We have identified areas where we are going to develop our programs and where we are going to hire new faculty. For instance, we are getting an undergraduate program now. It is part way through the approval processes. In order to get that I had to carry the faculty with me ... That’s a long-range vision-setting and budget-setting activity. The faculty play a significant role in that process; without them it wouldn’t happen. If you think I could turn around and say we are going to allocate this money in this area— every mechanism the university has is designed to ensure you carry the faculty with you. (Bernard, Interview)

What Bernard described resembles a collegial process. One word Bernard used throughout his interview was ‘buy-in’, and he emphasized how important this concept was in the planning process. He stressed that being a Dean is more than just being collegial; it is building consensus. Bernard, having worked in the U.K. where much of managerial/collegiality literature comes from, strongly affirmed this difference between Canada and U.K. with respect to planning.

It is a very different approach given the fact that I lived and worked in the U.K. You could use managerial practices to manage the development of a research agenda and research practices of faculty. You cannot do that here. Everything here needs to be based on consensus building. There is no chance that a Dean could get up one morning and say, ‘Our research agenda for the next three years is going to focus on a particular aspect.’ You just wouldn’t get the faculty to fall in line. (Bernard, Interview)
Jackson, who also had experience in the U.K., confirmed Bernard’s observations on how planning works in Canada.

I guess there is kind of two different levels and when it comes to the academic side of the house I actually think faculty should be making a lot of the decisions. That’s not to say that it can be in a complete free-for-all environment, and I think one of the things that becomes interesting then is the whole concept of how you manage academic planning. And clearly it will go into all levels within an institution, you know, from the departmental stuff through the divisional stuff through the institutional piece, and somehow or other it’s all got to align. I’m not saying that everything should necessarily go in the same direction. I mean, that would be impacted by external factors as well. But I think when it comes to much of that academic decision-making, yes, absolutely, faculty need to be involved because ultimately they need to buy in to what’s being put forward or they will not do it. I mean, that’s one of the … well, particularly in Canada, even more so than other jurisdictions now, because they’ve got security of employment in terms of tenure. It’s a very secure environment. (Jackson, Interview)

As previously stated, much of the literature focuses on the managerial trends from the U.K. Two administrators who enjoyed several years of their career in the U.K. mentioned the strong faculty role in planning and decision-making in general in Canada. All four administrators who spoke about the planning described processes involving community consultation. Clark articulated just how consultative their recent process had been.

I have real confidence in the community, and we had about 500 people who were in focus groups and task forces; they wrote the plan. They wrote the plan and it’s a great plan. One of the reasons that it’s so great it that it’s concrete, which is hard to achieve in a university environment. (Clark, Interview)

These documents are typically public, and help communicate the outcomes of the planning process.

Martin also described a lengthy final planning document.
So we had 12 priorities, 57 strategies in our plan. It's on our website, it's up there for everyone to see, and if there's a benchmark at the end of all this, what have you accomplished? This is what everyone wanted to see, and some of them take money, some don't. (Martin, Interview)

Once a plan is complete, lots of work must be accomplished to fulfill its objectives. Martin outlined the process of tracking and following through on strategies.

If you're judging it at the end of three or four or five years at the level of accomplishment you can sort of [say] ‘done, done, done, irrelevant, done, couldn't do’, and... And we report regularly on that at council in terms of our progress on the plan. (Martin, Interview)

Four out of the six administrators mentioned consultative, collegial and consensus-building exercises associated with the academic and strategic plans. A major thread in the interview data was the importance of broad community consultation. It seems that the exercises of consultation ensure everyone is heard, and while it is not possible for every idea to become a faculty priority, it is important for administration, faculty, staff and students to be part of conversation. Individuals have a better understanding of why decisions are made and why certain strategies are developed.

Strategic planning is also an important system for developing buy-in, as described earlier. Buy-in is particularly important in long-range planning because initiatives and strategies will not only require support staff; faculty will also be required to carry out the changes and perform the work.

The focus of this study was on the collegial/managerial tension. In this chapter, I have identified a few examples of practices institutionalized in policy, including the workload policy
and budget model. The degree to which these practices are corporate is difficult to determine within the limitations of this study.

**Research Question #4: Are the prevalent management practices influenced by corporate management practice?**

Another sub-question research question was: “Are the prevalent management practices influenced by corporate management practice?” One interview question that was designed to address this research question was: “Often these collegial/managerial tensions are more prominent when we are faced with an unanticipated operational problem. Can you describe how you dealt with a recent crisis in your operation?” Dean Li referenced a recent crisis with the Vice-President Academic. In the previous section, there was reference to some of the behaviour of the Vice-President, which Li describes as “directive” and “corporate.” Conflict and crises are certainly not more collegial nor managerial, however some of the tools used by the parties involved use may be. One particularly interesting strategy utilized by the Vice-President in this example is offering tenure-stream professors in Li’s faculty positions in another faculty. Li found the process particularly underhanded. “I call it luring and poaching, and she calls it wooing and courting,” he said. Li also detailed how the Vice-President manipulated reports generated by ‘external’ reviewers. This is an example of the collegial/managerialism tension in that is an obvious example of an attempt at the vice-president academic having central control.

Bernard spoke of a student revolt as an example of an unanticipated crisis in his operation. The literature indicates that administrators tend to be more managerial in times of crisis (Chabotar, 1995; Hardy, 1990; Hardy et al., 1983). In Bernard’s example however, the behaviour described sounds quite collegial. In fact, it was a very managerial, neo-liberal move that occurred before he took over as Dean that led to the student revolt. A new program had
been launched that resulted in graduate class sizes of 200-250 students. Bernard’s solution employed listening, consultation and group decision-making. De-escalating the student revolt started with a town hall meeting wherein “students would speak and we (administration) would not speak.” From there, a committee was struck that included both faculty and students. The charge of the committee was to “outline all the problems and suggestions on how we are going to solve it.” The Dean strongly emphasized a message of “we are in this together. We’ve got to do this together.” Bernard remarked that, “Within a couple of weeks as a faculty we had addressed every one of [the issues], except we couldn’t move the (class) rooms.” Bernard ended the story by saying “there is no way that, in this instance, a managerial solution would have played out well.” Bernard remarked upon a single experience in the U.K., in which managerialism contributed to more hierarchal organizations. Increased hierarchy has been associated with managerialism and corporate management practice in the U.K. and he had to fill out lengthy annual performance evaluation documents for each person who reported to him, including administrative staff, faculty and researchers. He described in detail how time-consuming the documents and subsequent meetings were. He stated that such a system “forces you to get more hierarchical relationships in your organization because you want other people to do them for you.” Assigning staff and faculty to Chairs and Associate Deans creates a more hierarchical relationship, and pushes more of the managerial performance activities to a lower level in the organization.

Three administrators—Clark, Wilson and Martin—all said that nothing arises unexpectedly in the academic environment. Both Clark and Wilson are veteran administrators; Martin however, is a new administrator. All stated that good planning, scanning the environment and being plugged into the future directions of the institution/field ensure that one is anticipating
the future and heading off potential crises. Clark gave an example of a recent budget shortfall caused by a professional association offering courses at half the price of institutional tuition. Clark observed that it had been common knowledge for several years that the institution would not be able to rely on such sources in the future, and budget figures had been adjusted accordingly. The pace at which they had to wean themselves off the funds was somewhat faster than anticipated—but nonetheless a crisis was averted with good planning.

Martin referenced a management practice of a corporate nature that had been recently eliminated from the institution’s operation. He explained that the institution held back a small percentage of faculty/departmental budgets, and then pooled the funds for allocation by request. This management practice introduced competition within faculties and departments on-campus, and was eliminated with the introduction of a new budget model. The institution’s new budget model may be even more managerial, however. Jackson also made reference to the new budget model. She noted that the new budget model is based on a ‘resource management model’. The resource management model, otherwise known as the responsibility center management, pushes the requirement for balanced books down to the department and faculty level, requiring each unit to fend for itself and balance its books. This approach introduces not only competition between faculties, but also requires identification of new sources of revenue for each faculty (Birnbaum 2000a, Birnbaum 2000b, Rooney and Stocum, 1997).

Clark described a similar financial ‘skim-and-pool’ scheme within her faculty which allowed her to allocate funds to priorities identified in the strategic plan. In both of these examples, there did not appear to be an established collegial process for making allocation decisions. In both cases, key administrators were able to make these decisions without faculty
involvement. As referenced earlier, Wilson stated that the faculty budget is under the Dean’s “absolute control.” New budget requests do not go through a committee or collegial decision-making group for approval. Instead, Wilson relies on an “informal process” where requests go directly to the Dean. This is inconsistent with the collegial tradition however, and resembles a corporate management practice of supervisory approval of spending. Another interesting aspect of Wilson’s faculty is the operation of a clinic. The clinical operation is a “fee for service” operation that generates some revenue for the faculty, although Dean Wilson described it as a “losing business.” This particular faculty is able to access additional sources of revenue beyond the typical sources of research and tuition.

A Dean’s World
I’ve affectionately titled this section A Dean’s World. It discusses several ideas shared across the interview data related to what a Dean does, and the responsibilities of the Deans interviewed in the sample. These threads provide interesting insights on the work and context of academic management. This section should help contribute to the Canadian context and provide some interesting narrative on what administrators are the important activities and experiences central to their role.

Experience.
Four administrators out of the six interviewed (Jackson, Wilson, Clark, Li) emphasized the importance of experience in their position. These four are the longer-serving faculty members in the study. Collectively, they have over 110 years of academic experience and 34 years of administrative experience. Li, although a new administrator, is a long-serving faculty member at the University.
Yeah, I have been around. All the accumulated experiences that make me hopefully better at this, better at this than 20 years ago, or 10 years ago really. (Li, Interview)

Jackson also spoke of her 10 years as a university administrator, and of the benefits of having been around the University for so long. Wilson described a similar advantage of experience:

Also being one of the oldest people in the faculty and being here a long time, sometimes it is useful to have me there. I have been at this school in one form or another since the 1960s. I have been on faculty since the late 1970s. Sometimes it is useful to have me there as the local historian. Sometimes they will say why don’t we try this? We tried it 20 years ago and didn’t work. (Wilson, Interview)

When pressed on how experience affects managerialism/collegiality, Wilson responded, “Overall, in my 10 years in this role, I can’t say I’ve ever found dealing with faculty an issue.” Wilson felt that her faculty experience had taught her far more about dealing with regulatory bodies and the government than about collegiality. She half-jokingly continued, “I think most of the people here think I’m reasonably collegial individual. And I don’t want you to find out otherwise because I’m going to be finished in just over a year as Dean and I want to leave thinking everybody loves me.”

**Orientation.**

How does one learn to be an administrator? The University in the study does, in fact, have a three-day training session for new academic administrators. One respondent described this orientation for new academic administrators:
I guess at that point it largely focused on some of the activities [of] academics...you know, like chairing a tenure committee, how to do a review, how to manage promotions, you know, again really much more focused on ‘here's the policy and here's how you make sure you don't breach it’ sort of thing. And I guess during my time in office, it's just evolved over time, apparently in response to what people are...because we do evaluate all these things, and so apparently it's in response to what people have said that they wanted. I think the orientation and leadership retreat—that's the three-day one that we do at the end of June/ beginning of July—I guess that serves a number of different functions. There's obviously the kind of factual information that's transmitted and that's important. Probably even more important...is that we expose them to all the resources that are available in the institution, so if they came to an issue they can put a name to a face and it's not just some anonymous person at the end of a phone line. Really it's to allow that kind of interaction and they know what's there to support them. (Jackson, Interview)

Collegiality/managerialism is not specifically a topic covered during the three-day workshops. However the training session does provide a method for communicating institutional culture, which is connected to collegiality/managerialism and, as stated above, time is also spent on institutional policies. Those policies have varying degrees of collegiality/managerialism built in through their inception, writing and development. Another way people learn how to be a Dean is through experience in lower-level administrative positions.

I actually think, in terms of leadership roles, the role of Chair is the most difficult one. I think many people know once they begin to go on a Decanal track, that a lot of them will continue along that trajectory and they’ll either go into greater things or they’ll exit because they’re tired… I think Chairs are more interesting just because certainly some of them you’d see as a first step going into academic administration, but there’s an awful lot that will just do it because they feel it’s their turn. (Jackson, Interview)

But the preparation does not only come from one’s own experiences. Subjects in the study also recalled learning from their Chairs and Associate Dean’s when taking on their Dean position. With the focus primarily on research and teaching however, it not always easy to find faculty willing to take on the role of Chair.
Clearly universities struggle to find Chairs, I mean, it's very hard to get people to step up to the plate. And sometimes the ones that do want to step up to the plate are not necessarily the best suited to the position itself. (Jackson, Interview)

Relatively few Chairs will become Deans. Jackson also indicated that, in some cases, Chairs may not have an understanding of the scope and responsibilities afforded to them.

I think that can sometimes be quite frustrating for Chairs, because often I think you’re enticed into the position because you’re told that you’ll have a platform to dream the big dreams and enact them all. And then reality hits and you’re told that, no, you’re not getting any new salary lines and since nobody’s retiring you’re kind of stuck…sometimes there’s a bit of a mismatch I think too…I don’t mean people being deliberately duplicitous, but that’s just the kind of way that it works out in practice, so that can be a problem too. (Jackson, Interview)

Clark argued that few administrators have any formal training or scholarship in administration.

My guess is most of us, and myself included, in leadership positions in the University, or many of us anyway, have absolutely no education in administration or business for anything along those lines. I don't. I have no qualifications whatsoever as a scholar in any of these areas. (Clark, Interview)

This is an interesting observation for someone who has attended a number of ‘new administrator’ orientations at several institutions. Clark explained that collegiality is more clearly expressed in culture than in training.

There is certainly nothing formally in place that I've experienced, nothing [in] any of these orientations or inductions into the community that really says anything other than [a] mention of the words ‘collaborate’ and ‘be collegial’. So I guess an awful lot must be up to the individual person, and then the culture in the faculty that they actually land in. (Clark, Interview)

Few administrators are trained for their roles; fewer still have any formal training or scholarship related to administration. Most administrators in the study described their experiences as “falling into leadership roles.” The pathways that lead to a Dean position are
typically via Chair positions and in some cases an Associate Dean role. Most Chairs will not go on to higher-level administrative positions. However, the Chair position provides exposure to some of the tasks and challenges of upper administrative positions. Leadership retreats help to orientate new administrators by covering important topics such as Chair tenure and promotion processes and reviews. Orientations also serve as important networking opportunities for new academic leaders and are a good way of communicating culture, thought it is not clear how important orientation and training are communicating ideas related to collegiality or managerialism.

**Big Picture.**

References were made in three out of the six interviews to administrators having a view of the “big picture” or “global view” (Martin, Jackson, Clark). These three administrators stressed the importance of having this big picture perspective. Clark noted the importance of a Dean focusing on the big picture in relation to describing the budget. As previously outlined in the section on budgetary planning, she described her role in ensuring the budget supports the academic mission of the faculty. Martin also felt that it is important as an administrator to see the “bigger picture, focus on the bigger vision.” She expressed this as “compromise” that is essentially academic.

I’d be shocked and amazed if, in any sense, there weren't both times when everyone's in sort of unanimous agreement about the direction things should go, and other times where the decision about what's best for the whole institution isn't necessarily what you would want for your particular unit at any given time. (Martin, Interview)

Jackson wondered if communication was sufficient to provide background, context and information for faculty to understand the full picture.
It wasn’t just about dollars and cents…this was our way if we desperately needed a new building. I guess that was the issue, you know, there was that bigger picture, but somehow that was never really conveyed to the faculty. So they didn’t buy in to the vision, and so of course that creates tensions because ultimately it’s them being left to carry the changes that they didn’t actually initiate in the first place. (Jackson, Interview)

There was no specific mention in Li’s interview about seeing or being connected to the big picture. I can’t speculate on whether this had anything to do with Li being the newest Dean in the sample, but I would suggest that Jackson, working directly with the Vice-President Academic, offers a stark contrast between her own view as encompassing the big picture and Li being narrowly focused on her own faculty. As Bernard pointed out:

This is a case where you realize the Dean doesn’t work for the faculty, right? The Dean actually works for the Vice-President Academic. This is a case where my duty to the University is greater than my duty to my faculty. (Bernard, Interview)

**Hiring.**

One important part of a Dean’s job that got surprisingly little attention in the interviews was hiring. Typically, faculty hiring is accomplished through various appointment committees. Appointment committees walk candidates through a rigorous selection process and recommend a short list of candidates to the Dean. Hiring came up in only two of the interviews.

Bernard described a recent hiring process in his faculty. The appointment committee had prepared a short list of two candidates, but Bernard did not feel the selection represented the best they could hire. Bernard had concerns about one candidate passing the tenure review, and felt the other lacked the ability to earn a full professor promotion. In a real example of
managerial/collegial tensions, the Dean rejected both candidates on the short list.

It was much more consultative. I started [my career] as a substitute teacher. You didn’t have many sanctions for students that fell out of line. You had detention. I learned very quickly that you really failed as a teacher if you had to use these sanctions. Just going back to them and saying, “It wasn’t good enough, go back and do it again”… would have been a dramatic failure on my part. Getting people to understand the mission and the goals and why this doesn’t fit; it makes them better citizens and it is fair to everybody. (Bernard, Interview)

He explained to the committee that the candidates were not of the appropriate caliber for the institution. He presented the committee with evidence based on the experience and number of publications, outlined in the candidates’ CVs. Although the committee was not pleased about having to re-start the recruitment process, they did understand the decision. Bernard added “I can take their CVs and I can show and benchmark against other cases elsewhere in the university that I’ve been involved with. There was a real thought behind my decision; I wasn’t just being obstinate.”

Clark described an appointment process at a previous institution that she worked at, whereby “new people were put in place a month before I began. That was not right. It should never have happened.” The previous Dean had hired and or renewed terms for a full slate of Associate Deans one month before Clark took over the faculty. Although hiring is generally a collective and collegial decision within a faculty, many leaders want influence over the hiring of their team. Team fit is important, and working with people who connect with your vision is a significant success factor. Clark observed that in any hiring situation, “You get a lot of very strong people who apply, but what you’re really looking for is that match.” She believes that, as
part of a leadership role within the faculty, a Dean needs an opportunity to build or swap personally selected teams.

**Accountability.**

Both Clark and Bernard spoke of the burden of accountability. Whether a Dean is particularly collegial or managerial, at the end of the day they are always accountable. Both Deans stated that they are ultimately responsible for everything in the faculty. Clark remarked on receiving praise as well as taking blame, and Bernard noted that though she consulted with her team, but ultimately responsible for the decision-making.

So when you're in this job you accept the responsibility and accountability [of] that. And a lot of the time you have the privilege of accepting the praise when things go well, but you also have to be able to stand out in front of the faculty and take the blows when things are not going too well. (Clark, Interview)

We have to make a decision on where we are going to invest. I can take all the advice I want—in the end I have to make a choice. I may have all kinds of scoring things for the tenders. All these bids are pretty close. What technique you use really depends on the situation. I don’t suppose if there were a fire in a building I would rely alone on consensus-building as a way to evacuate everybody. I would make a managerial decision. (Bernard, Interview)

**Career Administrator.**

An idea addressed in only one interview was that of “career administrators”. Li made comparisons between himself and other administrators whom he identified as career administrators. His description was not wholly pejorative but certainly not positive. He remarked on having “too many administrators and not enough faculty” and described another Dean at the institution as a “benevolent father of this family”.

I surmise that, because of his conflicts with the Vice-President Academic since accepting his interim appointment, Li identified a great deal more with his faculty colleagues than with
other Deans. “I have to advocate for my discipline and I have to go out and say, do you think this is important? Do you value this? This is what we do, is it not valuable?” He said. He specifically identified the Vice-President Academic as a career administrator who wanted to be “President of (another Canadian major research university)”. Li remarked upon one of the benefits of tenure to academic administrators; observing that “they are tenured, and they are independent” and can return to their research and to teaching positions. “If the Vice-President fires me, I’m glad to go. I’ve got better things to do.” One interesting observation is that Clark—a veteran administrator—“I never had any interest in being an administrator. I like fell into it.”

**Anticipating the Future.**

When asked about how they had handled a recent crisis or would deal with an unanticipated issue in their operation, both Clark and Wilson outlined a Dean’s role in anticipating the future. Wilson said, “I’ve rarely [had] academic issues come up suddenly and in an unanticipated fashion.” Clark echoed this experience, stating, “Unanticipated? I can’t recall a situation that came completely out of the blue.”

This chapter has presented evidence from empirical observations. This evidence was used to address several research questions. Additionally information related to the world of a Dean was presented in this chapter. In the next chapter the conclusions will be drawn based on the empirical evidence.
Chapter 5: Conclusions

The objective of this final chapter is to review and discuss the findings of this research study. The chapter begins by reviewing the findings related to the research questions. This is followed by a short review of the research methodology, recommendations for further research and the researcher’s final reflections.

Study Purpose

The purpose of this constructivist empirical study was to explore the collegial-managerial tension in a sample of administrators from a single Canadian research University. This study explored the following research question: How do administrators navigate the tension between collegiality and managerialism? There were three sub-questions: 1) In what ways have managers been influenced by the tradition of collegiality? 2) Are the prevalent management practices influenced by corporate management practice? 3) Have corporate sector practices become institutionalized in higher education or have new forms of management been developed and negotiated in the environment?

Evidence to Address Research Questions

Research Question #1: How do administrators navigate the tension between collegiality and managerialism?

Amaral et al identified that the higher up in the hierarchy of the university the more collegial-managerial tensions an administrator experiences (Amaral et al, 2003). However in this study, Deans and other administrators could provide few examples of this tension. In fact, when specifically asked to describe a time when the administrators felt a collegial/managerial tension in their work only one administrator – Dean Li identified significant conflict. This conflict was
related to a disagreement he had with the vice-president academic. The two veteran administrators in the sample described feeling absolutely no collegial-managerial tension. One could speculate that the most experienced administrators are the most comfortable in their roles and therefore feel the least amount of collegial-managerial tension.

The literature describes corporate-style, top-down management operating on the assumption that administrators possess a particular management skill set (Saravanamuth & Filling). It is not clear from the interview data if administrators in the study do possess a particularly skill set related to management. Administrators in the sample have very different academic backgrounds and pathways. In fact one interviewee, Clark, indicated that few administrators received any specific training and scholarship in the area of administration. Administrators learn on the job. In discussed in the previous chapter, experience was regarded as important by most of the participants in this study. Most Deans have administrative experience as department chairs, and it is from these experiences that they learn about the role and work of a dean. One can presume that skills required for higher level administrative positions are acquired in lower level positions rather than through training or study since none of the administrators in this study had any special training or study related to their work beyond being an academic.

Administrators in the sample did indicate that there are limits to collegial decision making. Bernard indicated that he worked for the vice-president academic and needed to make decisions in the best interest of the institution. Clark indicated that although faculty may believe all decisions need to be made by committee “at the end of the day, I'm the dean. I have to be responsible.” This sentiment was echoed by Martin, Bernard and Wilson. All the administrators
described the importance of shared decision making but indicated that they were ultimately responsible.

As outlined earlier much of the critique of managerialism in the academy comes from research studies from the in the United Kingdom (UK) and Australia and also a body of work emerging from studies in the United States. One of the most interesting findings in the interviews in this study was the contrast between the UK and Canadian academic experiences. One particular administrator who worked as an academic administrator in both countries described Canada as a “very different country” and indicated that he “wouldn’t use managerialism here (in Canada) at all” (Bernard, Interview). Martin also described some academics adjusting to the Canadian academic culture describing settings outside of Canada as “autocratic.”

In the U.K. there have been dramatic public-sector reforms and subsequently an increase in managerialism in that jurisdiction (Harman, 2002; Kogan et al., 2006). The university in this study did not have the managerialism outlined in the literature. The administrators in this study appear to favour collegiality and put tremendous value in collegiality and shared decision making. There is no doubt that everyone is expected to do more with fewer resources (Harman, 2002; Kogan et al., 2006) and this certainly came out in the interviews. However collegiality appears to be a strong cultural norm at this Canadian university. Although the findings of this small study cannot be generalized across the country it is a very interesting finding that two administrators identified a key difference in the culture of a Canadian research university. All
the interviews in this study indicate that the level of managerialism in the Canadian context appears to be far less that the experiences reported in the literature from the U.K. and Australia.

Although Deans in general describe collegial approaches to decision making – one area that does appear to be managerial is budgets. When it came to budget decisions, the participants in this study found that there was relatively little tension between collegiality and managerialism. One of the reasons may be because these senior administrators believed that there were limits to the degree to which colleagues should be involved in financial decisions. The administrators in the study described the budget as largely the dean’s responsibility and did not consult widely on regular basis. Several administrators (Martin, Li, Wilson) made reference to sharing budget authority, however the sentiment in the interviews was that budgets changed very little from year to year and were largely the Dean’s domain. In other words, the reason that these academic administrators felt that there was little tension between collegiality and managerialism in budget decisions may be related to the fact that they did not view these decisions as the responsibility of the collegium; the Deans in this study retained control of this area of decision making.

**Research Question #2: In what ways have managers been influenced by the tradition of collegiality?**

The literature described the post-war golden era for academic when faculty secured tenure and academic freedom (Chait, 2002; Freeland, 1997; Jencks & Riesman, 2001). Much of the literature argues that this period pre-dates a period of managerial attack and collegial decline (P. Gumport, 2000; Rhoades & Slaughter, 2006; Rhoades & Sporn, 2002). In contrast to the conclusions reached in these research studies, it would seem that collegiality is alive and well in terms of the views of administrators interviewed in this study. The administrators in the study
provided plenty of examples of collegial culture at their university. Martin described a planning process that was very collegial. In the process he outlined a small committee was struck to guide the planning process. The committee consulted widely before reporting back to an academic advisory committee. After that, new initiatives were discussed twice at academic council before a council vote. Martin characterized this as a typical process in the academic unit. Bernard described responding to a “student revolt” with a process of listening during a town hall that he organized, and then striking a committee of staff, faculty and students to address student concerns.

The comparisons between the U.K. and Canada were again important evidence for addressing the second research question. When Bernard moved from his administrative position in the U.K. to become a dean in Canada he had to throw out all the administrative tools he had brought with him. Dean Bernard was clear when he said “I wouldn’t use managerialism here (in Canada) at all.” He described collegiality as a “habit of mind.” This thread ran through most of the interviews with Jackson indicating that faculty should be making most of the decisions in the University. Martin indicated that there is “always an expectation of consultation” from the faculty. Jackson indicated that those administrators that struggled to communicate with faculty ultimately fail. Some scholars argue that there has been ‘professional peripheralization’ in which managers have pushed academics to the margins of decision-making in the academy (Levin, 2006; Rhoades & Sporn, 2002) however all participants in this study have come up through the faculty ranks and appear to honour the history and tradition of collegiality. All participants were arguably experts in their academic field and not trained experts in management or administration.

One observation that did not appear prominently in the literature but did come up in the interviews was the issue of faculty size. Deans of smaller, single department faculties indicated
that faculty size has an impact on collegiality. They indicated that they had close relationship with faculty colleagues and were more accessible. This may require further investigation. As institutions grow – so too to faculties and departments. If faculty size has an impact on collegiality this deserves more attention.

A key theme in the literature was that managers were becoming more managerial as neoliberal ideas gained prominence in the academy. What I found in the interviews were seemingly collegial leaders that described the importance of consulting and making shared decisions. Again it is important to note at this juncture that I did not interview faculty that worked with these administrators to establish what they thought about these leaders approach to decision making. Is it not possible that there are collegial managers and administrators? It would appear from the administrators in the sample – the answer is yes. Deans gave several examples where they consulted widely or created task forces or sub-committees to make decisions important to the academic unit.

**Research Question #3: “Have corporate sector practices become institutionalized in higher education or have new forms of management been developed and negotiated in the environment?”**

This research question is particularly challenging to address. It is difficult to answer this research question within the scope of this paper. There is certainly some evidence of some managerial practices institutionalized in policy. The two most prominent being the campus-wide faculty work load policy and the new institutional budget model. Both are real world example of the sort of managerial practices creeping into the academy (DiMaggio & Powell, 1991). The prevalence of strategic planning is particularly important. It is not clear within the scope of this study if strategic planning in the academy is similar to its private-sector counterpart. Is this a collegial, bottom-up process as described by study participants or a wolf in sheep’s clothing as
described in the literature? This deserves further study. Two important factors outlined by one study participant are the use of the “language of business” in the academy (Bernard) and the use of cash bonuses in the performance evaluation process. Both practices are reflected in the literature so although not highlighted by all the study participants they certainly have a presence in the university. This research question could likely be a thesis on its own and could certainly be the focus of future study.

**Research Question #4: “Are the prevalent management practices influenced by corporate management practice?”**

The literature indicated that in times of crisis, managerialism prevailed over collegiality (Harman 2002; Kogan, Bauer et al. 2006). When asked about an unexpected crisis in their operation it was surprising to hear three administrators (Clark, Wilson, Martin) indicate that with proper planning there are no unexpected crises in the academy. Upon reflection, the question asked in the interview may have been too focused on a particular crisis (micro) rather than a time of crisis (macro) that is suggested in the literature.

The literature also indicated that the top-down treatment of people in a university causes resentment suggesting “it cannot be maintained for long periods without such consequences” (McNay, 1993). This seemed quite consistent with the experience described by Li. Li described the vice-president academic as “top-down,” “directive,” and “corporate.” Li also described a desire to resign or to even be fired by the Vice-President and go back to performing his research. Certainly some of the budget practices described above are particularly managerial. However most of the practices, examples, stories and lessons shared through the interview were decidedly collegial.
Scholars have described a trend of public sector organizations attempting to mirror their private sector counterparts and raised questions about the suitability of applying those models to the university (Bessant, 1995; Deem & Brehony, 2005; Krücken & Meier, 2006; Levin, 2006). There were examples of managerial behavior described by study participants such as delegating responsibilities to associate deans, or developing budgets without consulting widely – but not nearly the systematic managerialism outlined in the literature. Bernard did however indicate that the “language of business” was creeping into the university and was met with some opposition from within the faculty. However he concluded that the “university should be lead by intellectual agendas and not by financial expediency.” There did not appear to be a collegial/managerial tension here nor an administrator/faculty tension.

Dean’s World

One interesting point that came up in several interviews is the importance of experience – both academically as well as administratively, in the work of academic Deans. According to the interview subjects in this study, administrators learn more strategies and gain more insight as they move through their career. This is particularly important when paired with another thread from the interviews – few if any administrators have any specialized training or education in management, administrator, etc. Experience is how administrators learn.

Three administrators (Martin, Jackson, Bernard) spoke about the importance of a Dean seeing the big picture. They spoke about importance of leaders to have a global view. One could speculate this could be a source of conflict within faculties when individual contributors may not see or be privy to information that helps illustrate a bigger picture. Connected to this is
the importance of anticipating the future – ensuring one is scanning the broader environment to anticipate threats and opportunities to the faculty.

I suspected administrators might highlight tension around hiring more contingent faculty or comment on the number of tenure stream positions available as these were prominent threads in the literature. There was very little mention of hiring across the interviews. I did not ask specific questions about the topic. In a future study I would include a question about hiring. (Basil & Basil, 2005; Bland et al., 2006; Dobbie & Robinson, 2008; Kezar & Sam, 2011).

**Methodology**

This research study aimed to address four research questions. The study was exploratory in nature and focused on one Canadian research university. This empirical study utilized focused, semi-structured interviews comprised of open-ended questions. Six administrators were interviewed in the study. All interviews took place in the administrator’s office and were recorded and transcribed. To validate results each transcription was shared with the participants so they may add clarification, corrections and additions. From there the data was coded and themed. Limitations to this study include: I only interviewed administrators and not faculty, the study included only six participants and focused one institution. This study explored the managerial/collegial tension from the administrator perspective.

**Recommendations for Further Research**

A number of important areas for further research emerged from this study, or by questions raised in this study. As noted in chapter two, there has been surprisingly little empirical research on academic administrators in Canadian universities and broad issues of academic administration and academic governance.
The administrators in this study described an environment very different than that described in the literature from the U.K. and Australia. It would be very interesting to further examine these differences. Of particular interest would be an examination of the state of academic freedom and faculty autonomy in Canada. Future studies should explore the use of faculty workload policies in Canada and the established practices of faculty evaluation. Dean Li’s experiences and conflicts with the vice-president academic would make a remarkable case study. This case could serve as an excellent example of managerial/collegial tension and add a relevant Canadian example to the conversation. The situation is a controversial example of a vice-president exerting a great deal of central control and could help add to the discussion of collegial/managerial tension. Further study into which corporate practices (if any) have been institutionalized as policy in the university could be quite valuable. I think there is an excellent opportunity to explore the use of corporate language in the Canadian academy via discourse analysis. This would help establish a discursive baseline to measure the apparent ‘creep of managerialism’ and neoliberalism in the future. There is a body of literature dedicated to strategic planning in the university. However there does not seem to be a common language and terminology for strategic planning in Canada. It is unclear if the strategic planning processes occurring in universities bare any resemblance to the strategic planning process in the corporate world. Further study could examine these practices and derive some best practices for collegial, consensual strategic planning for the academy. As stated earlier, it would be very prudent to explore collegiality in relation to faculty size – as institutions in the sector continue to grow it is important to identify if the collegial processes are scalable.
Researcher’s Final Reflections

In the first two chapters significant evidence of the tension between collegiality and managerialism in the academy was presented. Although impossible to generalize given the limitations of this study, it would appear from this exploratory analysis that Canadian higher education has not been impacted to the same degree as the U.K. and Australian higher education. However, little if any Canadian literature exists on the topic to provide insights on the Canadian experience. A more comprehensive study on the collegial/managerial tension at Canadian universities would help us understand the Canadian context in relation to the global body of literature. As a field, higher education needs to contribute more to create frameworks and models for efficient higher education management that are not at odds with the traditional collegial values of the Canadian academy. While there is still much to be done in terms of understanding higher education management in Canada, this exploratory study suggest that the Canadian experience may be quite different than the experiences that are described in other higher education contexts. As such, this study makes an important contribution by suggesting that there may be problems associated with assuming that managerialism has become the ‘norm.’ In fact, the reality may be much more nuanced. Further study is required to explore these nuances in greater detail.
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Dr. Glen A. Jones  
OISE/University of Toronto  
252 Bloor St. West  
Toronto, ON M5S 1V6

Mr. Chad Nutall  
OISE/University of Toronto  
252 Bloor St. West  
Toronto, ON M5S 1V6

Dear Dr. Jones and Mr. Nutall:

Re: Your research protocol entitled, “Everyday tensions between Collegiality and Managerialism”

ETHICS APPROVAL

| Original Approval Date: March 4, 2011 |
| Expiry Date: March 3, 2012 |
| Continuing Review Level: 1 |

We are writing to advise you that the Social Sciences, Humanities and Education Research Ethics Board has granted approval to the above-named research study under the RES’s delegated review process. Your study has been approved for a period of one year and ongoing projects must be renewed prior to the expiry date.

All your most recently submitted documents have been approved for use in this study.

Any changes to the approved protocol or consent materials must be reviewed and approved through the amendment process prior to its implementation. Any adverse or unanticipated events should be reported to the Office of Research Ethics as soon as possible.

Please ensure that you submit an Annual Renewal Form or a Study Completion Report 15 to 30 days prior to the expiry date of your study. Note that annual renewals for studies cannot be accepted more than 30 days prior to the date of expiry, as per federal and international policies.

If your research has funding attached, please contact the relevant Research Funding Officer in Research Services to ensure that your funds are released.

Best wishes for the successful completion of your project.

Yours sincerely,

Dean Sharpe, Ph.D.
Research Ethics Board Manager, Social Sciences and Humanities
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Please ensure that you submit an Annual Renewal Form or a Study Completion Report 15 to 30 days prior to the expiry date of your protocol. Note that annual renewals for protocols cannot be accepted more than 30 days prior to the date of expiry as per our guidelines.

Any changes to the approved protocol or consent materials must be reviewed and approved through the amendment process prior to its implementation. Any adverse or unanticipated events should be reported to the Office of Research Ethics as soon as possible. If your research is funded by a third party, please contact the assigned Research Funding Officer in Research Services to ensure that your funds are released.

Best wishes for the successful completion of your research.

Yours sincerely,

Margaret Schreiber, Ph.D.
C. Hayhn
RES Chair

Dean Sharpe, Ph.D.
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Dear Dr. (Last Name),

My name is Chad Nuttall. I am a Masters student at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto (OISE/UT) in the Higher Education group, Department of Theory and Policy Studies in Education. I am conducting research as part of my MA Thesis. My thesis supervisor is Dr. Glen A. Jones, Associate Dean, Academic, and Professor of Higher Education (OISE/UT).

The purpose of this research is to develop an understanding of the management practices of administrators (Deans, Vice-Provosts, etc.) in higher education. More importantly this study looks at the tension between collegiality and managerialism that senior administrators experience in their work. Few Canadian studies have examined this topic. I am writing to request your participation. I got your contact information from the INSTITUTION website and selected you to participate to obtain an even mix of administrators from single department faculties, multi-departmental faculties and other administrators reporting directly to the vice-president academic. Certain administrators were also chosen to ensure even representation of both genders.

Your participation would involve an interview and providing me a copy of your CV. The CV will be used to establish context and not waste valuable interview time to establish employment history, administrative experience, etc. It will be kept confidential. Interviews will take between sixty and ninety minutes and can take place in your office to be as convenient as possible. Should you wish to have the interview in another location, please let me know and we can set that up as well. Interviews will be audio taped and professional transcribed with your permission. After the interview, participants will be e-mailed a copy of the transcript for review to ensure clarity. Participants will be emailed the transcript within two weeks of the interview and will be asked to email comments within two weeks of their receiving the transcript. Knowledge of your participation in the survey will be limited to me and my thesis supervisor. In the final paper the institution will not be identified and every effort will be made to mask the identity of all participants by changing names, gender and position. All data will be stored in a secure location on a password protected computer and on an encrypted USB drive to ensure your privacy is protected.

No known risks or harms have been identified for those involved in this study. Your participation is entirely voluntary, and you may withdraw from the study at any time by contacting me directly by phone or e-mail without any consequences. If you withdraw from the study, any information you have supplied will be shredded and not included in the analysis.

The findings of this study will be made available publicly in the form of a master thesis and may be submitted for publication in scholarly journals and/or presented at conferences. Your information will continue to remain confidential in all these publications.

There is no compensation for participating in the study. However your contribution will be very valuable to my study and to the study of management in higher education. It will contribute to extremely understudied area - the everyday tension between collegiality-managerialism in the world of administrators in higher education. There are very few studies looking at these management practices and fewer still focusing on Canadian experiences. The interviews will also have the direct benefit to you.
as a great opportunity for reflection. Few administrators take the time to reflect and discuss how they manage and their philosophies of administration.

If you are interested in participating in this study, please contact me below. If you have any questions or concerns about this study, please do not hesitate to contact me or Dr. Jones directly.

For information regarding your rights as a participant, please contact the Office of Research Ethics at the University of Toronto: (telephone) 416-946-3273; (email) ethics.review@utoronto.ca

Thanks for your time,

Chad Nuttall
Masters Student, Higher Education
Department of Theory and Policy Studies in Education
OISE/University of Toronto
1008-311 Richmond St East
Toronto, ON M5A 4S8
Email: chad.nuttall@utoronto.ca
Telephone: 416-619-7650

Dr. Glen A. Jones, Ph. D.
Associate Dean, Academic/Professor of Higher Education
OISE/University of Toronto
252 Bloor Street W., 12th Floor,
Toronto, ON M5S 1V6
Email: gjones@utoronto.ca
Telephone: 416-978-8292
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The following script will be used when contacting potential study participant’s administrative assistants to confirm receipt of invitation e-mail.

Hello [admin assistant name],

I am a graduate student at OISE/UofT working under Dr Glen Jones. I recently e-mailed an invitation to [administrator name] to participate in research related to my master's thesis.

I know that [administrator name] is quite busy. I’m just calling to follow-up to ensure he/she received the invitation. Do you know if he/she has had a chance to review my e-mail?

Please allow me to leave my contact information should he/she have questions about my study.

Thanks you very much for your time.
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Informed Consent to Participate in Research

Everyday tensions between Collegiality and Managerialism

I am conducting research as part of my MA Thesis. My thesis supervisor is Dr. Glen A. Jones, Associate Dean, Academic, and Professor of Higher Education (OISE/UT). I am writing to request your participation.

My name is Chad Nuttall. I am a Masters student at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto (OISE/UT) in the Higher Education group, Department of Theory and Policy Studies in Education.

Study Purpose:

The purpose of this research is to develop an understanding of the management practices of administrators (Deans, Vice-Presidents, etc.) in higher education. More importantly this study looks at the tension between collegiality and managerialism that senior administrators experience in their work. Few Canadian studies have examined this topic.

There will be approximately eight participants in the study. Participants will be administrators (mostly Deans and Vice-Presidents) with a direct reporting relationship to the vice-president academic of a research intensive, medical/doctoral institution in Canada. When identifying participants for the study every effort was made to have a mix based on: single/multi-departmental faculties, gender and new/long serving administrators.

Study Procedure:

Interviews will take between sixty and ninety minutes and can take place in your office to be as convenient as possible. An alternative location can also be arranged. With your permission interviews will be audio taped and professional transcribed. Participants will be e-mailed a copy of the transcript for review to ensure clarity. Participants will be emailed the transcript within two weeks of the interview and will be asked to email comments within two weeks of their receiving the transcript.

Potential Risks:

No significant risks or harms have been identified for those involved in this study. Your participation is entirely voluntary, and you may withdraw from the study at any time by contacting me directly by phone or e-mail without any consequences. If you withdraw from the study, any information you have supplied will not be included in the analysis. You may skip any questions you are not comfortable with. At no time will you be, judged, or evaluated and at no time will be at risk of harm.

Confidentiality:

The institution will not be identified in the study, and every effort will be made to mask the identity of the senior administrators involved. Demographic details, names, faculties, and any details that could reveal the identity of the participants will be given particular attention throughout the process. Only the researcher and supervisor will know the true identities of the study participants. Only the researcher,
supervisor and transcription professional will have access to interview transcriptions and raw data. All data will be stored securely on a password protected computer. Back-up data will be stored on an encrypted USB drive in a locked filing cabinet in the researcher’s office. Any paper records will be digitized, then shredded. All data will be destroyed 5 years after the completion of the study. The findings of this study will be made available publicly in the form of a master thesis and may be submitted for publication in scholarly journals and/or presented at conferences. Participant’s identities will remain confidential throughout the study.

There is no compensation for participating in the study. However your contribution will be very valuable to my study and to the study of management in higher education. If you have any questions or concerns about this study, please do not hesitate to contact me or Dr. Jones directly.

For information regarding your rights as a participant, please contact the Office of Research Ethics at the University of Toronto: (telephone) 416-946-3273; (email) ethics.review@utoronto.ca. Please keep a copy of this letter for your records.

Chad Nuttall
Masters Student, Higher Education
Department of Theory and Policy Studies in Education
OISE/University of Toronto
1008-311 Richmond St East
Toronto, ON M5A 4S8
Email: chad.nuttall@utoronto.ca
Telephone: 416-619-7650

Dr. Glen A. Jones, Ph. D.
Associate Dean, Academic/Professor of Higher Education
OISE/University of Toronto
252 Bloor Street W., 12th Floor,
Toronto, ON M5S 1V6
Email: gjones@utoronto.ca
Telephone: 416-978-8292

☐ To request a copy of the final master thesis please check here. A copy of the final Master thesis will also be available in the University of Toronto library upon completion.

I understand, with my permission the interview will be audio taped and may be professionally transcribed.

________________________________________  _________________________
Signature of Subject      Date

I understand the procedures described above. My questions have been answered to my satisfaction, and I agree to participate in this study. I have been given a copy of this form.
Printed Name of Subject

_______________________________________  _________________________
Signature of Subject      Date

________________________________________  _________________________
Signature of Witness      Date
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Interview Protocol

Date: Place: Interviewee:

Introduction:

Under the supervision of Dr Glen Jones at OISE/UofT I am studying the tension between collegiality and managerialism. I'm particularly interested in how senior administrators navigate this tension in their work.

The interview will be recorded with your permission. At any time if you wish to stop the interview – or if at a later date you wish to withdraw from the study – no explanation will be required and there are no consequences to your withdrawing.

At no time will you be judged or evaluated and at no time will you be at risk of harm and no value judgment will be placed on your responses. You may also refuse to answer any questions that you are not comfortable with.

Collegiality: "shared power and authority vested among colleagues", collective and consultative decision making. Characterized by or having authority vested equally among colleagues.

Managerialism: Belief that standard, generic management skills/techniques that can be applied across organizations. Often characterized with more directive decision making.

Closing Thank You:

Thank You!

A copy of the transcript will be e-mailed to you within two weeks of the interview and will be asked to email comments within two weeks of their receiving the transcript. If at any time you wish to withdrawal from this study please contact me by e-mail.

Are you open to being contacted if I have any follow-up questions after the interview?

Thank you very much for taking the time to help with my study on the collegial/managerial tension in higher education. The information you shared will be quite valuable.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#1</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Probing Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Tension | Can you describe a time when you felt this collegial/managerial tension in your work? | 1. What caused the tension?  
2. How did you manage the tension?  
3. What was the outcome/how was it resolved? |
| **#2** | Question | Probing Question |
| Budget | Planning budgets can be a particularly sensitive activity on any campus.  
Thinking of your budget process last year – did you feel any collegial/managerial tension? | 1. Is there anything unique in your budget process?  
2. Who else (if anybody) is involved in your budget planning process? |
| **#3** | Question | Probing Question |
| | Are there types of decisions that come with an expectation to be more collegial? | 1. Where do these expectations come from? Tradition? Policy?  
2. Are there times you experienced feedback on processes, decisions not being collegial (enough)? |
<p>| <strong>#4</strong> | Question | Probing Question |
| Operational Problem | | 1. What collegial pressures did you feel? |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Probing Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#5 New Initiative</td>
<td>Can you please describe a time when you introduced a new policy (or initiative) and felt the tension between collegiality and managerialism?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. What initiated the change?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. What was the process for introducing the change?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Was it successful?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Any ‘lessons learned’?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6 Anything to Add</td>
<td>Do you have anything to add? Anything you wanted to share that did not come out in the questions? Any question you would like to go back to?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. What managerial pressures did you feel?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. What internal conflicts were part of your decision making?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. What external pressures impacted your course of action?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix G

## Masked Identities of Study Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title and Department</th>
<th>Experience Level</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary Martin</td>
<td>Head of smaller academic unit</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erin Jackson</td>
<td>Vice-President’s Office</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannah Wilson</td>
<td>Dean, Single department faculty</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Li</td>
<td>Dean, Single Department Faculty</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Bernard</td>
<td>Dean, Single department faculty</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Clark</td>
<td>Dean, Multi-department faculty</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Experience:
- New Administrator
- Experienced Administrator
- Veteran Administrator