

# Kent Academic Repository

## Full text document (pdf)

### Citation for published version

Shepherd, Sue (2011) Change and Continuity in the Appointment of Second Tier University Managers. Master of Arts (MA) thesis, University of Kent.

### DOI

### Link to record in KAR

<https://kar.kent.ac.uk/37701/>

### Document Version

UNSPECIFIED

#### Copyright & reuse

Content in the Kent Academic Repository is made available for research purposes. Unless otherwise stated all content is protected by copyright and in the absence of an open licence (eg Creative Commons), permissions for further reuse of content should be sought from the publisher, author or other copyright holder.

#### Versions of research

The version in the Kent Academic Repository may differ from the final published version.

Users are advised to check <http://kar.kent.ac.uk> for the status of the paper. **Users should always cite the published version of record.**

#### Enquiries

For any further enquiries regarding the licence status of this document, please contact:

[researchsupport@kent.ac.uk](mailto:researchsupport@kent.ac.uk)

If you believe this document infringes copyright then please contact the KAR admin team with the take-down information provided at <http://kar.kent.ac.uk/contact.html>

MA Social Research Methods

**Change and Continuity  
in the Appointment of  
Second Tier University  
Managers**

Dissertation

**Sue Shepherd  
September 2011**

MA Social Research Methods

# Change and Continuity in the Appointment of Second Tier University Managers

Dissertation

**Sue Shepherd**  
**September 2011**

**13,000 words**

## Abstract

The modern university is a multi-million pound enterprise, operating in a highly competitive global market place and an increasingly challenging economic environment. The quality of university management – especially as executive team level – has thus never been more important and it follows that appointing the best candidates is essential.

This study of university top team recruitment practice has two research components, or phases. The first identifies the extent to which pre-1992 universities are moving from an internal, fixed-term appointment process for their second tier managers – that is, Deputy and Pro Vice-chancellors – to one of external advertisement. The second is a census of current second tier managers.

The picture that emerges is one of change and continuity. Pre-1992 institutions are fairly evenly divided across different institutional types and affiliations into those that have changed their recruitment practice and those that have not. The number of second tier managers continues to rise and their remit widen to include portfolios outside traditional academic areas. Moreover, there is evidence of increasing role differentiation between DVCs and PVCs and between ‘policy’ and ‘executive’ PVCs.

The recruitment pattern remains remarkably constant, however. Even where an external appointment process has been adopted, the profile of second tier managers remains largely the same: they are overwhelmingly male professors from UK universities. This is because, although the nature and complexity of the job has changed, the presumption that only senior academics are appointable has not.

At a conceptual level, the increase in the number and executive power of academic managers appears somewhat at odds with the prevailing discourse of managerialism in universities, which bemoans the rise of “management” and diminution in status of the academic. Are today’s academic managers the agents of managerialism or HE’s unique means of defending against it? Either way, the issue warrants further investigation.

## Table of Contents

Abstract.....	3
Table of Contents.....	4
List of Tables .....	6
1. Introduction and Research Aims.....	7
1.1 Rationale .....	7
1.2 Research Aims and Outcomes .....	7
1.3 Dissertation Structure .....	8
2. Research Context and Contribution.....	9
2.1 Research Context .....	9
2.1.1 The Higher Education Environment.....	9
2.1.2 The University Community.....	10
2.1.3 The Executive Team .....	11
2.2 Contribution to Knowledge.....	12
3. Research Design and Methods .....	13
3.1 Research Design.....	13
3.2 Study Population.....	14
3.3 Data Collection Methods .....	15
3.3.1 Phase One: Advertisement Monitoring Exercise .....	15
3.3.2 Phase Two: Census of Second Tier Managers.....	15
3.4 Rationale for Choice of Methods.....	16
3.5 Ethical Considerations.....	17
4. Findings: Advertisement Monitoring Exercise .....	18
4.1. Overview .....	18
4.2 Executive Search Agencies.....	19
4.3 Vice-chancellors .....	20
4.4 Deputy Vice-chancellors .....	22
4.4.1 Numbers and Trends.....	22
4.4.2 Remit .....	23
4.4.3 Desired Attributes.....	24
4.5 Pro Vice-chancellors.....	25
4.5.1 Numbers and Trends.....	25
4.5.2 Remit .....	26

4.5.3	Desired Attributes.....	27
4.6	Other EMT posts .....	28
5.	Findings: Census of Second Tier Managers.....	29
5.1	Numbers and Type of Post Holders .....	29
5.2	Balance of DVC and PVC Posts .....	30
5.3	Gender of Post Holders.....	30
5.4	Academic Status of Post Holders .....	31
5.5	Previous Institution of Post Holders .....	32
5.6	Outcome of Second Tier Manager Advertisements.....	33
6.	Discussion and Analysis.....	34
6.1	Recruitment Practice .....	34
6.2	Executive Search Agencies .....	36
6.3	Demographic Profile .....	37
6.4	Role and Remit.....	39
6.5	Managerialism.....	40
7.	Conclusions .....	42
	References .....	44
	Appendices.....	47
	Appendix 1: List of Institutions Included in Recruitment Monitoring Exercise .....	47
	Appendix 2: Actual Job Titles of EMT Advertised Posts .....	48
	Appendix 3: Advertised EMT Posts in 1994 Group .....	50
	Appendix 4: Advertised EMT Posts in Russell Group .....	52
	Appendix 5: Advertised EMT Posts in Other Pre-1992 HEIs .....	54
	Appendix 6: Advertised EMT Posts in Post-1992 HEIs.....	55
	Appendix 7: Use of Executive Search Agencies.....	60
	Appendix 8: Breakdown of DVC Posts by Portfolio.....	61
	Appendix 9: Breakdown of PVC Posts by Portfolio .....	62

**List of Tables**

- Table 1 Number and Proportion of Advertised EMT Posts by Sector
- Table 2 Number of EMT Posts Advertised by Application Closing Date
- Table 3 Number and Proportion of Advertised EMT Posts Handled by ESAs
- Table 4 Number of Advertised EMT Posts Handled, and Market Share, of Most Used ESAs
- Table 5 Number of EMT Posts Advertised by Institutional Grouping
- Table 6 Number and Proportion of Advertising Institutions by Sector
- Table 7 Number and Proportion of Advertising Institutions by Group Affiliation
- Table 8 Number and Ratio of Advertised Second Tier EMT Posts per Advertising HEI
- Table 9 Summary of DVC Portfolios as Indicated by Job Title
- Table 10 DVC Portfolios by Sector in Overall Ranking Order
- Table 11 Five Most Frequently Sought Attributes in Prospective DVCs, Where Specified
- Table 12 HE-specific Attributes Sought from Prospective DVCs
- Table 13 Summary of PVC Portfolios as Indicated by Job Title
- Table 14 PVC Portfolios by Sector in Overall Ranking Order
- Table 15 Five Most Frequently Sought Attributes in Prospective PVCs, Where Specified
- Table 16 HE-specific Attributes Sought from Prospective PVCs
- Table 17 Numbers and Ratios of Second Tier Managers: 2005 and 2011
- Table 18 Second Tier Management Models: 2005 and 2011
- Table 19 Gender of Second Tier Managers: 2005 and 2011
- Table 20 Professorial Status of Second Tier Managers: 2005 and 2011
- Table 21 Previous Institution of Current Second Tier Managers
- Table 22 Outcome of Second Tier Post Advertisements
- Table 23 Change to Recruitment Practice by Institutional Type and Grouping
- Table 24: Institutions Undertaking Significant Change at Second Tier Management Level

## **1. Introduction and Research Aims**

### **1.1 Rationale**

Universities today operate in an increasingly fast moving and competitive higher education (HE) environment and extremely challenging political and economic circumstances. It could be argued therefore that the quality of university management, especially at executive management team (EMT) level, has never been more important. Attracting the best people is fundamental to the effectiveness of the university top team and, more broadly, to leadership capacity building in the sector. Nevertheless, the recruitment and selection of EMT members remains an under-researched and under-theorised area of investigation about which “there is little documented research or other evidence” (Kennie & Woodfield 2008, p. 50).

As the potential leaders of tomorrow, EMT second tier managers – that is, Deputy and Pro Vice-chancellors (DVCs and PVCs) - are vital to the future success of their university. An earlier study (Smith, D., Adams & Mount 2007) found that the way these second tier managers are appointed in pre-1992 universities is beginning to change. The author’s own professional experience gained in over twenty years in HE suggests that this process may be accelerating as increasing numbers of pre-1992 universities are replacing the traditional model of fixed-term internal appointment from the professoriate with a process of open competition and external advertisement – in some cases utilising the services of an executive search agency (ESA).

Notwithstanding these perceived changes to recruitment practice, it appears that the demographic of second tier managers has not changed significantly in recent years and that the overwhelming majority remain male professors. This is despite the increased complexity of the management task, the evolution of the role (Smith, D., Adams & Mount 2007) and the perceived emergence of a more managerial culture (Deem 2000).

Given the importance of this management group, and the potentially far-reaching and long-lasting consequences of any change to how they are appointed, it is both necessary and timely to undertake an empirical study to test these assumptions.

### **1.2 Research Aims and Outcomes**

This study aims to explore the scope and nature of recent change to the recruitment of second tier managers and to examine how observed trends are reflected in the profile of



current post holders. It comprises two distinct phases of data collection which, in turn, seek to answer the following research questions:

*Phase One: Advertisement Monitoring Exercise*

- (i) To what extent have English universities moved to the external recruitment of second tier EMT managers over the five-year period of the study?
- (ii) What do recruitment advertisements tell us about the role and remit of second tier managers and the desired attributes of post holders?

*Phase Two: Census of Second Tier Managers*

- (iii) What is the profile of current second tier managers and how has this changed since the start of the study period in 2005?
- (iv) What, if any, is the difference in profile between those institutions which have adopted an external recruitment process and those which have not?

Findings from the study will be used to inform the design of the author's proposed doctoral research on *Managerialism and the University Top Team*, specifically its sampling strategy and initial data collection questions. More broadly, it is anticipated that they should have relevance and value for both higher education professionals and policy makers.

### **1.3 Dissertation Structure**

This dissertation has seven sections, including this Introduction. The next section provides a brief research context for the study and situates it within the relevant literature. Section 3 describes the research design and data collection methods. Detailed findings from both phases of the research are presented in turn in Sections 4 and 5. A discussion and analysis of findings is then provided in Section 6, followed by conclusions and implications for future research in Section 7.

For ease of reference, key data in the form of tables is interwoven into the main body of the text and supporting information provided in the Appendices.

## 2. Research Context and Contribution

### 2.1 Research Context

#### 2.1.1 The Higher Education Environment

The UK higher education sector has been transformed over the last thirty years with significant consequences for the management of universities. These changes are well documented and include: a dramatic growth in the size and diversity of the sector with the end of the binary divide and the move from an elite to a mass system; intensified competition – both for students and resources; raised ‘customer’ expectations following the introduction of tuition fees; a higher public and political profile and heightened media interest. This transformation has taken place against a background of severe funding constraints, with a significant decline in the amount of funding per student leading to pressure on institutions to increase and diversify their income sources. The recent global banking crisis, subsequent recession and government cuts have further increased this financial pressure.

The last three decades have been characterised by a high level of state intervention and policy steer, notably with regard to the social inclusion and enterprise agendas, and the imposition of an increased legislative, regulatory and accountability burden – the so-called audit culture. In the 1970s the public sector came under sustained government pressure for change and the resulting “new public management” (Ferlie 1996) saw it subjected to the processes of managerialism and marketisation in the quest for more efficient, cost-effective and relevant public services. Higher education came under similar pressure and the commissioning of the *Jarratt Report* (CVCP 1985) was a manifestation of the government’s efforts to effect changes in the internal governance of institutions in order to improve their efficiency (Middlehurst 2004). This report, which recommended the adoption of business management structures and decision-making processes, marks the turning point for the introduction of the “new managerialism” which is perceived to have since permeated the management of universities (Deem 2000).

Governments have, nevertheless, remained ambivalent at best about the quality of university leadership (Smith, D. & Adams 2008). Although universities have performed extraordinarily well in a number of areas including research quality, student satisfaction and contribution to economic growth (Watson 2002), their management and governance nevertheless remains a government concern (as evidenced, for example, by

the Dearing Review in 1997, the Lambert Review in 2003 and the establishment of the Leadership Foundation in 2004) and a perception of “leadership deficit” (Watson 2008) remains.

### **2.1.2 The University Community**

Under the pressure of the government’s drive for a more business-like approach, the “consensual” model of governance in higher education has begun to give way to a more “corporate” one (Shattock 2002), focusing on the governing body and its relationship to the executive. In pre-1992 universities the collegial organisational and cultural model, the “collegium”, has been moving towards that of the “bureaucracy” and the “corporation” (McNay 1999). Though not all universities have reacted in the same way, the general trend towards a more managerial approach has typically taken the form of the consolidation of departments into schools and faculties, the devolution of budgets, the streamlining of committees and the emergence of a stronger executive (Middlehurst 2004).

At the same time, the traditional civil service model of administration, characterised by ‘neutral’ administrators working in a supportive role to the priorities of the academic community, has largely disappeared with the shift from ‘administration’ to ‘management’. The “cult of the gifted amateur” (Middlehurst 1993) has lost ground to increasing professionalization as generalist administrators have been replaced by specialist managers, such as those in marketing or estates management, often recruited from outside the sector. As the boundaries between academic and administrative roles and activity are becoming less clear cut, the identities of “professional” administrators and managers have broadened - with implications for their future career development and aspirations - and a new form of “third space” professional is emerging (Whitchurch 2006) between academic and professional domains.

There has been a shift of power away from academics’ governance of what were once seen as ‘their’ universities (Dearlove 2002). Working conditions have declined with the loss of tenure and the casualisation of contracts and academics have suffered a steady loss of status and remuneration relative to the administration as they have been transformed into a minority group within the university community (Smith, P. & Hussey 2010). External regulation, audit and assessment have subjected academic work to explicit scrutiny, effectively “de-mystifying” it (Henkel 1997), while the massification of the system has led to a commodification of academic practice and conflict over the

control of the curriculum and knowledge production – areas in which academics have traditionally been unchallenged. This loss of professional power and autonomy is deemed to have resulted in the “proletarianization” of academic life (Halsey 1992).

### **2.1.3 The Executive Team**

The “steering core” of the university (Burton Clark 2007), in the form of the EMT, has been strengthened over recent years. The role of the VC as Chief Executive and Accounting Officer has been more clearly defined and the present incumbents perform a function not unlike that of their counterparts in the private sector (Bargh et al. 2000). The DVC is increasingly a full-time, sometimes permanent, post with line management responsibility for Heads of School or Deans of Faculty (Middlehurst 2004). The number of both DVCs and PVCs has been increasing and there is some evidence that they are taking on more wide-ranging portfolios, including line management responsibilities outside traditional research and teaching and learning areas (Smith, D. & Adams 2008). Together with the University Registrar (or Chief Operating Officer, as they are now sometimes termed) and Director of Finance, these academic managers form the core of the typical university EMT.

The appointment of EMT members has also been evolving. There has been a shift towards a business model of appointing VCs for a shorter period of time, typically on a fixed-term basis of five years (Bargh et al. 2000). Posts are now filled by competitive recruitment and the use of ESAs has become almost universal. And, as the expectations and complexity of the VC’s role have grown, so has the specificity and range of required attributes from potential candidates (Breakwell & Tytherleigh 2008). Despite these changes, however, the recruitment pattern has remained remarkably predictable: the dominant tendency is for VCs to be chosen not only from within HE, but from within the same sub-sector (Bargh et al. 2000). It would appear that the binary divide in VC recruitment is still very much in evidence.

Until recently, this divide has also continued at second tier management level. Whilst the ‘new’ universities externally recruit full-time and permanent career PVCs, pre-1992 institutions have tended to make internal appointments on a fixed-term, part-time basis. A wide variation of internal appointment procedures are still in use in pre-1992 universities, including election by Senate, selection by invitation (the ‘tap on the shoulder’ model) and open competition. However, the binary divide appears to be weakening as evidence emerges that some pre-1992 institutions are eschewing the

more traditional internal appointment model in favour of the post-1992 one of external appointment (Smith, D., Adams & Mount 2007), in some cases utilising the services of an ESA.

One aspect of the EMT that has not changed, though, is the profile of its members who are still drawn overwhelmingly from the academic community.

## **2.2 Contribution to Knowledge**

There is an extensive literature in the field of higher education management (Shattock 2003, Bargh et al. 2000, Watson 2000, Middlehurst 1993, Green 1988). However, the amount of published work on the university EMT remains very limited and the phenomenon of the top team in practice remains relatively unexplored (Kennie & Woodfield 2008, Middlehurst 2004).

Despite being identified as an important policy issue (Deem 2000), there has been little documented research on the recruitment and selection of top team members and it is recognised that this is an area worthy of further investigation (Middlehurst 2004). In particular, there is a need to examine the strengths and weaknesses of current recruitment approaches, including the utilisation of ESAs (Kennie & Woodfield 2008). The empirical work which has been undertaken to date has focused on the selection of VCs (Goodall 2009, Breakwell & Tytherleigh 2008), including the use of ESAs for VC appointments (Breakwell & Tytherleigh 2008, Watson 2008).

This study seeks to extend existing research on top team recruitment to second-tier managers. To the author's knowledge, it is the first systematic analysis of recruitment adverts for EMT posts over a period of several years and the first to focus on second tier manager appointments.

DVCs and PVCs have rarely been the subject of research in their own right, though they have been included in a few wider studies of university senior management (Middlehurst 2004, Deem 2000). Relatively little was known about how they are appointed or what they do until a recent Leadership Foundation-sponsored project (Smith, D., Adams & Mount 2007) on the evolution of the PVC role between 1960 and 2005. This dissertation builds upon, and updates, aspects of this work.

### 3. Research Design and Methods

#### 3.1 Research Design

This dissertation is conceived as a preliminary study to the author's proposed doctoral research and, as such, is part of a wider research design.

Although concerned with empirical testing and involving the production of quantitative data, the study does not emanate from a quantitative or positivist research paradigm. Rather, it is part of a larger qualitative doctoral research project which has as its philosophical roots a constructivist ontology and interpretivist epistemology. The use of complementary quantitative and qualitative methods/data within the overall research design helps to generate a richer and more complete picture of the phenomenon under investigation (Horowitz & Gerson 2002), in this case, changing recruitment practice in pre-1992 universities. Quantitative data is used here to scope the 'macro' level of this phenomenon and qualitative data will subsequently be generated to examine the 'micro' level.

The study has an iterative research design in which the emergent analysis from the advertisement monitoring exercise (Phase One) is used to determine the data required in the census, or "enumeration of an entire population" (Bryman 2004), of second tier managers that constitutes Phase Two. The inclusion of these two related data sets means that it is possible to track specific adverts to current post holders, thus permitting an identification of the 'outcome' of the recruitment process. The combination of different data collection methods and sources (3.3) also has the benefit of introducing an element of methodological 'testing' or triangulation (Bryman 2004).

As appropriate to its purpose as a 'scoping' exercise, the study is descriptive rather than explanatory in nature. Descriptive research is of particular value in establishing both the fact, and the dimensions, of a given phenomenon prior to asking the 'why' questions (de Vaus 2001). Since it is concerned with measuring change over time, the research is also longitudinal in design. The advertisement monitoring exercise covers a five-year timeframe and tracks year-on-year change and trends over the period. The census of second tier managers provides a 'snapshot' in time (July 2011) and, where available, compares this data to that from the beginning of the Phase One study period in 2005. The value of a longitudinal design in a descriptive study is that it enables the identification of change (or stability) and of the direction of that change (de Vaus 2001).

### 3.2 Study Population

Though set within the context of the English higher education sector as a whole, the main study population is pre-1992 universities. These institutions are of particular research interest since they have more potential for change in response to the government's new public management agenda than post-1992 institutions given that their internal management and governance systems, structures and culture have traditionally been less business-like, or managerial.

For the purposes of this study, pre-1992 universities include all 43 English institutions "regarded as having the status of a university before the provisions of the Further and Higher Education Act 1992 came into force"<sup>1</sup> plus the Institute of Education (IOE) and School for Oriental and African Studies (SOAS), both specialist institutions of the University of London. The latter two institutions were included in order to ensure that all English members of the 1994 Group (a self-declared grouping of medium-sized research-intensive UK universities) and Russell Group (an association of 20 major UK research-intensive universities) are treated as pre-1992 institutions for the purposes of analysis, thus facilitating comparison between the two.

Data was also collected for comparative purposes from all 53 post-1992 universities<sup>2</sup>, as categorized by the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS). In total, then, 98 universities were included in the study population for Phase One. Appendix 1 provides a list of these institutions by sector and institutional grouping.

Data collection for Phase Two was confined to second tier managers in English pre-1992 institutions, as defined above. This management group was chosen as the focus of this study for three main reasons. Firstly, they are of pivotal importance to future leadership capacity building in the sector. Secondly, it appears that the way these managers are being appointed is undergoing significant change (2.1.3). Thirdly, they nevertheless remain an under-researched population (2.2).

This study population was split into two sub-groups based on the findings from Phase One: (i) those which have externally advertised a DVC or PVC post during the five-year study period (the 'advertisers') and (ii) those which have not (the 'non-advertisers'). This approach was taken to enable comparison between the two groups.

---

<sup>1</sup> [http://www.hero.ac.uk/reference\\_and\\_subject\\_resources/groups\\_and\\_organisations](http://www.hero.ac.uk/reference_and_subject_resources/groups_and_organisations) (15/01/2009)

<sup>2</sup> University Colleges and smaller specialist institutions were excluded from the study.

### 3.3 Data Collection Methods

#### 3.3.1 Phase One: Advertisement Monitoring Exercise

Job advertisements in the two major media for advertising higher education vacancies – *Times Higher Education*<sup>3</sup> and the *jobs.ac.uk* website – were monitored over a five-year period from 1 January 2006 to 31 December 2010 and copies of adverts collected for the following categories of EMT post:

- (i) Heads of Institution
- (ii) Deputy Heads of Institution
- (iii) Pro Vice-chancellors, or equivalent
- (iv) Heads of Administration
- (v) Directors of Finance; and
- (vi) Any other post which it is explicitly stated in the advertisement involves membership of the institution's most senior decision-making body.

Appendix 2 provides full details of actual job titles included under each of the above categories. For the sake of brevity and clarity, this report will use the most common job title in each category as a descriptor for all of the posts in that category, as indicated below:

- (i) Vice-chancellors (VCs)
- (ii) Deputy Vice-chancellors (DVCs)
- (iii) Pro Vice-chancellors (PVCs)
- (iv) Secretary and Registrars (Registrars)
- (v) Directors of Finance; and
- (vi) Executive Deans or Directors, whichever is appropriate.

A content analysis of advertisements meeting the stated criteria was then undertaken.

#### 3.3.2 Phase Two: Census of Second Tier Managers

Phase Two is a census of second tier managers based on data provided by pre-1992 universities on their institutional websites, including corporate management information, publication schemes, press releases and staff profiles.

---

<sup>3</sup> Formerly the *Times Higher Educational Supplement (THES)*



Data on second tier managers in pre-1992 universities was also taken from the 2006 Association of Commonwealth Universities (ACU) Yearbook. This enabled comparison of data sets over two points in time: just before and just after the five-year period of the recruitment monitoring exercise, in 2005<sup>4</sup> and 2011. ACU Yearbook data was available for 42 of the 45 pre-1992 institutions<sup>5</sup>, or 93% coverage of the study population. The two data sets are thus very similar, but not identical.

### 3.4 Rationale for Choice of Methods

The choice of methods was made on the basis of how well they work in answering the stated research aims and fit the internal logic of the research design (Denscombe 2007). The selected methods were deemed the most appropriate and valid to obtain the desired 'macro' level overview. They offer the required breadth of coverage across the relevant study population (3.2) and permit the collection of structured and consistent data to facilitate the 'mapping' of variables across sectors, institutions and institutional groupings. Importantly, they produce accurate and reliable data sets, largely avoiding item or unit non-response (and resultant bias) and have the additional advantages of replicability and non-reactivity in terms of direct researcher effect (Bryman 2004). Nevertheless, since it is acknowledged that there is no such thing as 'pure' data, free from bias (Hammersley & Atkinson 2007), the inevitable researcher effect has been taken into account when interpreting the data (3.5).

The use of surveys was considered but rejected for two main reasons. Firstly, full sectoral coverage was unlikely to have been achieved and secondly, what was required for this preliminary study was dispassionate evidence, uncoloured by the perspectives of individual institutions or post holders. The use of interviews for this stage of the research was also deemed inappropriate for three main reasons: their reliance on interviewees' own narratives and perspectives, the relatively unstructured nature of the resulting data, and small sample size. Their potential for exploring respondents' views and feelings about complex phenomena (Denscombe 2007) and providing unique access to individuals' descriptions of the lived world (Kvale & Brinkmann 2009) will instead be utilised in the subsequent 'micro' level doctoral research.

One of the limitations of Phase One of the research design is that those EMT jobs advertised exclusively outside *Times Higher Education* or the *jobs.ac.uk* website were not

---

<sup>4</sup> It should be noted 2006 ACU Yearbook data relates to the previous year, i.e. 2005.

<sup>5</sup> City, Essex and Sussex did not have entries in the 2006 Yearbook.

included in the data collection process. It is acknowledged that this may bias the findings towards advertised posts with an HE emphasis. Any future research design may benefit from including advertisements in non higher education specific national media since informal monitoring would suggest that EMT posts are being advertised more frequently in *The Sunday Times*, for example, than has been the case in the past. Moreover, the focus on external advertisement of posts inevitably means that the study provides only a partial picture of EMT recruitment which omits, for example, any evidence of EMT restructuring in institutions utilising exclusively internal selection processes.

The main limitation of Phase Two is that the data is restricted to that which is publically available and accessible online. It further relies on the published data being accurate and up to date.

### **3.5 Ethical Considerations**

The research was undertaken in accordance with the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC)'s *Framework for Research Ethics*. Every effort has been made to ensure the transparency, impartiality and integrity of the research. A process of reflexivity, or self awareness (Sarantakos 2005), was employed in which the researcher's own assumptions and biases were critically examined.

## 4. Findings: Advertisement Monitoring Exercise

Findings from Phase One of the study are presented and discussed in the following sections, organized by type of post. In accordance with the author's primary research interest, the emphasis is on pre-1992 institutions and, in particular, second tier managers.

### 4.1. Overview

A total of 310 EMT posts in English universities were advertised in the *Times Higher Education (THE)* or *jobs.ac.uk* website during the five years from 1 January 2006 to 31 December 2010. Pre-1992 institutions account for 44% of the total number of advertised EMT posts and 36% of all the advertised second tier posts. The overall breakdown of adverts by type of EMT post is presented in Table 1.

**Table 1: Number and Proportion of Advertised EMT Posts by Sector**

<i>Type of Post</i>	<i>Pre-1992s</i>		<i>Post-1992s</i>		<i>All</i>
	<i>Number</i>	<i>% Total</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>% Total</i>	<i>Total</i>
Vice-chancellor	28	49	29	51	57
Deputy Vice-chancellor	15	28	38	72	53
Pro Vice-chancellor	49	39	78	61	127
Registrar	20	57	15	43	35
Director of Finance	6	43	8	57	14
Executive Dean	14	70	6	30	20
Director	3	75	1	25	4
<b>Total</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>175</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>310</b>

A full list of all pre-1992 EMT job advertisements in 1994 Group institutions is attached as Appendix 3 and for Russell Group institutions as Appendix 4. EMT posts advertised by other pre-1992 institutions are given in Appendix 5 and by post-1992 universities in Appendix 6. This institutional-level data reveals that 39, or 87%, of pre-1992 HEIs across all institutional groupings advertised for at least one EMT post during the study period – exactly the same proportion as for post-1992 institutions. The six pre-1992 universities not advertising any EMT posts are Exeter, Leeds, LSE, Reading, York and Warwick. The seven post-1992 institutions not placing any EMT adverts are Bath Spa, Birmingham City, Brighton, Buckingham, Liverpool Hope, Middlesex and Roehampton. As for second tier managers, just over half (23, or 51%) of pre-1992 institutions placed adverts for either a DVC or PVC (or both) compared to 85% of post-1992 institutions (45 of 53).

Analysis of the advertised posts by application closing date (Table 2) shows an overall (39%) rise in the number of EMT posts advertised in 2010 compared to 2006. The general trend for both second tier posts is upwards with a 70% increase in advertised DVC and PVC posts between 2006 and 2010. The fact that there are year-on-year fluctuations in all types of EMT post is likely to be a reflection of the cyclical nature of recruitment and the fixed-term nature of most academic-manager posts.

**Table 2: Number of EMT Posts Advertised by Application Closing Date**

<i>Type of Post</i>	<i>2006</i>	<i>2007</i>	<i>2008</i>	<i>2009</i>	<i>2010</i>	<i>All</i>
Vice-chancellor	15	10	7	15	10	57
Deputy Vice-chancellor	6	8	12	14	13	53
Pro Vice-chancellor	21	15	28	30	33	127
Registrar	13	2	0	8	12	35
Other	4	8	2	10	14	38
<b>Total</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>310</b>

## 4.2 Executive Search Agencies

The overall number of EMT appointments for which ESAs are utilized is 89 in pre-1992 universities and 105 in post-1992 universities. ESAs are used for just under two-thirds of all advertised EMT posts (63%), with pre-1992 institutions utilising ESAs for a slightly higher proportion of advertised posts: 66% as opposed to 60% (Table 3).

Table 3 shows that ESAs are involved in the recruitment of virtually all VC posts (96%) across both sectors. ESAs were utilized in the recruitment process for 72% of all DVC posts but only 43% of PVC posts. This can be explained by the fact that a number of institutions advertising multiple PVC posts (for example, Sheffield, Liverpool, Kent, Greenwich and Kingston) utilized their own Human Resources team rather than an ESA.

**Table 3: Number and Proportion of Advertised EMT Posts Handled by ESAs**

<i>Type of Post</i>	<i>Pre-1992s</i>		<i>Post-1992s</i>		<i>All</i>	
	<i>Number</i>	<i>% Total</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>% Total</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>% Total</i>
Vice-chancellor	26	93	29	100	55	96
Deputy Vice-chancellor	12	80	26	68	38	72
Pro Vice-chancellor	22	45	33	42	55	43
Registrar	14	70	6	40	20	57
Other	15	65	11	73	26	68
<b>Total</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>63</b>

Table 3 shows that a higher proportion of pre-1992 than post-1992 institutions utilised ESAs for the recruitment of DVCs and PVCs.

Full details on the use of ESAs for EMT appointments are provided in Appendix 7. Twelve ESAs were utilized in total, however the top four account for the overwhelming majority (83%) of all advertised EMT posts handled by ESAs during the five-year period.

**Table 4: Number of EMT Posts Handled, and Market Share, of Most Used ESAs**

ESA	Pre-1992s		Post-1992s		All	
	Posts	% Share	Posts	% Share	Posts	% Share
Perrett Laver	39	44	33	31	72	37
Heidrick & Struggles	17	19	16	15	33	17
Odgers	7	7	23	21	30	16
Saxton Bampfylde	13	15	13	12	26	13
Other (n=8)	13	15	20	19	33	17
<b>Total</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>100</b>

The clear market leader is the Perrett Laver Partnership which is the most used ESA by both pre- and post-1992 institutions (Table 4) with over a third (37%) of the overall market share. They account for 44% of all ESA-advertised posts for pre-1992 institutions. Heidrick & Struggles are the second most utilized ESA, with a 17% overall market share. Next are Odgers with a 16% overall market share. Odgers are more widely used by post-1992 universities, with a 21% share in this sector compared to 7% in the pre-1992 market. The last of the 'big four' is Saxton Bampfylde Hever which has a 13% overall market share.

### 4.3 Vice-chancellors

A total of 57 Vice-chancellor posts were advertised during the period, evenly split between pre and post-1992 institutions: 28 and 29 respectively (Tables 1 and 5). At 57, the number of VC posts advertised in pre-1992 institutions is proportionately higher than that for other one-per-institution EMT posts, notably that of Registrar (35) or Director of Finance (14). This is likely to reflect the fixed-term, rather than open-ended, nature of VC appointments.

As Table 5 illustrates, the 28 VC posts advertised by the pre-1992 institutions were fairly evenly spread across institutional groupings, with ten in the 1994 Group, nine in the Russell Group and nine in other pre-1992 institutions.

**Table 5: Number of EMT Posts Advertised by Institutional Grouping**

Type of Post	1994 Group	Russell Group	Other Pre-92s	Post-1992s	Total
Vice-chancellor	10	9	9	29	57
Deputy Vice-chancellor	7	6	2	38	53
Pro Vice-chancellor	18	23	8	78	127
Registrar	12	5	3	15	35
Other	7	11	5	15	38
<b>Total</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>175</b>	<b>310</b>

One pre-1992 institution (Queen Mary College) advertised for a Vice-chancellor twice within a year, the second advert likely to be - though not explicitly stated as - a re-advertisement by the institution of a post previously advertised by an ESA. UEA also placed two advertisements for a VC within the period. This means that there were 26 pre-1992 universities advertising for a VC, representing over half (58%) of all pre-1992 institutions in the study population (n=45). Approximately half of post-1992 universities – 26<sup>6</sup> of 53 (49%) – also advertised for a VC during the period (Table 6).

**Table 6: Number and Proportion of Advertising Institutions by Sector**

<i>Type of Post</i>	<i>Pre-1992s</i>		<i>Post-1992s</i>	
	<i>Institutions</i>	<i>% Sector (n=45)</i>	<i>Institutions</i>	<i>% Sector (n=53)</i>
Vice-chancellor	26	58	26	49
Deputy Vice-chancellor	9	20	21	40
Pro Vice-chancellor	15	33	37	70
Registrar	17	38	12	23
Others	11	24	11	21
<b>Total</b>	<b>79</b>		<b>107</b>	

An average of approximately five institutions in each sector advertised for a VC each year. Assuming that all VC posts are externally advertised, this implies an average turnover of pre-1992 university VCs every 8.6 years and post-1992 VCs every 10.2 years. This equates to an overall implied average turnover of VCs every 9.4 years. It should be noted that the *actual* turnover rate – or tenure - can only be established once a VC's term of office comes to an end.

An examination of the data by pre-1992 institutional grouping (Table 7) shows that a much higher proportion (82%) of 'other pre-1992 universities' advertised a VC post during the five-year period than is the case for Russell Group (56%) or 1994 Group (44%) members.

**Table 7: Number and Proportion of Advertising Institutions by Group Affiliation**

<i>Type of Post</i>	<i>1994 Group</i>		<i>Russell Group</i>		<i>Other Pre-92s</i>	
	<i>Number</i>	<i>% Group (n=18)</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>% Group (n=16)</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>% Group (n=11)</i>
Vice-chancellor	8	44	9	56	9	82
Deputy Vice-chancellor	2	11	5	31	2	18
Pro Vice-chancellor	6	33	5	31	4	36
Registrar	9	50	5	31	3	27
Other	3	17	4	25	4	36
<b>Total</b>	<b>28</b>		<b>28</b>		<b>22</b>	

<sup>6</sup> The Universities of Chichester, Cumbria and East London each placed two advertisements for a VC during the period so there were 26 institutions advertising 29 VC posts (Appendix 6).

## 4.4 Deputy Vice-chancellors

### 4.4.1 Numbers and Trends

A total of 53 Deputy Vice-chancellor posts were advertised during the period, the large majority of them (72%) in post-1992 universities (Table 1). Of the 15 posts advertised by pre-1992 institutions, seven are in the 1994 Group, six in the Russell Group and two in other pre-1992 universities (Table 5). Since some institutions advertised multiple DVC posts, it is important to consider the number of advertising institutions as well as the number of adverts placed. Table 8 provides this data and the ratio of DVC (and PVC) posts per advertising institution.

**Table 8: Number and Ratio of Advertised Second Tier EMT Posts per Advertising HEI**

<i>Type of Post</i>	<i>Pre-1992s</i>			<i>Post-1992s</i>		
	<i>Posts</i>	<i>HEIs</i>	<i>Ratio</i>	<i>Posts</i>	<i>HEIs</i>	<i>Ratio</i>
Deputy Vice-chancellor	15	9	1.7	38	21	1.8
Pro Vice-chancellor	49	15	3.3	78	37	2.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>2.0</b>

This table shows that the ratio of advertised DVC posts per advertising institution is similar for pre- and post-1992 institutions: 1.7 and 1.8 respectively.

Closer examination of the data (Appendix 3) reveals that three pre-1992 institutions advertised more than one DVC post during the period. Surrey placed four DVC advertisements during 2008 and 2009 relating to three posts<sup>7</sup>; Queen Mary advertised for a Vice-Principal in 2006 and two Vice-Principal and Executive Deans in 2010 and Manchester advertised two Vice-President and Deans in 2010. Nine post-1992 institutions advertised for more than one DVC during the study period (Appendix 6). The proportion of institutions placing adverts for more than one DVC post is 33% for pre-1992 (3 of 15) and 43% (9 of 21) for post-1992 universities.

Table 6 illustrates the fact that the proportion of post-1992 universities which advertised a DVC post during the period is double that of pre-1992 universities: 40% compared to 20%. Within the pre-1992 sector, the proportion of Russell Group members advertising a DVC post (31%) is significantly higher than that for 1994 Group members or other pre-1992 institutions – at 11% and 18% respectively (Table 7). It is interesting to note that there is virtually no overlap between those pre-1992 institutions which advertised for a DVC and

<sup>7</sup> One of the advertised posts (DVC Academic) was a re-advertisement due to the current post holder being appointed to the externally advertised post of Senior DVC.

those which advertised for a PVC; Birmingham was the only university placing adverts for both types of post, suggesting an either-or approach to second-tier manager recruitment.

#### 4.4.2 Remit

Six generic ‘Deputy Vice-chancellor’ posts (i.e. without a specific portfolio or academic area of responsibility in the job title) were advertised in pre-1992 universities, representing 40% of the advertised posts. This compares to 11 generic DVC posts in post-1992 universities, or 29% of the total. DVC posts in pre-1992 universities are significantly more likely to have job titles indicating a functional portfolio than those in post-1992 institutions: 27 of 38 (71%) compared to five of 15 (33%). This is logical given the greater incidence of multiple DVC posts within post-1992 universities and the resultant need to differentiate between the remits of post holders. A summary of advertised DVC portfolios is given in Table 9.

**Table 9: Summary of DVC Portfolios as Indicated by Job Title**

<i>DVCs</i>	<i>Pre-1992s</i>		<i>Post-1992s</i>		<i>All</i>	
	<i>Number</i>	<i>% Sector</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>% Sector</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>% Sector</i>
With functional portfolio	5	33	27	71	32	60
With academic leadership	4	27	0	0	4	8
With campus leadership	0	0	0	0	0	0
With no specific portfolio	6	40	11	29	17	32
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>100</b>

This table illustrates that four of the advertised DVC posts within the pre-1992 institutions have faculty leadership responsibilities – joint DVC and Dean/Executive Dean. There are no examples of this type of DVC role being advertised by post-1992 institutions. Table 10 provides a breakdown of the broad area of responsibility of those 32 DVCs with a functional portfolio indicated in their job title. Full details of specific job titles and how these have been categorized into portfolio areas are provided in Appendix 8. This analysis is limited in that it is unable to take into account the portfolio responsibilities of any DVCs where not explicitly stated in the job title. However, it does provide a useful high-level overview.

**Table 10: DVC Portfolios by Sector in Overall Ranking Order**

<i>Portfolio</i>	<i>Pre-1992s</i>	<i>Post-1992s</i>	<i>All</i>
Planning and Resources	1	10	11
Research and/or Enterprise	2	6	8
Academic	2	3	5
Student Experience	0	3	3
Hybrid/Multiple Portfolios	0	2	2
Teaching and Learning	0	1	1
External Relations	0	1	1
International	0	1	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>32</b>



Whilst most of the DVC functional portfolios relate to academic functions such as Research or Teaching and Learning, post-1992 institutions are more likely to have ‘non-academic’ portfolios, particularly in Planning and Resources. This is linked to the fact post-1992 institutions may not have a Registrar or Head of Administration and, hence, a DVC may fulfil this type of function. Other newer functional portfolios include Student Experience and Internationalisation.

#### 4.4.3 Desired Attributes

Of the 15 DVC posts advertised by the pre-1992 institutions, 11 (73%) of the job adverts include some reference to the type of experience, skills and qualities being sought in the prospective post holder: three in the 1994 Group, six in the Russell Group and two in the remaining pre-1992 institutions. Table 11 summarizes the top five attributes required of potential DVCs according to the job advertisements. By its nature, this data does not include implicit, or unstated, requirements.

**Table 11: Five Most Frequently Sought Attributes in Prospective DVCs, Where Specified**

<i>Attribute</i>	<i>Frequency</i>
Leadership skills and/or experience	9
Management skills and/or experience, including change management	8
Academic track record/achievement	7
People skills including influencing and/or teamwork	6
Academic and/or personal credibility	4

Management and leadership were, perhaps unsurprisingly, the most frequently mentioned requirements of potential post holders. In some cases it was specified that this experience should have been gained in an HE context. In fact, all of the DVC adverts which outline the attributes sought required some HE-specific experience, knowledge or attributes. These requirements are detailed in Table 12.

**Table 12: HE-specific Attributes Sought from Prospective DVCs**

<i>Institutional Grouping</i>	<i>Academic Achievement</i>	<i>Academic Credibility</i>	<i>Academic Leadership</i>	<i>HE Management</i>	<i>HE Knowledge</i>
1994 Group (n=3)	2	0	1	1	1
Russell Group (n=6)	4	1	1	0	1
Other Pre-1992s (n=2)	1	1	1	1	0
<b>Total (n=11)</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>

It is worth noting that not only did all 11 DVC adverts ask for HE experience, nine of the 11 specifically required prospective post holders to be academics, i.e. have either an academic track record and/or academic credibility (which may be a different way of asking for essentially the same thing).

## 4.5 Pro Vice-chancellors

### 4.5.1 Numbers and Trends

A total of 127 Pro Vice-chancellor posts were advertised during the period, accounting for 41% of all advertised EMT posts. This figure is relatively high since, unlike all the other types of EMT posts with the exception of DVCs (in some institutions), there is typically more than one PVC per institution.

A higher proportion of PVC posts were advertised by post-1992 than pre-1992 institutions: 61% compared to 39% (Table 1). Of the 49 PVC posts advertised by pre-1992 institutions during the five-year period, 18 were placed by 1994 Group members and 23 by Russell Group members. Eight were placed by other pre-1992 universities (Table 5). The 49 pre-1992 PVC posts advertised during the period were placed by only 15 institutions, or 33% of the pre-1992 study population (Table 6). This is in contrast to the post-1992 universities, 70% of which advertised PVC posts: 37 out of 53. In other words, proportionately fewer pre- than post-1992s advertised for a PVC. Within the pre-1992 institutions, 33% of 1994 Group, and 31% of Russell Group institutions advertised for PVCs during the period. The proportion is slightly higher for other pre-1992 institutions at 36% (Table 7).

Table 8 illustrates the fact that advertised PVC posts in the pre-1992 sector tend to be concentrated in a relatively small number of institutions with a relatively high ratio of adverts per advertising institution (3.3) compared to the post-1992 sector (2.1). This is due to the large number of pre-1992s advertising more than one PVC post. The Russell Group has the highest ratio of PVC adverts per advertising institution (4.6) largely due to the fact that Sheffield placed an advert for eight PVCs. Newcastle and Liverpool each advertised for three PVCs and Oxford for two (Appendix 4). The 1994 Group has a ratio of 3.0. Those 1994 Group members advertising multiple PVC posts are: Durham (4), Sussex (4), Leicester (4) and Loughborough (2) (Appendix 3). Bath advertised one PVC post. The other pre-1992 institutions have a ratio of 2.0, with Kent advertising three PVC posts, the Open University two and Hull one (Appendix 5).

#### 4.5.2 Remit

An analysis of the responsibilities of advertised PVC posts, as indicated by job title, is presented in Table 13.

**Table 13: Summary of PVC Portfolios as Indicated by Job Title**

<i>PVCs</i>	<i>Pre-1992s</i>		<i>Post-1992s</i>		<i>All</i>	
	<i>Number</i>	<i>% Sector</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>% Sector</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>% Sector</i>
With functional portfolio	34	69	46	59	80	63
With academic leadership	14	29	24	31	38	30
With campus leadership	1	2	2	3	3	2
With no specific portfolio	0	0	6	8	6	5
<b>Total</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>127</b>	<b>100</b>

This shows that a large majority of the job titles of advertised PVC posts in both pre- and post-1992 institutions have a specified functional portfolio: 69% of pre-1992 HEIs and 59% of post-1992 HEIs. Just under one third of advertised PVC posts across both sectors incorporate some form of academic leadership responsibilities, typically combined PVC and Dean of Faculty or Head of School roles (29% and 31% respectively).

Table 14 provides a breakdown of broad portfolio area for those advertised PVC posts specifying a portfolio in the job title. Full details of specific job titles and how these have been categorized into portfolio areas is given in Appendix 9.

**Table 14: PVC Portfolios by Sector in Overall Ranking Order**

<i>Portfolio</i>	<i>Pre-1992s</i>	<i>Post-1992s</i>	<i>All</i>
Research and/or Enterprise	10	14	24
Teaching and Learning	7	4	11
External Relations	6	5	11
Academic	2	7	9
Student Experience	3	5	8
Planning and Resources	2	5	7
International	3	2	5
Hybrid/Multiple Portfolios	1	4	5
<b>Total</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>80</b>

This table shows that, in both sectors, the more ‘traditional’ academic PVC portfolios (Academic, Research and Enterprise, and Learning and Teaching) account for approximately 55% of all advertised posts with a specified portfolio. There is no significant difference in this figure between pre-and post-1992 institutions, meaning that institutions in both sectors have advertised for the same proportion of PVCs with ‘non-traditional’ portfolios (around 45%), particularly in External Relations, Planning and Resources and Student Experience.

### 4.5.3 Desired Attributes

Of the 49 advertised pre-1992 PVC posts, 42 (93%) included reference to the requirements of prospective post holders: 15 of the 1994 Group, 20 of the Russell Group and seven other pre-1992 HEIs. Table 15 summarizes the top five attributes required of prospective PVCs according to the job advertisements.

**Table 15: Five Most Frequently Sought Attributes in Prospective PVCs, Where Specified**

<i>Attribute</i>	<i>1994 Group</i>	<i>Russell Group</i>	<i>Other Pre-1992s</i>	<i>Total Pre-1992s</i>
Leadership skills and/or experience	12	22	5	39
Management skills and/or experience, including change management	11	17	8	36
Academic track record/achievement	12	16	4	32
People skills including influencing and/or teamwork	9	17	6	32
Strategic planning and vision	6	6	5	17

As with DVCs, leadership, management and people skills were seen as the most important attributes, together with a track record of academic achievement. Strategic planning skills are also sought. 37 of the 42 institutions require some form of HE-specific knowledge, experience or attributes. It is noticeable that the four PVC posts that do not require HE experience or academic credentials all have ‘third stream’ (i.e. concerned with the development of business links and the commercialisation of research) portfolio responsibilities. Instead, candidates for these posts are required to have entrepreneurial experience or skills. This appears to be a portfolio area overtly open to candidates from outside HE in terms of the experience and attributes sought.

All but five of the 42 specifically require prospective post holders to be academics, i.e. to have an academic track record or academic credibility. These five comprise the four ‘third stream’ PVCs referred to above and a PVC (Learning and Teaching) at the OU. This latter post is interesting in that the advert specifically states that “candidates need not come from higher education” since the primary focus appears to be on the use of technology to benefit the student experience.

**Table 16: HE-specific Attributes Sought from Prospective PVCs**

<i>Institutional Grouping</i>	<i>Academic Achievement</i>	<i>Academic Credibility</i>	<i>Academic Leadership</i>	<i>HE Management</i>	<i>HE Knowledge</i>
1994 Group (n=15)	12	1	5	1	2
Russell Group (n=20)	16	3	6	5	1
Other Pre-1992s (n=7)	4	4	3	1	0
<b>Total (n=42)</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3</b>

#### **4.6 Other EMT posts**

Data for other EMT posts are included in the main summary tables in this report. Numbers of posts are small and no detailed analysis has been undertaken since they are not a priority group for this research.

## 5. Findings: Census of Second Tier Managers

This section presents the findings of Phase Two of the research process: the census of current DVC and PVC post holders in pre-1992 universities.

### 5.1 Numbers and Type of Post Holders

Numbers of second tier managers in pre-1992 institutions have increased significantly since 2005, with 20 additional DVCs and 34 PVCs (Table 17).

**Table 17: Numbers and Ratios of Second Tier Managers: 2005 and 2011**

<i>Type of Institution</i>	<i>2005 (ACU Yearbook)</i> <i>n=42</i>			<i>2011 (Website Review)</i> <i>n=45</i>		
	<i>DVC</i>	<i>PVC</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>DVC</i>	<i>PVC</i>	<i>Total</i>
<b><i>Advertisers (n=22/23)</i></b>						
1994 Group	11	16	27	15	23	38
Russell Group	11	26	37	21	41	62
Other Pre-1992s	2	20	22	7	15	52
<i>Sub-total</i>	24	62	86	43	79	122
<b>Ratio posts/institution</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>1.9</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>5.3</b>
<b><i>Non-Advertisers (n=20/22)</i></b>						
1994 Group	7	14	21	10	26	36
Russell Group	8	23	31	4	29	33
Other Pre-1992s	3	11	14	5	10	15
<i>Sub-total</i>	18	48	66	19	65	84
<b>Ratio posts/institution</b>	<b>0.9</b>	<b>2.4</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>0.9</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<b>3.8</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>206</b>
<b>Ratio posts/institution</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>2.6</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>4.6</b>

Overall, numbers of post holders rose from 152 to 206 between 2005 and 2011 – an increase of 36% over the six-year period, or an average of 6% per year. This rise in second tier post holders is consistent with the increase in the number of advertised DVC and PVC posts found in Phase One of the study (Table 2).

The knowledge that there are presently 206 second tier managers puts Phase One findings on the number of advertised DVC and PVC posts into context. The 64 such adverts placed between 2006 and 2010 represents just under one third (31%) of the current number of post holders.

There are presently 4.6 second tier posts per pre-1992 institution on aggregate, an increase of one full-time equivalent (fte) post per institution since 2005. The level of increase in second tier managers since 2005 is significantly higher in advertising institutions than in the non-advertising group: 42% compared to 27%. Moreover, advertising

institutions now have significantly more second tier managers (122 to 84) and a higher ratio of posts per institution (5.3 to 3.8) than the non advertisers.

The difference between the two groups is most noticeable at DVC level; although DVCs accounted for virtually the same proportion of second tier managers in both advertising and non-advertising institutions in 2005 (28% and 27% respectively), by 2011 the proportion of DVCs in advertisers had increased to 35% whilst in non-advertisers it had decreased to 23%. Accordingly, there are now approximately two DVCs (1.9) per institution on average in the advertising group and only one (0.9) in the non-advertising group. This is because the advertising group has tended to increase the number of both DVCs and PVCs<sup>8</sup> whereas the non-advertising group as a whole has added only PVC posts, with only one net aggregate gain in DVC numbers over the period.

## 5.2 Balance of DVC and PVC Posts

In the pre-1992 sector the predominant second tier management model is that of one DVC plus one or more PVCs. Table 18 illustrates that 23, or half (51%), of pre-1992 institutions presently adopt this model whilst just over a quarter (12, or 27%) have PVCs only. This is a reversal of the situation in 2005 when the predominant model was PVCs only (19 institutions, or 45%), followed by the one DVC plus PVCs model (13 institutions, or 31%). Put another way, nearly three-quarters (73%) of pre-1992 universities have at least one DVC post now compared to only half in 2005.

**Table 18: Second Tier Management Models: 2005 and 2011**

<i>Management Model</i>	<i>2005 (ACU Yearbook)</i>		<i>2011 (Website Review)</i>	
	<i>Number</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>%</i>
DVCs only	6	14	5	11
PVCs only	19	45	12	27
1 DVC plus PVC(s)	13	31	23	51
Mixture of DVCs and PVCs	2	5	5	11
Neither	2	5	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>100</b>

## 5.3 Gender of Post Holders

Given that the ACU Yearbook contains a large amount of data for which gender is unspecified (initials only rather than first names in full), a straightforward comparison of the proportion of female (or male) post holders between 2005 and 2011 would be misleading. A more accurate reflection of change over time can be gauged by comparing

<sup>8</sup> The exception is the 'other pre-1992' institutions which have effectively converted PVCs to DVCs.

the number of females as a proportion of those for whom gender is known. These figures are 25 in 2005 and 45 in 2011, equating to 21% and 22% respectively – virtually no aggregate increase in the proportion of female managers over the period.

**Table 19: Gender of Second Tier Managers: 2005 and 2011**

<i>Type of Institution</i>	<i>2005 (ACU Yearbook)</i>			<i>2011 (Website Review)</i>		
	<i>n=42</i>			<i>n=45</i>		
	<i>Female</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Unspec</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Unspec</i>
<b><i>Advertisers</i></b>						
1994 Group	2	20	4	10	28	
Russell Group	6	22	9	7	53	2
Other Pre-1992s	6	13	3	6	16	
<i>Sub-total</i>	<i>14</i>	<i>55</i>	<i>16</i>	<i>23</i>	<i>97</i>	<i>2</i>
<b><i>Non-Advertisers</i></b>						
1994 Group	6	13	2	10	25	1
Russell Group	4	15	12	10	23	
Other Pre-1992s	1	12	1	2	13	
<i>Sub-total</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>40</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>22</i>	<i>61</i>	<i>1</i>
<b>Total</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>3</b>

Interestingly, whilst the proportion of female second tier managers (of those for whom gender is known) was the same (20%) in both advertising and non-advertising institutions in 2005, the figure fell slightly to 19% in the advertisers (23 of 120) while rising to 26% in the non-advertisers (22 of 83). In other words, those institutions selecting candidates internally were more likely to have improved the gender balance of second tier post holders than those advertising externally.

Findings do vary by institutional affiliation, however. This contrast is particularly evident within the membership of the Russell Group. On aggregate, the non-advertising members have increased the number of female and male post holders by six and eight over the period – a reasonable gender balance. In contrast, those Russell Group institutions that did externally advertise second tier posts have on aggregate gained only one female and 31 male post holders since 2005. Within the 1994 Group, on the other hand, the advertising members have increased their number of both male and female post holders by eight each, whereas the non-advertising members have gained three males for every one female manager (12 males to 4 females).

#### 5.4 Academic Status of Post Holders

The proportion of second tier managers from the professoriate was very high in 2005: 86% on aggregate, with very little difference between the advertising group (85%) and the non-advertisers (88%). As Table 20 shows, this figure has risen slightly for both groups, to 91%



for the advertisers and 90% for the non-advertisers. The overwhelming majority of current second tier managers of both groups are therefore members of the professoriate. Of the 19 who are not professors, 13 have the title 'Dr' and most of them are also academics.

**Table 20: Professorial Status of Second Tier Managers: 2005 and 2011**

<i>Management Model</i>	<i>2005 (ACU Yearbook)</i> <i>n=42</i>		<i>2011 (Website Review)</i> <i>n=45</i>	
	<i>Professor</i>	<i>Non</i>	<i>Professor</i>	<i>Non</i>
<b><i>Advertisers</i></b>				
1994 Group	25	2	37	1
Russell Group	32	5	59	3
Other Pre-1992s	16	6	15	7
<i>Sub-total</i>	<i>73</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>111</i>	<i>11</i>
<b><i>Non-Advertisers</i></b>				
1994 Group	18	3	30	5
Russell Group	28	3	31	2
Other Pre-1992s	12	2	14	1
<i>Sub-total</i>	<i>58</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>75</i>	<i>8</i>
<b>Total</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>19</b>

Close examination of the data for individual post holders reveals that, in fact, only six second tier managers from in the advertising group and four in the non-advertising group are from non-academic backgrounds. This includes four former librarians (at Leicester and York), two Registrars/CEOs (at UCL and Salford), one Director of External Relations (Birkbeck) and one Director of Finance (Kent). Three of these individuals now hold DVC-level posts: a DVC and Registrar, a DVC (Commercial Services) and a VP (Operations). The remaining three are PVCs with responsibility for Students; the Student Experience; and Estates and Special Projects respectively. There are an additional four post holders who were external appointments from outside HE (see next section).

## 5.5 Previous Institution of Post Holders

As one might expect, the overwhelming majority (96%) of current second tier managers in non-advertising institutions (for whom their previous institution is known) are appointed from within the same institution: 100% of DVCs and 95% of PVCs (Table 21). Of the three PVCs appointed<sup>9</sup> from a different previous institution, one came from another University of London College and two were from outside HE: one from the British Council (now PVC International) and one from Advantage West Midlands (now PVC Enterprise).

<sup>9</sup> The appointment method is unknown since the posts were not advertised in the media monitored for this study, if at all.

Just over two-thirds (68%) of all second tier managers in the advertising institutions (for whom their previous institution is known) also held their previous post within the same university: 27, or 73%, of DVCs came from inside the university and 10 from outside. The majority of the latter came from other HEIs and one from the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE). Only one current DVC was appointed from outside HE – a VP (Research & Innovation) who was previously a Director of the Government Office North West. Two PVCs were international appointments from universities in Australia.

**Table 21: Previous Institution of Current Second Tier Managers**

<i>Type of Institution</i>	<i>2005 (ACU Yearbook)</i> <i>n=42</i>			<i>2011 (Website Review)</i> <i>n=45</i>		
	<i>Same</i>	<i>Different</i>	<i>Unknown</i>	<i>Same</i>	<i>Different</i>	<i>Unknown</i>
<b><i>Advertisers</i></b>						
1994 Group	11	4		14	9	
Russell Group	11	4	6	22	7	12
Other Pre-1992s	5	2		8	7	
<i>Sub-total</i>	<i>27</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>44</i>	<i>23</i>	<i>12</i>
<b><i>Non-Advertisers</i></b>						
1994 Group	9		1	23	2	1
Russell Group	4			25		4
Other Pre-1992s	5			8	1	1
<i>Sub-total</i>	<i>18</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>56</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>6</i>
<b>Total</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>18</b>

## 5.6 Outcome of Second Tier Manager Advertisements

Given the relatively low numbers of second tier managers - even in the advertising institutions - who were appointed from outside the recruiting university, it was decided to examine the institutional origins of those managers whose post was advertised during the period of the study (Table 22).

**Table 22: Outcome of Second Tier Post Advertisements**

<i>DVCs</i>	<i>Advertised Posts</i>		<i>External Appointments</i>		<i>Internal Appointments</i>		<i>Discontinued Posts</i>	
	<i>DVC</i>	<i>PVC</i>	<i>DVC</i>	<i>PVC</i>	<i>DVC</i>	<i>PVC</i>	<i>DVC</i>	<i>PVC</i>
1994 Group	6	16	4	9	2	4		3
Russell Group	5	17	3	4	2	12		1
Other Pre-1992	2	8	2	4		3		1
<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>

Overall, just under half (26, or 48%) of the 54 advertised second tier posts resulted in the appointment of a candidate from outside the recruiting university. As Table 22 shows, this figure is significantly higher for DVC advertised posts (69%) than for PVC posts, less than half of which (42%) resulted in candidates being appointed from outside the institution.

## 6. Discussion and Analysis

### 6.1 Recruitment Practice

This would appear to be a pivotal moment for the pre-1992 sector which is split 50: 50 between those institutions that have, and those that have not, adopted an external recruitment process for their DVCs and PVCs. At least in part. For it is important to note that mixed recruitment models are in place at some institutions<sup>10</sup>, whereby DVCs and/or PVCs within the same EMT may have been appointed using different selection mechanisms. It is likely that, as existing posts become vacant or new posts are created, the opportunity is being taken to fill them by a process of external competition, even if this has not previously been the institution's practice.

This type of flexible and pragmatic approach does not appear to present a governance problem given that, according to the author's review of statutes and ordinances, two thirds of pre-1992 universities do not have a proscribed second tier manager appointment procedure. The remaining third (mainly comprising the non-advertisers<sup>11</sup>) state that DVCs and PVCs should be selected from amongst members of the academy.

The nature of the split between the advertisers and the non-advertisers is interesting. It is not the case that all universities of a particular type or institutional grouping/affiliation are advertisers whilst those of another are non-advertisers. On the contrary, each institutional type and affiliation comprises universities from each sub-group. For ease of reference, Table 23 plots institutions by type and grouping with the advertisers capitalised and highlighted in bold print.

The fact that institutions of the same type or peer group have not all acted in the same way does not mean to say, however, that there is no peer group pressure or 'fashion' element to HE recruitment practice. University managers are not immune to the dangers of "casual benchmarking", that is copying what others are doing based on the - not necessarily rational - assumption that, since a particular practice is being adopted, it must work (Tourish 2011).

---

<sup>10</sup> The University of Kent is one such example.

<sup>11</sup> Surprisingly, this latter group contains two universities (Bradford and Sussex) that have externally advertised second tier manager posts during the study period. This suggests that the regulations have not kept pace with actual practice.

**Table 23: Change to Recruitment Practice by Institutional Type and Grouping**

<i>University Type</i>	<i>1994 Group (18)</i>	<i>Russell Group (16)</i>	<i>Other (11)</i>
<i>Ancients</i>	<b>DURHAM</b>	<b>OXFORD</b> Cambridge	
<i>Civics</i>		<b>BIRMINGHAM</b> <b>BRISTOL</b> <b>LIVERPOOL</b> <b>MANCHESTER</b> <b>SHEFFIELD</b> Leeds	London
<i>Red Brick</i>	<b>LEICESTER</b> Exeter Reading	<b>NEWCASTLE</b> Nottingham Southampton	<b>HULL</b>
<i>Former CATs</i>	<b>BATH</b> <b>LOUGHBOROUGH</b> <b>SURREY</b>		<b>KEELE</b> <b>SALFORD</b> <b>BRADFORD</b> Aston Brunel City Cranfield
<i>Plate Glass</i>	<b>LANCASTER</b> <b>SUSSEX</b> Essex East Anglia York	Warwick	<b>KENT</b> <b>OPEN UNIVERSITY</b>
<i>London Colleges</i>	<b>QUEEN MARY</b> Birkbeck Goldsmiths IOE Royal Holloway SOAS	<b>KINGS COLLEGE</b> <b>UCL</b> Imperial LSE	

There is also a PR dimension to recruitment. The decision to advertise may be as much or more about making a public statement or signal to one's peers as a recruitment method in itself. Placing an advert in *The Sunday Times*, for example, may serve a number of purposes: raising the profile of the institution, signalling the importance of a particular post, and communicating a willingness to consider applicants from outside HE – or at least giving the appearance of doing so (see 6.3). For the choice of advertising channel, in conjunction with other aspects of the recruitment process (notably the person specification), will inevitably shape the pool of applicants attracted to a post.

## 6.2 Executive Search Agencies

The involvement of ESAs in the appointment of EMT members is a relatively new phenomenon. Watson (2008) found no use of ESAs in VC recruitment in 1986/87 and, if ESAs were not used for the top posts, it is unlikely that they were involved in the appointment of second tier managers. Yet, from a zero base, their use has grown dramatically over the last twenty five years and, as these findings show, is now prevalent at EMT level. The reasons for this can only be surmised though, as already noted in 6.1, a degree of “casual benchmarking” is likely.

ESAs can be beneficial to universities in undertaking the recruitment groundwork (such as research, the ‘sifting’ of applications and communication with candidates) and in imposing a discipline on the process. It is likely that their participation has helped to professionalise EMT recruitment (Watson 2008). Arguably the aspect of recruitment in which ESAs can add most value, though, is in widening the pool of potential applicants to include those from outside the sector or from overseas. The fact that, despite the increasing use of ESAs, virtually no non-HE or non-UK second tier management appointments have been made over the last five years is therefore noteworthy.

The absence of this type of ‘non-standard’ appointee does not necessarily mean that ESAs have failed in their task, however. Suitably qualified and interested non-standard candidates may simply not exist or may have been deterred from applying by adverts aimed squarely at academics. Alternatively, they may have applied, but not been selected. After all, ESAs work to a brief provided by the recruiting institution and it is the institution that has ultimate responsibility for determining both the type of candidate sought and appointed. And for as long as pre-1992 institutions continue to believe that only academic candidates are appointable to second tier posts, it is unlikely that the potential value of ESAs in broadening the candidate pool will be maximised.

The use of ESAs, in any case, is not unproblematic. VCs who have been involved with agencies as applicants, advisers or clients remain unconvinced about the extent to which they really understand HE or deliver what they claim for HE clients (Breakwell & Tytherleigh 2008). Moreover, where the recruitment process is effectively outsourced to ESAs, it may effectively ‘de-skill’ the university’s Human Resources team and even lead to “intellectual laziness” (Watson 2008).

The most serious concern about ESAs arising from these findings, however, relates to the market dominance of a small number of agencies in HE. In a situation where just four ESAs

account for over 80% of all EMT-level assignments, it is hard to believe that each search is genuinely 'fresh'. Breakwell's (2008) study found commonalities across person specifications and sources used for different VC assignments and it is probable that the same potential for conflicts of interest and the re-circulating of candidates applies to second tier appointments.

An over-reliance on so few ESAs makes the sector vulnerable to "aspiration shaping" (Breakwell & Tytherleigh 2008). ESAs may have become too influential in determining the person specification for EMT posts despite the fact that their knowledge of the sector and understanding of the roles may be limited (Watson 2008). There is a real danger of ESAs having a fixed perception of what a VC or PVC looks like and of undertaking searches on that basis, making it more difficult for 'non-standard' candidates to succeed.

In any event, the use of ESAs has resulted in the creation of a "competitive waiting room" of potential VC candidates, mainly comprising 55 year old male DVCs or PVCs (Watson 2008). In Watson's experience, this group is becoming less diverse as younger, more interesting candidates tend to drop out after being encouraged by ESAs to apply but not succeeding. This implies that it is recruiting institutions as much, or more than, ESAs that have a tendency to reinforce the cycle of recruiting the same type of individuals, an issue explored further in the next section.

### 6.3 Demographic Profile

The adoption of an external recruitment process for DVCs and PVCs has extended to this management tier the 'transfer market', or inter-institutional movement of staff, that already exists for other academic posts. The opening up of these posts to academic candidates from other universities has been the only significant change to the demographic profile of second tier managers over the last six years. This change, which echoes what is happening at VC level (Bargh et al. 2000), can be characterised as 'more of the same' rather than as a genuine diversification of the candidate pool.

One reason for the continuity in profile is immediately apparent from an analysis of the adverts for second tier posts. In the vast majority of cases, the required attributes for potential post holders articulated in these adverts can only realistically be met by career academics<sup>12</sup>. Recent Universities UK guidance (2009) recommends that each stated

---

<sup>12</sup> The only exceptions to this, as already noted in 4.5.3, are 'third stream' DVC or PVC posts for which the value of experience outside HE is recognised.

attribute should reflect a genuine requirement and should be both legitimate and proportionate, i.e. not excessively demanding nor discriminatory. It is arguable whether the management and leadership experience for second tier posts necessarily has to be acquired in HE or whether more general, but equivalent, experience would be suitable. Nevertheless, the assumption remains that for senior academics the required management experience “can be taken for granted as part of the career pathway to the top” (Breakwell & Tytherleigh 2008, p. 43). As long as this belief persists, the typical route into second tier management posts will continue to be that of an academic career, as evidenced by a professorship and/or academic management roles as Head of Department or Dean (Smith, D., Adams & Mount 2007).

The proportion of second tier managers from the professoriate has continued to rise since the completion of Smith’s study in 2005, even in advertising institutions. This is unlikely to change while there is a continued emphasis on academic credibility within the identity construction of these roles (Smith, D. & Adams 2008). Academic credibility remains a prerequisite for senior posts because, without it, it is believed that appointees will be unacceptable to the main internal constituencies over which leadership will be exercised, i.e. rank and file academics (Bargh et al. 2000). This view is not unreasonable given that the traditional ‘policy’ PVC role is one of influence and persuasion, rather than overt authority (Smith, D. & Adams 2008). However, as a more executive interpretation of the DVC/PVC role emerges (6.4), the primacy of academic credibility becomes questionable. Instead, a more management-oriented skill set coupled with experience gained outside HE may be as, or more, relevant.

The fact that the nature and complexity of the second tier manager job is changing, but the people who undertake it are not, is worthy of scrutiny. Although the “cult of the gifted amateur” (Middlehurst 1993) has been replaced within the administration by one of increasing professionalization (2.1.2), it continues to be the norm within the ranks of senior academic managers. The sector’s response to government concerns about “leadership deficit” appears to have taken the form of an increased take up of formal leadership training programmes (like those provided by the Leadership Foundation), rather than any more fundamental re-consideration of the required experience and attributes of the role.

Not only are applicants from outside HE not encouraged or considered suitable, but 2010 data from the Equality Challenge Unit reveals that both women and ethnic minorities remain significantly under-represented in the professoriate relative to their overall

participation in HE<sup>13</sup> (Brill 2008). And, since the professoriate is the main recruiting ground for second tier managers, it is no surprise to find that the gender balance at this level remains poor<sup>14</sup>. Whilst the informal ‘tap on the shoulder’ internal selection mechanism may have excluded some eligible staff, including women, there is no evidence that the adoption of an external recruitment process has improved the situation. On the contrary, the gender balance has worsened somewhat in advertising institutions over the last six years.

Possible explanations for this include inexperienced and/or unrepresentative interview panels and a tendency towards like-for-like hiring; people “are more likely to hire others who are similar to themselves, even though the decision may be entirely subconscious” (Goodall 2011, p. 44). VCs, who are central to EMT selection, may also be more comfortable with team members drawn from an academic, rather than professional management background (Lauwerys 2008). For all these reasons, recruitment practice at this level is inhibiting the development of a broader and more inclusive talent ‘pipeline’.

#### 6.4 Role and Remit

There appears to be increasing role differentiation between DVCs and PVCs. New DVC posts are being created in institutions that previously had only PVCs. In many cases, the DVC works closely with the VC in a more executive capacity, to a different brief and with a more obviously senior status than PVCs (Smith, D. & Adams 2008). The findings of this study echo those of Smith in identifying a more hierarchical and “stretched” second management tier, as evidenced by the move to a DVC plus PVCs management model.

Even amongst PVCs, different variants of the role are emerging. The more traditional PVC post holder typically has a cross-institutional policy remit and relies heavily on his or her powers of persuasion to effect change. The continuation of such a role of influence, rather than command, is arguably a manifestation of a collegial culture (Shattock 2003). One perceived weakness of this ‘responsibility without power’ model is the difficulty of ensuring that agreed policy is implemented. Some universities have responded by redesigning the role and bringing together DVC/PVC and Dean remits. This approach combines policy development responsibility and the executive management of a faculty or

---

<sup>13</sup> Women make up 44% of academic staff, but only 18.7% of the professoriate. Black and ethnic minorities account for 6.7% of academic staff (compared to 8.7% of the UK population) and 5.5% of the professoriate. Source: HESA (2009/10)

<sup>14</sup> Albeit that at 22% overall, the proportion of female second tier managers is slightly higher than that of the professoriate.



school within a single post (Smith, D. & Adams 2008). These findings show that this trend has continued since 2005 and a third of all current second tier manager posts are now of this hybrid type. 'Executive' PVC roles are also emerging with direct line management responsibility for specific functional areas, more akin to the post-1992 university PVC model. Something of a fault line is appearing between these 'policy' and 'executive' interpretations of the role and it is interesting to speculate whether the more traditional 'policy' PVC model may be coming under threat (Smith, D., Adams & Mount 2007) and whether the executive variant is symptomatic of a more managerial approach.

## 6.5 Managerialism

At the heart of a managerial ideology is the primacy and legitimisation of management. It places an emphasis on importing ideas and practices (such as performance monitoring, targets, external accountability and audit mechanisms) from the private sector on the assumption that they are superior. Another key characteristic is an extension of the right to manage into public service organisations like universities, previously the domain of autonomous professionals (Deem & Brehony 2005).

Unlike in the NHS for example, where professional managers have been brought in at the most senior levels, in HE academics continue to fill VC and second tier management positions. Not only has there been a remarkable increase in the number of second tier managers - one additional post on average for every pre-1992 university in the last six years alone - but also the range of their executive responsibilities has grown, including over professional services. In HE, far from professional managers taking over, it could be argued their position is weakening and they currently have little or no chance (in pre-1992 universities, at least) of breaking the glass ceiling and becoming a DVC or PVC.

The literature on academic identity suggests that "management" is now regarded as a distinct interest group and many academics consolidate their own sense of professional identity through differentiation from this group (Henkel 2002). The prominence of academics in management roles has been found to have strengthened the divide between academic managers and other academics (Deem & Brehony 2005). For their part, academic managers are reluctant to identify wholeheartedly with "management" or the label "manager" (Johnson 2002), preferring to see themselves as providing intellectual leadership. Nevertheless, academic managers do draw on a managerial ideology to assist them "in maintaining relations of power and dominance, whatever the underpinning

values of the managers concerned” (Deem & Brehony 2005, p. 231). It is this that permits them to assert their right to manage.

## 7. Conclusions

This dissertation has focused on testing two underlying assumptions: that the way second tier managers in pre-1992 English universities are appointed is changing but that the profile of current post holders is not. The findings provide empirical evidence to confirm both assumptions and, in so doing, present a picture of change and continuity at second tier management level.

The sector has reached a tipping point in terms of recruitment practice, with half having moved – at least in part – to external advertisement of DVC and PVC posts, often utilising the services of ESAs. As posts become vacant or new ones are created, the opportunity is being taken to change not only the way appointments are made, but also how the posts are configured. In a number of cases, this is happening as part of a wider second tier management restructuring exercise (Table 24). This data will be used to inform the sampling strategy of the author’s doctoral research, with case studies being selected from amongst these institutions.

**Table 24: Institutions Undertaking Significant Change at Second Tier Management Level**

<i>Institution</i>	<i>Advertised posts</i>	<i>Reference to context in advertisements</i>
<b>1994 Group</b>		
Durham	4 PVCs	Programme of strategic change, including new senior appointments (2006)
Leicester	5 PVCs, including 3 PVC/Heads	Significant restructuring (2008)
Queen Mary	2 PVC/Exec Deans	Strategic reorganisation of the senior team
Surrey	4 DVCs	New operating structure and senior management
Sussex	5 PVCs	Newly created VC’s Executive (2006); academic restructuring (2009)
<b>Russell Group</b>		
Birmingham	1 DVC and 2 PVCs	Academic reorganization of Schools to Colleges
Liverpool	3 PVCs, including 2 PVC/Heads	Programme of “transformational change” (2007); new executive PVC/Head posts
Newcastle	4 PVCs	
Sheffield	10 PVCs, including 5 PVC/Heads	Creation of new Executive Board
<b>Other Pre-1992s</b>		
Kent	3 PVCs	Includes two new posts

The findings evidence both a strengthening and a diversification of second tier management. The number of second tier managers continues to increase and the breadth of their collective responsibilities widen. A hierarchy is also developing, with DVCs having a different and more senior role than PVCs, and the presence of both within the same EMT becoming more common. PVCs with a cross-institutional policy role are being joined by

those with executive and line management responsibility for an academic faculty and/or professional services function. Taken together, these changes represent a move towards a post-1992 management model and are suggestive of a more executive approach, designed to combine responsibility for policy development and implementation. The drivers of change, including the degree to which these developments may be a response to a more managerial agenda, are not yet known and warrant further investigation.

The conservative and predictable recruitment pattern to second tier posts also merits scrutiny. The findings show that, although the role and recruitment methods are changing, the profile of DVC and PVC post holders remains the same. This is problematic given the current under-representation of women and ethnic minorities at this level. From a leadership capacity building perspective, the desirability and sustainability of excluding non-academics from second tier management posts is also questionable. It is surely in a university's best interests to secure the best candidates as DVCs and PVCs from the widest possible pool of suitable applicants. Yet it is not apparent that newer external recruitment methods – with or without the services of ESAs – are any more effective than traditional internal selection procedures in serving this purpose. The author remains unconvinced that current practice is ensuring the creation of the broadest and most inclusive talent 'pipeline' - or even that the need to do so is acknowledged.

Why do academics continue to predominate at second tier management level? It may simply be the case that academics are the only credible candidates for the job. Alternatively, it may be a form of academic protectionism. Because what this research shows is that if there is a "management" takeover of universities, it is being carried out by academics rather than professional managers. Have academics been seduced by managerialism, or at least the power that it gives them to manage? Or, on the other hand, is the ring fencing of the top jobs for academics a form of defence against the worst excesses of managerialism? Or is it rather a unique adaptation of managerialism for a university context? At the moment, we can only speculate. The motivations and implications of the changes and continuities identified in this study are as yet unknown. However, given the importance of these issues for future leadership capacity building, they warrant further empirical study.

## References

- Bargh, C., et al. (2000). *University Leadership: The Role of the Chief Executive*. Buckingham: SRHE/Open University Press.
- Breakwell, G. and Tytherleigh, M. (2008). *The Characteristics, Roles and Selection of Vice-Chancellors. Final Report*. London: Leadership Foundation for Higher Education.
- Brill, C. (2008). *Equality in Higher Education: Statistical Report 2008*. London: Equality Challenge Unit.
- Bryman, A. (2004). *Social Research Methods*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Burton Clark, R. (2007). *Creating Entrepreneurial Universities: Organizational Pathways of Transformation*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- CVCP (1985). *Report of the Steering Committee for Efficiency Studies in Universities*. London: CVCP.
- de Vaus, D. (2001). *Research Design in Social Research*. London: Sage.
- Dearlove, J. (2002). A Continuing Role for Academics: The Governance of UK Universities in the Post-Dearing Era. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 56(3), 257-275.
- Deem, R. (2000). 'New Managerialism' and the Management of UK Universities. *End of Award Report*. Swindon: ESRC.
- Deem, R. and Brehony, K. (2005). Management as Ideology: The Case of 'New Managerialism' in Higher Education. *Oxford Review of Education*, 31(2), 217-235.
- Denscombe, M. (2007). *The Good Research Guide for Small-scale Social Research Projects*. Maidenhead: Oxford University Press.
- Ferlie, E. (1996). *The New Public Management in Action*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Goodall, A. H. (2009). Highly Cited Leaders and the Performance of Research Universities. *Research Policy*, 38(7), 1079-1092.
- Goodall, A. H. (2011). Panel Games. *Times Higher Education*, 17 February, 43-44.
- Green, M. (1988). *Leaders for a New Era: Strategies for Higher Education*. New York: Macmillan.
- Halsey, A. H. (1992). *The Decline of Donnish Dominion: The British Academic Professions in the Twentieth Century*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Hammersley, M. and Atkinson, P. (2007). *Ethnography: Principles in Practice*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Henkel, M. (1997). Academic Values and the University as Corporate Enterprise. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 51(2), 134-143.
- Henkel, M. (2002). Academic Identity in Transformation? The Case of the United Kingdom. *Higher Education Management and Policy*, 14(3), 137-147.
- Horowitz, R. and Gerson, K. (2002). Observation and Interviewing: Options and Choices in Qualitative Research. In: May, T. ed. *Qualitative Research in Action*. London: Sage.
- Johnson, R. (2002). Learning to Manage the University: Tales of Training and Experience. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 56(1), 33-51.
- Kennie, T. and Woodfield, S. (2008). *The Composition, Challenges and Changes in the Top Team Structures of UK Higher Education Institutions*. London: Leadership Foundation for Higher Education.
- Kvale, S. and Brinkmann, S. (2009). *InterViews: Learning the Craft of Qualitative Research Interviewing*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Lauwerys, J. (2008). Changing Structures of Leadership and Management in Higher Education. *Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education*, 12(1), 2-10.
- McNay, I. (1999). Changing Cultures in UK Higher Education: The State as Corporate Market Bureaucracy and the Emergent Academic Enterprise. In: Braun, D. and Merrien, F. eds. *Towards a New Model of Governance for Universities? A comparative view*. London: Jessica Kingsley.
- Middlehurst, R. (1993). *Leading Academics*. Buckingham: SRHE/Open University.
- Middlehurst, R. (2004). Changing Internal Governance: A Discussion of Leadership Roles and Management Structures in UK Universities. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 58(4), 258-279.
- Sarantakos, S. (2005). *Social Research*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Hamilton.
- Shattock, M. (2002). Re-Balancing Modern Concepts of University Governance. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 56(3), 235-244.
- Shattock, M. (2003). *Managing Successful Universities*. Maidenhead: SRHE/Open University.
- Smith, D. and Adams, J. (2008). Academics or Executives? Continuity and Change in the Roles of Pro-Vice-Chancellors. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 62(4), 340-357.
- Smith, D., Adams, J. and Mount, D. (2007). *UK Universities and Executive Officers: the Changing Role of Pro-Vice-Chancellors. Final Report*. London: Leadership Foundation for Higher Education.

Smith, P. and Hussey, T. (2010). *The Trouble with Higher Education: A Critical Examination of our Universities*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Tourish, D. (2011). The Appraisal Malaise. *Times Higher Education*, 25 August, 26.

Watson, D. (2000). *Managing Strategy*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Watson, D. (2002). Is UK HE fit for purpose? *perspective*, 6(3), 63-72.

Watson, D. (2008). Hunting the Headhunters. *Engage*, 10-11.

Whitchurch, C. (2006). Who Do They Think They Are? The Changing Identities of Professional Administrators and Managers in UK Higher Education. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 28(2), 159-171.

## Appendices

### Appendix 1: List of Institutions Included in Recruitment Monitoring Exercise

#### English Pre-1992 Institutions by Institutional Grouping (Total 45)

<i>1994 Group (18)</i>	<i>Russell Group (16)</i>	<i>Other (11)</i>
Bath	Birmingham	Aston
Birkbeck	Bristol	Bradford+
Durham	Cambridge	Brunel
East Anglia (UEA)	Imperial	City
Essex	Kings College London (KCL)	Cranfield
Exeter	Leeds	Hull
Goldsmiths	Liverpool	Keele
Institute of Education (IOE)	London School of Economics (LSE)	Kent
Royal Holloway	Manchester	London
Lancaster	Newcastle	Open University (OU)+
Leicester	Nottingham	Salford+
Loughborough	Oxford	
Queen Mary	Sheffield	
Reading	Southampton	
School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS)	University College London (UCL)	
Surrey	Warwick	
Sussex		
York		

+ Members of University Alliance

#### English Post-1992 Universities by Institutional Grouping (Total 53)

<i>Million Plus (24)</i>	<i>University Alliance (15)</i>	<i>Other (14)</i>
Anglia Ruskin	Bournemouth	University of the Arts
Bath Spa	De Montfort	Brighton
Bedfordshire	Hertfordshire	Buckingham
Birmingham City	Huddersfield	Canterbury Christ Church
Bolton	Lincoln	Chester
Buckinghamshire New	Liverpool John Moores	Chichester
Central Lancashire (UCLAN)	Manchester Metropolitan	University for the Creative Arts
Coventry	Northumbria	Cumbria
Derby	Nottingham Trent	Edge Hill
East London (UEL)	Oxford Brookes	Liverpool Hope
Gloucestershire	Plymouth	Westminster
Greenwich	Portsmouth	Winchester
Kingston	Sheffield Hallam	Worcester
Leeds Metropolitan	Teeside	York St John
London Metropolitan	West of England (UWE)	
London South Bank		
Middlesex		
Northampton		
Roehampton		
Southampton Solent		
Staffordshire		
Sunderland		
West London+		
Wolverhampton		



**Appendix 2: Actual Job Titles of EMT Advertised Posts****Table 1: Heads of Institution (Vice-chancellors)**

	<i>Pre-1992s</i>	<i>Post-1992s</i>	<i>Total</i>
Vice-Chancellor	18	26	44
Vice-Chancellor and Principal	2	0	2
Vice-Chancellor and Chief Executive	1	2	3
President and Vice-chancellor	1	0	1
Director	1	0	1
Principal	3	0	3
Rector	1	1	2
Warden	1	0	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>57</b>

**Table 2: Deputy Heads of Institution (Deputy Vice-chancellors)**

	<i>Pre-1992s</i>	<i>Post-1992s</i>	<i>Total</i>
Deputy Vice-Chancellor	3	11	14
DVC (with portfolio)	3	25	28
Senior Deputy Vice-Chancellor	1	0	1
Vice-Principal	2	0	2
Vice-Principal (with portfolio)	1	0	1
Vice-Principal/Director (with portfolio)	0	1	1
Vice-Principal and Executive Dean	2	0	2
Vice-President and Dean	2	0	2
Deputy Rector (with portfolio)	0	1	1
Vice Provost (with portfolio)	1	0	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>53</b>

**Table 3: Pro Vice-Chancellors**

	<i>Pre-1992s</i>	<i>Post-1992s</i>	<i>Total</i>
Pro Vice-Chancellor	0	5	5
Executive Pro Vice-Chancellor	0	1	1
PVC (with functional portfolio)	34	45	79
PVC (faculty/subject)	3	2	5
PVC and Dean/Head of (faculty/subject)	9	15	24
PVC and Executive Dean of (faculty/subject)	0	8	8
Executive PVC and Dean/Head of (subject)	2	0	2
PVC/Provost (campus)	1	2	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>127</b>

**Table 4: Heads of Administration (Registrars)**

	<i>Pre-1992s</i>	<i>Post-1992s</i>	<i>Total</i>
Registrar & Secretary (or vice versa)	7	1	8
Registrar	5	3	8
Registrar & CEO	1	0	1
Registrar and Director of Administration	1	0	1
University Secretary	2	6	8
University Secretary & Registrar	0	2	2
Chief Operating Officer	3	2	5
Head of Administration	1	0	1
Director of Services	0	1	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>35</b>

**Table 5: Directors of Finance**

	<i>Pre-1992s</i>	<i>Post-1992s</i>	<i>Total</i>
Director of Finance	5	5	10
Finance Director	1	2	3
Chief Finance Officer	0	1	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>14</b>

**Table 6: Other EMT Posts**

	<i>Pre-1992s</i>	<i>Post-1992s</i>	<i>Total</i>
Executive Deans	14	6	20
Executive Director of Estates & Property Services	1	0	1
Executive Director of Human Resources	1	0	1
Executive Director of Organisation & People Development	0	1	1
Director of Planning	1	0	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>24</b>

**Appendix 3: Advertised EMT Posts in 1994 Group**

<i>University</i>	<i>Post</i>	<i>Closing Date</i>	<i>ESA</i>
<b>Vice-chancellors</b>			
Durham	Vice-chancellor	17/04/2006	Perrett Laver Partnership
Essex	Vice-chancellor	18/12/2006	Perrett Laver Partnership
UEA	Vice-chancellor	29/03/2006	Saxton Bampfylde Hever
Sussex	Vice-chancellor	05/03/2007	Perrett Laver Partnership
Queen Mary	Principal	17/07/2008	Heidrick & Struggles
Goldsmiths	Warden	04/09/2009	Heidrick & Struggles
Queen Mary	Principal	16/04/2009	
Royal Holloway	Principal	05/01/2009	Saxton Bampfylde Hever
UEA	Vice-chancellor	26/02/2009	Perrett Laver Partnership
IOE	Director	13/05/2010	Saxton Bampfylde Hever
<b>Deputy Vice-chancellors</b>			
Queen Mary	Vice-Principal	02/06/2006	
Surrey	DVC (Research and Innovation)	21/03/2008	Perrett Laver Partnership
Surrey	DVC (Academic Development)	21/03/2008	Perrett Laver Partnership
Surrey	Senior Deputy Vice-chancellor	01/03/2009	Perrett Laver Partnership
Surrey	DVC (Academic Development)	01/07/2009	Perrett Laver Partnership
Queen Mary	Vice-Principal and Executive Dean (Science and Engineering)	24/03/2010	Perrett Laver Partnership
Queen Mary	Vice-Principal and Executive Dean (Warden of St Barts and the London School of Medicine and Dentistry)	28/10/2010	Perrett Laver Partnership
<b>Pro Vice-chancellors</b>			
Durham	PVC (Student Experience)	24/04/2006	Norman Broadbent
Loughborough	PVC (Enterprise)	30/07/2006	
Sussex	PVC (Enterprise)	23/02/2006	Perrett Laver Partnership
Sussex	PVC (Research)	23/02/2006	Perrett Laver Partnership
Sussex	PVC (Teaching and Learning)	23/02/2006	Perrett Laver Partnership
Durham	PVC (Research)	21/02/2008	Perrett Laver Partnership
Durham	PVC (Learning and Teaching)	14/02/2008	
Leicester	PVC (Resources)	01/07/2008	Harvey Nash
Leicester	PVC and Head of College of Arts, Humanities and Law	01/07/2008	Harvey Nash
Leicester	PVC and Head of College of Social Sciences	01/07/2008	Harvey Nash
Leicester	PVC and Head of College of Science and Engineering	01/07/2008	Harvey Nash
Loughborough	PVC (Enterprise)	20/10/2008	
Bath	PVC (Learning & Teaching)	02/09/2009	
Durham	PVC (Science)	27/03/2009	
Leicester	PVC (Research and Enterprise)	05/10/2009	Harvey Nash
Sussex	PVC (International)	07/05/2009	Perrett Laver Partnership
Sussex	PVC (Teaching and Learning)	19/11/2009	Perrett Laver Partnership
Lancaster	PVC (International)	23/07/2010	

<b>Registrars</b>			
Bath	University Secretary	30/04/2006	Odgers
Goldsmiths	Secretary & Registrar	11/08/2006	Odgers
Leicester	Registrar & Secretary	01/02/2006	Saxton Bampfylde Hever
SOAS	Registrar	31/03/2006	
Surrey	Registrar	09/06/2006	
Loughborough	Chief Operating Officer	04/04/2007	Perrett Laver Partnership
Durham	Registrar and Secretary	23/01/2009	NRG Executive
Loughborough	Chief Operating Officer	23/05/2009	Odgers
SOAS	Registrar & Secretary	15/05/2009	
Sussex	Registrar & Secretary	02/07/2009	Perrett Laver Partnership
Royal Holloway	Registrar and Director of Administration	18/08/2010	Saxton Bampfylde Hever
Surrey	Registrar	31/08/2010	Perrett Laver Partnership
<b>Others</b>			
Loughborough	Director of Finance	07/01/2008	Carbonsearch
Goldsmiths	Director of Finance	26/02/2009	
Birkbeck	Executive Deans x 5	16/02/2009	

**Appendix 4: Advertised EMT Posts in Russell Group**

<i>University</i>	<i>Post</i>	<i>Closing Date</i>	<i>ESA</i>
<b>Vice-chancellors</b>			
Newcastle	Vice-chancellor	21/04/2006	Heidrick & Struggles
Sheffield	Vice-chancellor	17/10/2006	Saxton Bampfylde Hever
Birmingham	Vice-chancellor and Principal	03/08/2007	Saxton Bampfylde Hever
Imperial	Rector	23/02/2007	Saxton Bampfylde Hever
Liverpool	Vice-chancellor	15/06/2007	
Nottingham	Vice-chancellor	17/10/2007	Perrett Laver Partnership
Oxford	Vice-chancellor	20/03/2008	Heidrick & Struggles
Cambridge	Vice-chancellor	01/06/2009	Perrett Laver Partnership
Manchester	President and Vice-chancellor	06/04/2010	Perrett Laver Partnership
<b>Deputy Vice-chancellors</b>			
Birmingham	Vice-Principal	13/06/2007	Saxton Bampfylde Hever
Bristol	Deputy Vice-chancellor	22/10/2007	
KCL	Vice Principal (Research & Innovation)	28/03/2008	Heidrick & Struggles
UCL	Vice-Provost (Operations)	15/04/2009	Perrett Laver Partnership
Manchester	Vice-President and Dean of the Faculty of Humanities	06/01/2010	Perrett Laver Partnership
Manchester	Vice-President and Dean of the Faculty of Medical and Human Sciences	04/11/2010	Saxton Bampfylde Hever
<b>Pro Vice-chancellors</b>			
Oxford	PVC (Research, Academic Services & University Collections)	27/02/2006	
Oxford	PVC (Planning and Resources)	06/10/2006	
Newcastle	PVC and Head of Humanities and Social Sciences	10/10/2007	Tribal Resourcing
Newcastle	PVC (Research and Innovation)	11/02/2008	Tribal Resourcing
Newcastle	PVC (Engagement)	11/02/2008	Tribal Resourcing
Sheffield	PVC (Research and Innovation)	18/01/2008	
Sheffield	PVC (Learning and Teaching)	18/01/2008	
Sheffield	PVC (External Affairs)	18/01/2008	
Sheffield	PVC and Head of Arts	18/01/2008	
Sheffield	PVC and Head of Engineering	18/01/2008	
Sheffield	PVC and Head of Medicine	18/01/2008	
Sheffield	PVC and Head of Pure Science	18/01/2008	
Sheffield	PVC and Head of Social Science	18/01/2008	
Liverpool	Executive PVC (Health & Life Sciences)	17/08/2009	
Liverpool	Executive PVC (Human & Social Sciences)	17/08/2009	
Liverpool	PVC for Internationalisation	17/08/2009	
Birmingham	PVC (Education)	22/09/2010	Perrett Laver Partnership
Birmingham	PVC (Research and Knowledge Transfer)	22/09/2010	Perrett Laver Partnership
Liverpool	PVC (Student Experience)	13/03/2010	

Newcastle	PVC (Learning, Teaching and Student Experience)	01/10/2010	
Oxford	PVC (Development and External Affairs)	01/03/2010	
Sheffield	PVC (Arts and Humanities)	03/05/2010	
Sheffield	PVC (External Affairs)	03/05/2010	
<b>Registrars</b>			
KCL	Head of Administration	03/04/2006	Heidrick & Struggles
Nottingham	Registrar	Jun-06	
Southampton	Registrar & Chief Operating Officer	10/07/2006	Heidrick & Struggles
Sheffield	Registrar & Secretary	05/03/2009	Perrett Laver Partnership
Oxford	Registrar	11/06/2010	Saxton Bampfylde Hever
<b>Others</b>			
UCL	Director of Finance	23/05/2007	Odgers
Liverpool	Director of Finance	25/05/2009	
Liverpool	Director of Planning	10/04/2007	
Southampton	Executive Deans x 8	13/05/2010	Perrett Laver Partnership

**Appendix 5: Advertised EMT Posts in Other Pre-1992 HEIs**

<i>University</i>	<i>Post</i>	<i>Closing Date</i>	<i>ESA</i>
<b>Vice-chancellors</b>			
Bradford	Vice-chancellor and Principal	09/10/2006	Perrett Laver Partnership
City	Vice-chancellor	20/10/2006	Heidrick & Struggles
Kent	Vice-chancellor	07/01/2007	Odgers
Hull	Vice-chancellor	30/10/2008	Odgers
OU	Vice-chancellor	15/08/2008	Odgers
Salford	Vice-chancellor and Chief Executive	30/06/2008	Heidrick & Struggles
City	Vice-chancellor	31/12/2009	Perrett Laver Partnership
Keele	Vice-chancellor	02/10/2009	Perrett Laver Partnership
London	Vice-chancellor	13/07/2009	Saxton Bampfylde Hever
<b>Deputy Vice-chancellors</b>			
Keele	Deputy Vice-chancellor	06/12/2007	Perrett Laver Partnership
Bradford	Deputy Vice-chancellor	21/11/2008	
<b>Pro Vice-chancellors</b>			
Kent	PVC (Research)	28/04/2006	
OU	PVC (Curriculum and Awards)	13/10/2006	Heidrick & Struggles
OU	PVC (Learning and Teaching)	13/10/2006	Heidrick & Struggles
Kent	PVC (Medway)	18/01/2007	
Kent	PVC (External)	18/01/2007	
Hull	PVC (Learning & Teaching)	20/11/2009	Veredus
Hull	PVC (Engagement)	20/11/2009	Veredus
Salford	PVC (Academic)	25/02/2010	Heidrick & Struggles
<b>Registrars</b>			
Bradford	University Secretary	05/05/2006	
Aston	Chief Operating Officer	14/05/2007	Heidrick & Struggles
Cranfield	Secretary & Registrar	05/03/2010	
<b>Others</b>			
Salford	Director of Finance	26/09/2006	Heidrick & Struggles
Brunel	Finance Director	28/09/2009	Saxton Bampfylde Hever
Salford	Executive Director of Estates and Property Services	29/05/2007	Heidrick & Struggles
Salford	Executive Director of Human Resources	29/05/2007	Heidrick & Struggles
Aston	Executive Dean	14/10/2010	Heidrick & Struggles

**Appendix 6: Advertised EMT Posts in Post-1992 HEIS**

<i>University</i>	<i>Post</i>	<i>Closing Date</i>	<i>ESAs</i>
<b>Vice-chancellors</b>			
Anglia Ruskin	Vice-chancellor	21/05/2006	Odgers
Chichester	Vice-chancellor	12/09/2006	Odgers
East London	Vice-chancellor	16/10/2006	Perrett Laver Partnership
Huddersfield	Vice-chancellor	29/03/2006	Perrett Laver Partnership
Oxford Brookes	Vice-chancellor	09/06/2006	Perrett Laver Partnership
Sheffield Hallam	Vice-chancellor	09/10/2006	Heidrick & Struggles
Southampton Solent	Vice-chancellor	25/08/2006	Odgers
Westminster	Vice-chancellor	06/10/2006	Perrett Laver Partnership
Northumbria	Vice-chancellor	25/09/2007	Perrett Laver Partnership
Plymouth	Vice-chancellor	18/05/2007	Perrett Laver Partnership
University of the Arts	Rector	26/10/2007	Odgers
UWE	Vice-chancellor	05/10/2007	Odgers
Cumbria	Vice-chancellor	24/11/2008	Saxton Bampfylde Hever
London South Bank	Vice-chancellor	14/07/2008	Perrett Laver Partnership
Canterbury CC	Vice-chancellor	02/10/2009	Odgers
East London	Vice-chancellor	02/09/2009	Odgers
Leeds Met	Vice-chancellor	05/05/2009	Heidrick & Struggles
Lincoln	Vice-chancellor	06/05/2009	Saxton Bampfylde Hever
London Met	Vice-chancellor and Chief Executive	01/10/2009	Perrett Laver Partnership
Northampton	Vice-chancellor	18/11/2009	Saxton Bampfylde Hever
York St John	Vice-chancellor	12/10/2009	Heidrick & Struggles
Bournemouth	Vice-chancellor	19/05/2010	Saxton Bampfylde Hever
Chichester	Vice-chancellor	08/11/2010	Perrett Laver Partnership
Cumbria	Vice-chancellor	20/09/2010	Saxton Bampfylde Hever
De Montfort	Vice-chancellor	25/01/2010	Perrett Laver Partnership
Hertfordshire	Vice-chancellor	08/03/2010	Heidrick & Struggles
Kingston	Vice-chancellor	24/09/2010	Odgers
Staffordshire	Vice-chancellor and Chief Executive	18/06/2010	Heidrick & Struggles
Wolverhampton	Vice-chancellor	01/12/2010	Perrett Laver Partnership
<b>Deputy Vice-chancellors</b>			
Northumbria	DVC (Learning & Teaching)	29/09/2006	Perrett Laver Partnership
Northumbria	DVC (Research & Enterprise)	29/09/2006	Perrett Laver Partnership
Plymouth	DVC (Academic)	06/01/2006	
Teeside	DVC (Development)	29/09/2006	Odgers
Teeside	DVC (Research & Enterprise)	29/09/2006	Odgers
Bedfordshire	DVC (External Relations)	23/07/2007	Perrett Laver Partnership
Hertfordshire	Deputy Vice-chancellor	05/10/2007	Perrett Laver Partnership
London Met	DVC (Research & Development)	25/05/2007	
Northumbria	DVC (Research & Enterprise)	23/04/2007	Perrett Laver Partnership
Sunderland	DVC (Resources)	17/12/2007	NRG
Central Lancashire	Director/VP (Strategic Planning and Performance)	11/01/2008	



Manchester Met	DVC (Student Experience)	25/02/2008	Carbonsearch
Manchester Met	DVC (Strategic Planning)	25/02/2008	Carbonsearch
Plymouth	Deputy Vice-chancellor	23/04/2008	Perrett Laver Partnership
Plymouth	Deputy Vice-chancellor	23/04/2008	Perrett Laver Partnership
Teeside	DVC (Learning & Student Experience)	08/08/2008	Odgers
West London	DVC (Enterprise)	16/01/2008	Perrett Laver Partnership
West London	DVC (Academic)	16/01/2008	Perrett Laver Partnership
Gloucestershire	DVC (Operations)	12/03/2009	Perrett Laver Partnership
Greenwich	DVC (Resources)	02/04/2009	
Greenwich	DVC (Academic Development)	06/05/2009	
Huddersfield	Deputy Vice-chancellor	29/05/2009	
Kingston	Deputy Vice-chancellor	10/08/2009	
Northumbria	DVC (Strategic Planning)	11/02/2009	Perrett Laver Partnership
Plymouth	Deputy Vice-chancellor	21/10/2009	
Sheffield Hallam	Deputy Vice-chancellor	29/05/2009	Heidrick & Struggles
Sunderland	DVC (Academic) Research, Knowledge Exchange and Business Engagement	29/09/2009	Perrett Laver Partnership
Teeside	DVC (Development)	04/12/2009	Odgers
Worcester	Deputy Vice-chancellor	09/02/2009	
Bournemouth	Deputy Vice-chancellor	17/11/2010	Saxton Bampfylde Hever
Creative Arts	Deputy Rector (Strategic Development)	23/07/2010	Odgers
Leeds Met	DVC (Student Experience)	22/03/2010	Heidrick & Struggles
Leeds Met	DVC (Research & Enterprise)	22/03/2010	Heidrick & Struggles
Leeds Met	DVC (Strategic Development)	22/03/2010	Heidrick & Struggles
Lincoln	DVC (International, Marketing and Communications)	30/10/2010	
Southampton Solent	Deputy Vice-chancellor	06/04/2010	
Southampton Solent	Deputy Vice-chancellor	06/04/2010	
Sunderland	DVC (Academic) Student Recruitment, Academic Programmes and Partnerships	12/03/2010	
<b>Pro Vice-chancellors</b>			
Bedfordshire	PVC (Research & Enterprise)	04/12/2006	Perrett Laver Partnership
Bournemouth	PVC (Research & Enterprise)	06/01/2006	KMC International
Bournemouth	PVC (Education)	06/01/2006	KMC International
De Montfort	Pro Vice-chancellor	26/04/2006	
Derby	PVC (Academic Development)	19/05/2006	
Derby	PVC (Learning, Teaching and Scholarship)	19/05/2006	
Manchester Met	PVC & Dean of Humanities, Law and Social Sciences	12/12/2006	
Portsmouth	PVC (Resources)	17/03/2006	Norman Broadbent
Sheffield Hallam	PVC (Research)	10/03/2006	Odgers
Westminster	Campus Provost & PVC	19/06/2006	
Wolverhampton	PVC (Academic)	10/03/2006	
Anglia Ruskin	PVC (Research, Scholarship & Development)	27/07/2007	Veredus
Edge Hill	PVC (Students and External)	12/03/2007	
Edge Hill	PVC (Students and External)	22/10/2007	

Greenwich	PVC (Research & Enterprise)	07/06/2007	
Kingston	PVC (External Relations)	31/05/2007	
Kingston	PVC (Employer Engagement)	01/10/2007	
Manchester Met	PVC & Dean of Education	29/05/2007	
Northampton	PVC (Strategic Planning & Resources)	02/02/2007	Heidrick & Struggles
Southampton Solent	PVC (Academic)	10/04/2007	Odgers
Staffordshire	Executive PVC	11/05/2007	
UWE	Executive Dean of Social Sciences and Humanities & PVC	26/01/2007	KMC International
UWE	Executive Dean of Health and Life Sciences & PVC	26/01/2007	KMC International
Anglia Ruskin	PVC & Dean Arts, Law and Social Sciences	04/07/2008	Veredus
Canterbury Christ Church	PVC and Dean of Education	22/02/2008	
Chichester	PVC (External Relations, Research and Employer Engagement)	13/02/2008	
Coventry	PVC (International Development)	07/02/2008	Perrett Laver Partnership
East London	PVC (Academic)	20/02/2008	
East London	PVC (Research and Knowledge Exchange)	20/02/2008	
Huddersfield	PVC (Research & Enterprise)	01/06/2008	
Lincoln	PVC (Student Experience, Participation and Partnership)	14/03/2008	Harvey Nash
Liverpool John Moores	Pro Vice-chancellor	01/08/2008	Tribal Resourcing
Winchester	PVC (Academic)	09/05/2008	
Wolverhampton	PVC (Regional Investment and Development)	13/03/2008	Perrett Laver Partnership
Anglia Ruskin	PVC and Dean of Faculty of Education	23/10/2009	
Buckingham New	PVC and Executive Dean (Society & Health)	12/03/2009	
Buckingham New	PVC and Executive Dean (Creativity & Culture and Enterprise & Innovation)	15/05/2009	
Chester	PVC and Provost Warrington Campus	22/06/2009	
Coventry	PVC (Planning & Resources) and Group Financial Director	12/10/2009	Odgers
Derby	Pro Vice-chancellor	27/09/2009	
Edge Hill	PVC (Academic)	06/03/2009	
London South Bank	PVC (External)	09/12/2009	Perrett Laver Partnership
Manchester Met	PVC and Dean (Art & Design)	13/03/2009	
Manchester Met	PVC and Dean (Science & Engineering)	13/03/2009	
Oxford Brookes	PVC (External Relations)	20/02/2009	
Oxford Brookes	PVC (Student Experience)	20/02/2009	
Plymouth	PVC and Dean of Business School	07/01/2009	Perrett Laver Partnership
Plymouth	PVC and Dean of Health	27/02/2009	
Plymouth	PVC and Dean of Science & Technology	27/02/2009	
Plymouth	PVC (Internationalisation)	21/10/2009	

Sheffield Hallam	PVC (Student Experience, Learning & Teaching)	29/05/2009	Perrett Laver Partnership
UWE	PVC (Research)	13/03/2009	Odgers
UWE	PVC and Executive Dean (Business School)	13/03/2009	Odgers
UWE	PVC and Executive Dean ((Bristol Business School)	02/10/2009	Odgers
Bolton	Pro Vice-chancellor	10/05/2010	
Bournemouth	Pro Vice-chancellor	17/11/2010	Saxton Bampfylde Hever
Canterbury Christ Church	PVC (External Relations)	20/12/2010	
Central Lancashire	PVC (Research & Knowledge Transfer)	28/10/2010	
Central Lancashire	PVC (Student Experience)	13/04/2010	
Cumbria	PVC (Enterprise and Research)	03/06/2010	Saxton Bampfylde Hever
De Montfort	PVC (Research & Innovation)	11/10/2010	Perrett Laver Partnership
De Montfort	PVC (Teaching & Learning)	11/10/2010	Perrett Laver Partnership
East London	PVC (Learning, Teaching and the Student Experience)	18/06/2010	
Manchester Met	Dean of MMU Business School and PVC	28/05/2010	
Manchester Met	Dean of Hollings Faculty and PVC	28/05/2010	
Northumbria	PVC (Learning & Teaching)	05/08/2010	
Northumbria	PVC (Region, Engagement and Partnerships)	12/02/2010	
Northumbria	PVC (Research & Innovation)	12/02/2010	
Nottingham Trent	PVC (Academic)	01/10/2010	Odgers
Nottingham Trent	PVC and Head of the College of Business, Law and Social Sciences	01/10/2010	Odgers
Oxford Brookes	PVC (Research)	09/04/2010	
Oxford Brookes	PVC and Dean of the Faculty of Technology, Design and Environment	27/09/2010	Heidrick & Struggles
Sheffield Hallam	PVC and Dean Sheffield Business School	08/11/2010	Heidrick & Struggles
Sheffield Hallam	PVC Faculty of Arts, Computing, Engineering & Sciences	28/05/2010	Heidrick & Struggles
York St John	PVC (Development)	28/10/2010	NRG
York St John	PVC (Resources)	28/10/2010	NRG
UWE	PVC and Executive Dean Faculty of Creative Arts, Humanities and Education	19/04/2010	
UWE	PVC and Executive Dean Faculty of Health and Life Sciences	19/04/2010	
<b>Registrars</b>			
Bolton	University Secretary	26/05/2006	Hays
Kingston	University Secretary	03/03/2006	
Manchester Met	Director of Services	17/03/2006	
Manchester Met	Registrar	17/03/2006	
Bedfordshire	University Secretary	30/01/2009	
Birmingham City	University Secretary	05/06/2009	Veredus
East London	Secretary & Registrar	12/10/2009	Odgers
Bedfordshire	Registrar	05/05/2010	Perrett Laver Partnership

Cumbria	University Secretary & Registrar	03/06/2010	Saxton Bampfylde Hever
De Montfort	Chief Operating Officer	11/10/2010	Perrett Laver Partnership
Gloucestershire	Chief Operating Officer	12/05/2010	
Northumbria	University Secretary	14/05/2010	
Oxford Brookes	Registrar	09/04/2010	
West London	University Secretary and Registrar	07/05/2010	
West London	University Secretary	16/06/2010	
<b>Others</b>			
Chichester	Director of Finance	09/06/2006	
East London	Director of Finance	16/06/2006	KMC International
Northampton	Finance Director	16/10/2006	KMC International
Teeside	Director of Finance	20/06/2008	NRG
Hertfordshire	Director of Finance	03/04/2009	Odgers
Westminster	Director of Finance	May-09	
Kingston	Finance Director	19/10/2010	
Lincoln	Chief Finance Officer	24/10/2010	Harvey Nash
South Bank	Executive Dean of Business, Computing & Information Management	16/02/2007	Heidrick & Struggles
South Bank	Executive Dean of Engineering, Science & the Built Environment	16/02/2007	Heidrick & Struggles
South Bank	Executive Dean of Arts & Human Sciences	02/10/2007	Heidrick & Struggles
Cumbria	Executive Dean Arts, Business and Science	03/06/2010	Saxton Bampfylde Hever
Cumbria	Executive Dean Education	03/06/2010	Saxton Bampfylde Hever
Cumbria	Executive Dean Health	03/06/2010	Saxton Bampfylde Hever
Staffordshire	Executive Director of Organisation & People Development	11/05/2007	

## Appendix 7: Use of Executive Search Agencies

**Table 1: Executive search agencies utilized for EMT posts by sector**

	<i>Pre-1992s</i>		<i>Post-1992s</i>		<i>Total</i>	
	<i>Posts</i>	<i>% Sector</i>	<i>Posts</i>	<i>% Sector</i>	<i>Posts</i>	<i>% Total</i>
Perrett Laver Partnership	39	44	33	31	72	37
Heidrick & Struggles	17	19	16	15	33	17
Odgers	7	8	23	22	30	15
Saxton Bampfylde Hever	13	15	13	12	26	13
Norman Broadbent	1	1	1	1	2	1
Tribal Resourcing	3	3	1	1	4	2
Harvey Nash	5	6	2	2	7	4
Veredus	2	2	3	3	5	3
NRG Executive	1	1	4	4	5	3
Carbon Search	1	1	2	2	3	2
KMC international	0	0	6	6	6	3
Hays	0	0	1	1	1	1
<b><i>Total</i></b>	<b><i>89</i></b>	<b><i>100</i></b>	<b><i>105</i></b>	<b><i>100%</i></b>	<b><i>194</i></b>	<b><i>100%</i></b>

**Appendix 8: Breakdown of DVC Posts by Portfolio**

<i>Specified Portfolio</i>	<i>Pre-1992s</i>	<i>Post-1992s</i>	<i>Total</i>
<b>Academic</b>			
Academic	0	2	2
Academic and Development	2	1	3
	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Teaching and Learning</b>			
	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Research</b>			
	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Enterprise</b>			
	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Research and Enterprise</b>			
Research and Enterprise	0	4	4
Research and Innovation	2	0	2
Research and Development	0	1	1
	<b>2</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Planning and Resources</b>			
Resources	0	2	2
Strategic Planning and Performance	0	1	1
Strategic Planning	0	2	2
Strategic Development	0	2	2
Operations	1	1	2
Development	0	2	2
	<b>1</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>External Relations</b>			
	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>International</b>			
International, Marketing and Comms	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Student Experience</b>			
Student Experience	0	2	2
Learning and Student Experience	0	1	1
	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Hybrid/Multiple Portfolios</b>			
(Academic) Research, Knowledge Exchange and Business Engagement	0	1	1
(Academic) Student Recruitment, Academic Programmes and Partnerships	0	1	1
	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>32</b>

**Appendix 9: Breakdown of PVC Posts by Portfolio**

<i>Specified Portfolio</i>	<i>Pre-1992s</i>	<i>Post-1992s</i>	<i>Total</i>
<b><i>Academic</i></b>			
Academic	1	6	7
Academic and Development	0	1	1
Curriculum and Awards	1	0	1
	<b>2</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>9</b>
<b><i>Teaching and Learning</i></b>			
Teaching and Learning (or vice versa)	6	2	8
Education	1	1	2
Learning , Teaching and Scholarship	0	1	1
	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>11</b>
<b><i>Research</i></b>			
	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>
<b><i>Enterprise</i></b>			
Enterprise	3	0	3
Regional Investment and Development	0	1	1
Employer Engagement	0	1	1
	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5</b>
<b><i>Research and Enterprise</i></b>			
Research and Enterprise	1	5	6
Research and Innovation	2	2	4
Research and Knowledge Exchange	0	1	1
Research and Knowledge Transfer	1	1	2
	<b>4</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>13</b>
<b><i>Planning and Resources</i></b>			
Resources	1	2	3
Planning and Resources	1	0	1
Strategic Planning and Resources	0	1	1
Planning, Resources and Group Planning Director	0	1	1
Development	0	1	1
	<b>2</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>7</b>
<b><i>External Relations</i></b>			
External	1	1	2
External Affairs	2	0	2
External Relations	0	3	3
Engagement	2	0	2
Development and External Affairs	1	0	1
Regional Engagement and Partnerships	0	1	1
	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>11</b>
<b><i>International</i></b>			
International	2	0	2
Internationalisation	1	1	2

International Development	0	1	1
	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5</b>
<b><i>Student Experience</i></b>			
Student Experience	2	2	4
Student Experience, Participation and Partnership	0	1	1
Student Experience, Learning and Teaching	1	2	3
	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>8</b>
<b><i>Hybrid/Multiple Portfolios</i></b>			
Students and External	0	2	2
Research, Academic Services and University Collections	1	0	1
External Relations, Research and Employer Engagement	0	1	1
Research, Scholarship and Development	0	1	1
	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>80</b>