Chapter 3

FORMAL BASIS TO THE OFFICE AND APPOINTMENT PROCEDURES

Introduction

Since Australian universities are statutory bodies constituted under an Act of Parliament, it is pertinent when examining any aspect of a university's formal structure or any part of its operations to look initially at the legal powers and obligations which a given Act prescribes in respect of the matter being examined. To respond to the first of the three simple questions underpinning this research, "How is the office of vice-chancellor defined in Australian universities?", one is compelled to review legislation that affects that office. Thus, in the first section of this chapter, a survey of the legal and formal basis to the office is done through an analysis of the enabling legislation which constituted the nineteen universities and also of those derivative acts, statutes and bylaws which mention, with any significance, the office, power, or duties of a vice-chancellor.

This analysis of legislation yields a relatively static profile of the office. In the second section of the chapter, some life is breathed into the bare bones of this anatomy through an evaluation of appointment procedures, including advertisement, selection criteria, and interview patterns. In later chapters the office and role are fleshed out and a physiology is articulated as incumbent vice-chancellors delineate work patterns in response to issues that impinge on the office.

Legal and Formal Basis

Data Sources and Collection. University legislation enacted by parliaments and by governing councils are documents which clearly stand in the public domain. In Australia, these acts, bylaws and other subsidiary regulations are published in an institution's *Calendar* or similar compendium. Usually a university calendar includes, or in the case of larger and academically more differentiated institutions, is published in conjunction with, degree requirements and course patterns and outlines. The writer had recourse to these publications but was aware that the legislation in them may not be always current for two reasons: firstly, because of the slowness with which legislation achieves its final form as an amendment or new instrument passes through university decision-making bodies before engaging like processes in the appropriate parliament; and because of the time lag involved in a major and complex publishing undertaking such as a university calendar.

To obtain synchronous information a letter was sent in April 1986 to the registrar of each university requesting that current copies of the following documents be furnished:

1. The University Act.

2. Any bylaws that deal specifically with the office of vice-chancellor, pro- or deputy vice-chancellor/s, registrar, secretary and/or any other senior executive and administrative officers.

3. Any resolutions of council that deal specifically with the office, role, powers, functions and duties of the vice-chancellor and/or pro- or deputy vice-chancellor/s.

4. Any other information that might contribute to a fuller understanding of this important but relatively unstudied office.

Registrars were assured "that any confidential data provided under Item 4 will be treated confidentially" and that "as the focus of research is on the office of vice-chancellor, there would be no identification of particular institutions or persons". A copy of the letter and a list of the addressees are at Appendix 1.

Justification for the data requested under Item 1 and Item 2 has been discussed already. In respect of the latter, which included a request for bylaws relating to associated officers other than the vice-chancellor, it was thought that these contrastive perspectives might sharpen the focus on the office under scrutiny. All universities responded with copies of legislation in these two categories and these data form the basis of the ensuing analysis.

One intention underlying the request in Item 3 was, at this point in the research, to extend the analysis beyond a fairly static review of legislation, to move directly into the more animated interaction between a university council and its executive officers as specific issues were encountered which often demand an interpretation or expression of the role, powers, and functions of an individual or a group. On the basis of available data such an analysis could not be undertaken here because the general response was that council resolutions relating to the office of vice-chancellor were not codified or otherwise accessible. Several registrars furnished one or two resolutions, passed in recent years; only one provided comprehensive data, at least for the period 1959 to 1986. In providing this set of resolutions, that registrar doubtless echoed the sentiments of his colleagues in other universities when he advised:

These resolutions are rather disconnected and reflect the fact that generally they arose because of a specific issue rather than from a systematic examination of the role of the Vice-Chancellor. (R.7)

This statement, and the assistance registrars were able to give was not at all discouraging, but provided further stimulus to continue the research.

The data resulting from the request under Item 4, while contributory, were less than comprehensive. Included in this response category were: extracts from the administrative or management handbooks in several universities; organisation charts and duty statements from others; and a report of a committee of administrative review. These assisted the analysis generally rather than in respect of single institutions.

Other Sources and Perspectives. Thus the principal data source is university legislation. A secondary and complementary source is government reports and inquiries notable among which are: the *Murray Report* with its somewhat normative statements about the vice-chancellor's office, *e.g.*, "a Vice-Chancellor is, or ought to be, the academic and executive head of the whole institution" (Murray, 1957, S.343); the *Martin Report* of 1964 primarily concerned with the creation of an advanced education sector; the Williams Report on *Education, Training and Employment* which concluded its chapters on universities by referring to "the final responsibility" of governing bodies and their need for reliable information (Williams, 1979, 212); and the more recent *Efficiency and Effectiveness Report* which also notes that "the council carries the ultimate legal responsibility for the institution's activities and is thus the formal means by which the institution exercises its accountability to the Parliament and the community" (Hudson, 1986, 255). As observed elsewhere in this thesis, little is explicitly written about the vice-chancellor in these reports; much would seem to depend on tradition generally, and on the convention of particular universities. However, by critical evaluation of such legal and formal responsibilities that are identified, it should be possible to draw some inferences about the office.

Despite the wealth of literature about the presidency in universities of the USA, data from that source were not informative for what is essentially not a comparative study. The pluralism of USA higher education, in particular the different legislative and financial matrix, had little in common with the relatively monochrome relationships between government and institutions that existed in the Australian university sector in the 1980s. By comparison, UK government reports were contributory. The *Robbins Report* dealt specifically with the complexity of the vice-chancellorial office (Robbins, 1963, S.676). The *Jarratt Report* recognized that British "Vice-Chancellors have virtually no formal constitutional powers other than those which may be delegated to them" (Jarratt, 1985, 26).

A final and significant source of data is the 576 page *Transcript of Proceedings of the Academic Salaries Tribunal,* which sat in 1985. The writer attended all but one day of the Tribunal's sittings in Sydney during which Mr. Justice J.T. Ludeke heard an application by the chancellors of eighteen Australian Universities into salaries payable to vice-chancellors. (Sydney University did not participate). Ambit claims by some colleges of advanced education and institutes of technology for remuneration for their executive heads at parity with vice-

chancellors resulted in the calling as witnesses of a vice-chancellor, a pro-vice-chancellor, and a director of an institute of technology, among others. Cross-examination by counsel of such key witnesses not only provided broader insight into the general topic of research, but also placed in a contemporary and exact locus some legal issues pertaining to the office of vice-chancellor.

Analysis of University Legislation. What is remarkable from a review of the legislation dealing with the office of vice-chancellor in Australia's nineteen universities is its dissimilarity in form, in content and in the selective emphasis given various provisions. In recognizing that all Australian universities owe their foundation to parliamentary legislation, one might expect greater commonality among the instruments by which they were incorporated.

In the following analysis, which is principally concerned with content and to lesser extent with selected emphases, the two pieces of legislation examined are the university act by which the institution is legally inaugurated and subsidiary legislation, generated by the governing body, which deals specifically with the office and role of vice-chancellor. Unless reference is made to a designated legislative instrument, the former will be termed "the act" and the latter, known variously as a bylaw or statute, will be termed "the bylaw". In the legislation the governing council is known as either the Council or the Senate, whereas the principal academic body is known by one of seven different titles: Academic Board, Academic Committee, Academic Council, Academic Senate, Education Committee, Professorial Board, or Senate. Generic terms will be used, the former being designated "the council" and the latter "the academic board".

A reading of the act and the bylaw dealing with the office of vice-chancellor for each university suggested a range of characteristics associated with the legal and formal definition of the office. This range of principal characteristics was clustered into eight elements. The two pieces of legislation were analysed on a matrix showing university (i.e., its act and bylaw) by the extent to which the principal elements in the legislation relating to the office of vice-chancellor are formally identified. A tripartite scale was used to indicate whether an element was (1) explicit, or (2) implied, or (3) not mentioned in the legislation. The results of this analysis are presented in Table 3.1 and are discussed in the following review of content. Formal expressions of the legislative basis to the office of vice-chancellor may appear in other subsidiary bylaws; but for the data presented in Table 3.1, the comparative analysis was confined to the act and the vice-chancellorial bylaw.

The analysis begins with a brief note about the office of vice-chancellor compared with that of chancellor and of deputy chancellor. In all universities it is evident that the vice-chancellor is identified as the principal officer charged with the day to day leadership and

Table 3.1 Legislative Basis to the Office of Vice-Chancellor

University	Legislative Elements							
	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
Adelaide	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-
ANU	+	+	+	-	+	/	-	-
Deakin	+	+	+	/	+	+	/	-
Flinders	+	+	/	-	+	-	/	-
Griffith	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+
James Cook	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-
La Trobe	+	+	+	/	+	+	/	-
Macquarie	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+
Melbourne	+	+	+	-	+	/	/	+
Monash	+	+	+	-	+	/	-	/
Murdoch	+	+	+	-	/	+	+	-
Newcastle	+	+	+	-	+	/	/	/
New England	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+
New South Wales	+	+	+	+	-	+	/	+
Queensland	+ (1)	+	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sydney	+	+	+	+	/	+	+	+
Tasmania	+ (1)	+	+	+	+	+	/	/
Western Australia	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+
Wollongong	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

Element: 1. CEO of University; 2. Member of Council, *ex officio*; 3. Powers and duties as prescribed; 4. Promote interests and further the development of university; 5. Exercise general superintendence over the affairs of university; 6. Responsible for academic, administrative, financial and other business of university; 7. Exercise general supervision over all persons in service of university; 8. Exercise general supervision over welfare and discipline of students of university.

Key: +   Explicit
/   Implied
-   No Mention

Note: (1)   Variation in title.

management of the enterprise. While this role is clearly ascribed, it is also commonly stated in the legislation that no authority given to the vice-chancellor "shall affect the precedence or authority of the Chancellor or Deputy Chancellor". In Australian universities these latter two offices are honorific and non-remunerative posts, usually held by leading citizens. In the past,

members of the judiciary and retired academics have held such appointments; more recent new appointments as chancellor have tended to favour blue-chip industrialists and business leaders.

A chancellor has the right formally to be a member of any committee, board or faculty within the university and may preside at any meeting of such a committee. The writer is unaware of any chancellor having exercised these rights in the domain of academic decision-making. Chancellors chair meetings of the council and often of several sub-committees of council and are most frequently seen presiding at graduation ceremonies and on other formal occasions. Depending upon personal circumstances, some chancellors have become active ambassadors for their institutions and for specific university programs, often of a fund raising or development nature, with which they have become closely associated. The involvement of a chancellor in the day to day operations of a university is not expected, nor would it be welcome.

As the principal officer of the university who is engaged full time on university affairs, the vice-chancellor is designated in the act and bylaw of each university, "the Chief Executive Officer". There are two variations to this title, one expansionary and the other possibly restrictive. In the University of Tasmania legislation, the vice-chancellor is styled "the Chief Academic and Executive Officer"; at the University of Queensland, the act declares the vice-chancellor to be "the Chief Administrative Officer". Both probably have local and historic explanations. The University of Queensland is on record in not having a full time, salaried and academically qualified vice-chancellor until 1960 (some 30 years after other comparable Australian universities), the incumbent for the preceding 22 years being a retired State public servant.

The only other legislative element which all acts and bylaws have in common is the vice-chancellor's being a member, *ex officio*, of the university council. Other bylaws, beyond the scope of the present analysis, also give the vice-chancellor membership of the academic board and usually a right, similar to that of a chancellor, to be a member of any university committee. Thus a vice-chancellor is formally incorporated into the senior policy making body of the organisation, the university council. A vice-chancellor possesses the distinction, sometimes shared with one or more of the deputy vice-chancellors should there be any, also of formally being an active member of the senior academic governance body, the academic board. Ideally, this common membership should see the vice-chancellor standing as a bridge linking the endeavours of each body, or in popular parlance, acting as a vital communication modem. Whether the vice-chancellor is seen as a creature of the council or as an emissary of the academic board is beyond the scope of this study and merits investigation in other research.

Apart from the above two legislative elements common to all nineteen universities, there remain six provisions relating to the office of vice-chancellor which are specified in the act and the bylaw of various universities. Following the initial content analysis of legislation detailed in Table 3.1, the data were subject to a number of simple analytical measures to establish if any pattern obtained. Several of these are presented, the first of which in Table 3.2 is the frequency of citation of each legislative element according to the tripartite scale previously used.

No pattern or set of relationships is immediately evident. The frequency of citation of the legislative elements ranges from the University of Adelaide and the University of Queensland which include only the two provisions previously reviewed, to the University of Wollongong which specifies all eight elements in its legislation. It could be more than coincidence that Wollongong is the most recently established of the universities studied, and the second to evolve from a dependency relationship as a college of the University of New South Wales.

Adelaide and Queensland are also the two universities which do not specify in their acts that the vice-chancellor "shall possess such powers and perform such duties as the Bylaws prescribe or, subject to the Bylaws, the Council determines", this being a common form of words for 16 universities. The University of Queensland is singularly distinctive in that there exists no bylaw dealing with the office of vice-chancellor; and the act simply states there shall be a vice-chancellor. Quite likely this brevity, or lack, relates to what persons associated with that University refer to as the "Story Era", being a reference to J.D. Story, the senior civil servant who became vice-chancellor. The remaining university whose act and bylaw imply, but do not make explicit, the granting to the vice-chancellor of powers and duties, is the Flinders University of South Australia. That Flinders is in the same state and began as a campus of the University of Adelaide might serve to explain this circumstance.

This seemingly plausible explanation encouraged the search for a pattern underlying the legislation for universities within the same state, particularly for any that had commenced as colleges of another institution. Australia's nineteen universities are grouped by state or territory in Table 3.3. This classification also includes comparative information derived from Table 3.2 about the specification of legislative elements in various universities.

In an analysis of legislation in states where there exists more than one university, the greatest degree of dissimilarity, in terms of legal provisions affecting the office of vice-chancellor, occurs among and between institutions in the states of Queensland, South Australia and Western Australia. The four Victorian universities exhibit totals of legislative elements which, initially, suggest a high degree of similarity among their legislative instruments. A further scrutiny of these comparable raw totals, by reference to distribution of legislative

Table 3.2 Frequency of Citation of Legislative Elements

University	Legislative Elements								Total by University		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	+	/	-
Adelaide	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	0	6
ANU	+	+	+	-	+	/	-	-	4	1	3
Deakin	+	+	+	/	+	+	/	-	5	2	1
Flinders	+	+	/	-	+	-	/	-	3	2	3
Griffith	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	7	0	1
James Cook	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	3	0	5
La Trobe	+	+	+	/	+	+	/	-	5	2	1
Macquarie	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	7	0	1
Melbourne	+	+	+	-	+	/	/	+	5	2	1
Monash	+	+	+	-	+	/	/	/	4	3	1
Murdoch	+	+	+	-	/	+	+	-	5	1	2
Newcastle	+	+	+	-	+	/	/	/	4	3	1
New England	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	7	0	1
New South Wales	+	+	+	+	-	+	/	+	6	1	1
Queensland	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	0	6
Sydney	+	+	+	+	/	+	+	+	7	1	0
Tasmania	+	+	+	+	+	+	/	/	6	2	0
Western Australia	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	7	0	1
Wollongong	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	8	0	0
Total by +	19	19	16	8	10	10	7	8			
Element /	0	0	1	2	2	4	8	3			
-	0	0	2	9	7	5	4	8			

Element: 1. CEO of University; 2. Member of Council, *ex officio*; 3. Powers and duties as prescribed; 4. Promote interests and further the development of university; 5. Exercise general superintendence over the affairs of university; 6. Responsible for academic, administrative, financial and other business of university; 7. Exercise general supervision over all persons in service of university; 8. Exercise general supervision over welfare and discipline of students of university.

Key: +   Explicit
      /   Implied
      -   No Mention

Table 3.3 Comparison of Legislative Elements in Australian Universities by State or Territory

State or Territory	University	Legislative Elements		
		+	/	-
Queensland	Griffith	7	0	1
	James Cook	3	0	5
	Queensland	2	0	6
New South Wales	Macquarie	7	0	1
	Newcastle	4	3	1
	New England	7	0	1
	New South Wales	6	1	1
	Sydney	7	1	0
	Wollongong	8	0	0
Australian Capital Territory	ANU	4	1	3
Victoria	Deakin	5	2	1
	La Trobe	5	2	1
	Melbourne	5	2	1
	Monash	4	3	1
Tasmania	Tasmania	6	2	0
South Australia	Adelaide	2	0	6
	Flinders	3	2	3
Western Australia	Murdoch	5	1	2
	Western Australia	7	0	1

Key: +   Explicit
       /   Implied
       -   No Mention

elements in Table 3.2, indicates that Deakin and La Trobe universities possess a similar legislative basis in terms of the distribution of elements, whereas the University of Melbourne and Monash University both differ from each other and from the other two institutions.

The highest degree of correspondence among university legislation occurs in relation to the six universities of New South Wales. Although the separate acts and bylaws vary, the legislation includes a high proportion of the eight specific elements. And in the case of the Macquarie University and the Universities of New England, New South Wales and of Sydney, it is the same legislative element that is either implied or not mentioned. It should be noted that legislation for the University of Newcastle differs from that of the University of New South Wales of which it was once a college.

One general conclusion is that, with the exception of most of the universities in New South Wales, no overall pattern of legislation affecting the office of vice-chancellor is common to all universities within the same state.

If universities within the same state differ in their definition of the legal and formal basis to the office of vice-chancellor, could it be that institutions established in the same general time frame or at the same juncture in the development of Australia's system of higher education would possess greater similarity? To test this assumption another investigative analysis was pursued, that is, to compare legislative elements among group of institutions according to the classification of Australian universities delineated in Table 2.2 in the previous chapter. These data appear in Table 3.4 with a refinement in the presentation of legislative elements.

The eight legislative elements which are found in the act and bylaw and were identified in Table 3.1 are reasonably discrete dimensions of the formal basis to the office of vice-chancellor, with the exception of Legislative Element No.4 and Legislative Element No.5. These two elements are:

4. Promote interests and further the development of university.

5. Exercise general superintendence over the affairs of university.

The extent to which these two elements interpenetrate, with the former being slightly more expansive than the latter, allow them to be regarded as stylistic variations of the one legal intent; and arguably to be considered as one for the purpose of analysis. From Table 3.1 it can be deduced that these two legislative elements are together explicit in 15 universities, and implied in one with neither being mentioned in three other institutions.

This altered format for data in Table 3.4 has little effect on previous presentations. To use this format in a review of the inquiry pursued in Table 3.3, for example, would reinforce the conclusion that most of the universities in New South Wales are distinctive in possessing a common pattern of legislative elements.

The possibility that the several groups of universities, each established within a similar social ethos, economic climate, and stage in the evolution of a system of higher education, might have a comparable portfolio of legislative elements relating to the vice-chancellorship, proved to be false. Despite what was considered a more finely tuned data presentation, it was found that little or no pattern of comparison obtains; for example, each group has at least one university with all seven legislative elements.

Table 3.4 Comparison of Legislative Elements Within Groups of Universities

Group	Universities	Legislative Elements +	/	-
19th Century Institutions	Sydney	7	0	0
	Melbourne	5	1	1
	Adelaide	2	0	5
	Tasmania	5	2	0
Early 20th Century Institutions	Queensland	2	0	5
	Western Australia	7	0	0
Post War Institutions	New South Wales	6	1	0
	New England	7	0	0
	Monash	4	3	0
	ANU	4	1	2
New Institutions	La Trobe	5	1	1
	Macquarie	7	0	0
	Flinders	3	2	2
	Newcastle	4	3	0
	James Cook	3	0	4
	Griffith	6	0	1
	Murdoch	5	1	1
	Deakin	5	1	1
	Wollongong	7	0	0

Key: + Explicit
      / Implied
      - No Mention

There is one aspect of this analysis which is of passing interest even though it incompletely supports any comparability within groups of universities. It concerns Legislative Element No 8, which deals with a vice-chancellor's formal responsibility for the welfare and discipline of students. Let the Universities of Adelaide and Queensland be set apart as significantly atypical in the provisions included in their act and bylaws. Then, of the six universities which make no mention of the vice-chancellor's legal role in respect to students, all except the ANU are found in the New Institutions group. The issue of students' rights and of student discipline was certainly a dominant one in the decade following 1960 within which many of this group of universities were inaugurated. It is reminiscent of the spirited debate between Sir Eric Ashby and Sir Bruce Williams about the need to distinguish between the university's position *in loco parentis* and the student's position *in statu pupillari* (Williams, 1972). To pursue this matter further would be to stray too far from the central theme.

Specific Emphases. The analysis now moves from consideration of the form and content of legislation affecting the office of vice-chancellor to a brief review of selected specific emphases.

The various analytical strategies pursued in the previous section indicate no clear sets of patterns in the legislation of different universities. However, there would be general concurrence within Australian universities with the statement in Statute 3.3 of Griffith University that "The Vice-Chancellor shall diligently perform the duties lawfully required of him". (S.5.0)

The range of legal and formal duties ascribed to a vice-chancellor in university legislation is both extensive and variable in its specific emphasis in different institutions. For instance, at a mundane level, the Site Bylaws of the University of Western Australia provide that:

> (a) A person shall make application for a Permit or Parking Permit other than a Visitor's-ticket to the Vice-Chancellor or an Authorised Person.
>
> (b) The Vice-Chancellor may prescribe such categories of Parking Permit as he thinks fit. (S.2B)

If credence is given to Clark Kerr's insight about the bonding of disparate academics through their shared grievance over parking, perhaps some Australian vice-chancellors have more in common with American university presidents than the writer recognizes. By comparison the vice-chancellor's role specified in Statute 1.4 of La Trobe University includes more pleasing tasks:

> The Vice-Chancellor may from time to time declare as a University holiday (such other days) whether or not such a day is a gazetted public holiday. (S.2(b))

In the range of concerns touched upon by the university act and bylaw there is evidence suggesting a response to local circumstances. While outside the immediate focus of the present study, examples of local conditions are well illustrated in the composition, *ex officio,* of the council of a university. For example, at the University of Queensland both "the Anglican Archbishop of Brisbane" and "the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Brisbane" are specified as members of council (S.6(a)(vi)&(vii)). This class of membership would not be easily accepted at all other Australian universities, particularly those established earlier than Queensland under the influence of utilitarian philosophers. Another example of local emphasis in the same legislative domain may be found at the University of Tasmania where in making official appointments, the Governor shall consider the desirability of including as council members,

> (a) two persons who have had wide experience, and demonstrated capacity, in commerce, industry, or agriculture; and

(b)   one person who has his usual place of residence in the Northern
        Division of the State (S.5.(5))

To return to the office of vice-chancellor, there are several universities in which legislation gives specific emphasis to procedures for the conduct of an inquiry and the possible removal from office of an incumbent about whom allegations of incapacity in the performance of duties have been submitted. This matter is quite a dominant concern in the legislation of the University of Adelaide and is dealt with in some detail at both La Trobe and Deakin Universities. Another example of local emphasis may be seen in the Vice-Chancellorship statute of the ANU which gives the incumbent powers in relation to intellectual property:

The Vice-Chancellor may -

(a)   act for and on behalf of the University in the administration of
        any right or interest of the University in any intellectual
        property; and

(b)   appoint such persons in Australia or any place outside Australia
        as he or she thinks fit, and subject to such terms and conditions
        as are specified in the instrument of appointment, as agents or
        attorneys to act for and on behalf of the University in the
        administration of any such right or interest. (S.6(1))

This section continues with definitions of "administration" and "intellectual property". That this concern, which constitutes in length 23 per cent of the total Statute, receives such emphasis is appropriate to a university a significant part of whose *raison d'être* is based on its being a national research institution.

The most important matter dealt with in the act and bylaw of each Australian university is the relationship of a university council with its vice-chancellor. In legal standing all councils are unequivocally responsible for the overall management and control of the university, though the legislative expression given to this responsibility varies in detail and in its explicitness. To take as an example, the act of Australia's oldest tertiary institution, the University of Sydney, which states:

> The Senate (council) shall have the entire management of and
> superintendence over the affairs, concerns, and property of the
> University, and in all cases unprovided for by this Act the Senate may
> act in such manner as appears to them to be best calculated to promote
> the purposes of the University. (S.14(2))

This unambiguous declaration follows immediately the section detailing the council's perogative to appoint a vice-chancellor. Comparable statements of responsibility are found in the

legislation of Australian universities as old as Melbourne (at S.15(1)) or as recently established as Wollongong. (at S.25(1)(c))

This clarity, which declares the ultimate responsibility of the council and so defines with other legislation the relationship between council and vice-chancellor, is also present in Bylaws Chapter VI of the University of Sydney which sets out the formal basis to the office of vice-chancellor. After a section defining the office it states:

> (2) The Vice-Chancellor shall, under the Senate (council), subject to the Bylaws and to any resolution of the Senate .... (S2.(2))

While the formal ascendancy of council is reiterated, what follows are eleven sub-sections detailing explicit functional responsibilities of the vice-chancellor. As was indicated in Table 3.1 and subsequent tables, the extent to which significant duties are formally made explicit or implied varies among universities.

The extent to which the legal and formal basis to the office of vice-chancellor is not made explicit in the act and bylaw does not seem ostensibly to affect the operation of an institution. The University of Adelaide and of Queensland are legislatively atypical in their deficient formal treatment of the office of vice-chancellor. Yet each is a major and apparently successful university; and, in terms of a general perception of organisational culture, the two are not of the one type. Reputedly, Queensland University has a centralist administrative tradition with strong authority patterns being tolerated; by contrast, Adelaide University is thought to support a culture which esteems more apparent participation.

The degree of precision in stating a council's ultimate legal power and responsibility should not be interpreted to mean that a vice-chancellor is inversely less responsible for the executive leadership of the university. Chapter VII of the Bylaws dealing with the Vice-Chancellor of Macquarie University, for instance, state explicitly that the Vice-Chancellor:

> (b) shall be responsible for the academic, administrative, financial and other business of the University. (S.3)

Not all universities are formally as explicit for as Table 3.2 indicates only ten institutions, or 53 per cent of the total, specify this legislative element. Yet in view of the drastic decline in funding available to universities in the past decade, we know experientially that a vice-chancellor must be intimately involved with financial management, at least at the level of budget policy and its formulation. This point about the divergence between legal formalities and operational reality is well made in the following example.

Legislation at the ANU does not make as explicit the responsibilities of the vice-chancellor in the financial area as does that, for instance, of Macquarie University. However the incumbent Vice-Chancellor of ANU in 1986, Professor Peter Karmel, was no less responsible for or involved in the strategic management of the institutional budget. In response to a question about the overall responsibilities of a vice-chancellor addressed to him while a witness before the 1985 Academic Salaries Tribunal, Professor Karmel said:

> I think the vice-chancellor's roles are quite wide, but one of the most important ones is to have a grip on the budget, to be deeply involved in the design of the budget from year to year, and in looking ahead to see how the budget will evolve, and in using the budget as a means of bringing about change and growth and evolution within the institution. (AST, 1985, 54-55)

Evidentially this testimony indicates that the Vice-Chancellor of ANU is closely associated with financial management. In terms of other formalities not to be examined here, it should be noted that Australian universities are required to submit annually to their respective parliaments or to the State Governor, a report of operations and to the auditor-general a report of their financial accounts. Both submissions would normally be vetted by the vice-chancellor before being formally approved and transmitted by the council. The finely balanced relationship between a council and the vice-chancellor and particularly between the chancellor and the vice-chancellor was noted during this research and merits investigation in a separate study.

The commonly phrased provision that "the council shall have entire management and control of the affairs, concerns and property of the university" is closely linked to the council's power to delegate. Delegation by a council to an officer or class of officers of the university is another aspect of the legal basis to the vice-chancellorship and also of the formal relationship between a council and the vice-chancellor. In the act and vice-chancellor bylaw not all universities provide, at this level of legislation, authority for delegation to the vice-chancellor. A primary analysis of these two legislative instruments indicates that the power of a council to delegate is explicitly provided in sixteen universities, it is strongly implied in the legislation of the Universities of Sydney and of Western Australia, and is apparently absent in the act and bylaw of the University of Tasmania.

It may be that delegation might be dealt with at another level, for instance, by resolution of the council. The matters of the responsibility of the vice-chancellor to the council, of the vice-chancellor's relationship with the chancellor, and of the delegation of powers are dealt with in some detail, for example, at the University of Melbourne in the Standing Resolutions of Council. In the writer's experience the linked matters of delegation by a council and of the legal liability of council members are often inadequately understood by them and others in a university. At a subsidiary level, detailed delegations for decision-making and of financial

commitments are often provided for in a university's administrative handbook. An excellent example of such provisions was made available by the University of Wollongong.

Summary. This section began by recognizing the need to examine university legislation that deals significantly with the office of vice-chancellor if one is to respond to the question, how is that office defined in Australian universities. What follows now are eight propositions derived from the preceding analysis, the first two of which are general observations.

Proposition 3.1 **There is a remarkable lack of similarity – in form, in content and in specific emphases – in the legislation of Australia's nineteen universities which deals with the office of vice-chancellor despite the comparable parliamentary source of the legislation.**

Proposition 3.2 **In the legislation dealing with the office of vice-chancellor which was analysed, no clear relationship was found to exist among the provisions in Australia's nineteen universities when compared by state of location or by class of university.**

Proposition 3.3 **That certain legislative elements concerning the office of vice-chancellor are not specified does not necessarily imply a lack of responsibility or of professional concern for the management of a university.**

A primary example in support of this proposition may be found at the University of Adelaide, the legislative deficiencies of which in respect of the vice-chancellorship have been remarked upon. From 1979, at least until 1985, that University engaged upon a scrutiny and reorganisation of its decision-making bodies and the functions of principal officers. The *Committee of Administrative Review Consolidated Report 1979-80* (the "Corbett Report") and such council papers as "Committee of Administrative Review: Corbett Revisited" (C/85/1/10), which the writer has examined, stand testimony to an ongoing reappraisal of executive authority and decision-making in that University. Perhaps formal amendments to legislation will follow.

Proposition 3.4 **In a university where brevity is a feature of legislation relating to the vice-chancellor there is no impression that the office and role of vice-chancellor are more constricted than in a university which makes more explicit the legal and formal basis to the office; indeed, the contrary situation may obtain.**

Among Australian universities which exhibit the least number of legislative elements as a formal basis to the office of vice-chancellor are the University of Adelaide, ANU, James

Cook University, Monash University and the University of Queensland. Each institution has four or fewer explicit legislative elements as analysed in Table 3.2. Evidence is not readily available to suggest that the vice-chancellor in any of these universities actually exercises a less influential role than in other Australian universities.

Proposition 3.5 **It is explicitly stated in legislation that a university council has the ultimate legal control over the affairs of a university and it is accepted that the council has authority to delegate powers to the vice-chancellor and other officers of the university.**

The ultimate responsibility of a council is clearly stated though perhaps not so clearly understood. All but one Australian university makes explicit or strongly implies in its legislation the procedure for delegation of powers; and it is assumed that provision exists for subsidiary delegation by council resolution or other approved means.

Proposition 3.6 **In legal terms, a clear intent of the act and bylaw is that the vice-chancellor is the council's officer, appointed by and responsible to the council in discharging the responsibilities of the office.**

The formal position is unquestionable. The minor debate of the 1960s whether a vice-chancellor was a creature of the council or of the academic board was, in part, fostered by Murray who, against a UK background, found the practice in some Australian universities of the vice-chancellor not chairing the academic board to be anomalous.

Proposition 3.7 **Specific emphases in legislation affecting the office of vice-chancellor and also any apparent deficiency may be related to local history, traditions and particular experience within a university.**

Despite standardised formal relations that exist between Australian universities and Commonwealth government authorities, the strength of organisational culture in separate institutions has resulted in different emphases over time in the legislation relating to the legal and formal basis of the vice-chancellorship.

Proposition 3.8 **If decision-making and executive leadership in a university are exercised in an organisational environment which is influenced by political processes, the power of expertise is as important to a vice-chancellor or other officer as any formal specification of responsibilities and powers in legislation.**

The office of vice-chancellor must have an indisputable legal base and the formal relationship of the office with the council must also be unambiguous. All Australian universities provide by legislation that the vice-chancellor is chief executive officer and, *ex officio*, a member of council. Of critical significance then is how the office is occupied, how the role is discharged. These are the latter two of the three initial questions which give direction to this research and the response to them will be presented in the following three chapters.

To conclude this section, it should be noted that Australian universities stand in the broad inheritance of a tradition that is seven hundred years old, with the particular titles of chancellor, vice-chancellor, dean and others deriving from medieval cathedral choir schools. This is a living tradition, like T.S. Eliot's image of tradition as a river rising as a trickle in the hills and surging out at the ocean, one which has been successively received, adapted and transmitted; and yet its essential characteristics, like water in one river compared with another, remain discernible suggesting a strength of organisational culture, corporately and institutionally.

This same enduring and distinctive culture encourages a viewpoint supported by the preceding analysis that legislation defining the office of vice-chancellor is best seen as a framework providing general parameters. Upon such a broad stage individual vice-chancellors assume the mantle of office and often interpret the role differently to that of their predecessor. Key parts and essential action requirements are designated. Differences in discharging such a leading role are accepted and generally encouraged provided the production continues. At one level this interpretation is parallel with the insightful observation of the university registrar who wrote:

> There is no other statutory or documentary material here which is relevant to your survey. It is assumed everyone understands what the role of the Vice-Chancellor is, and so there is no need to write it down! But I guess we are not unique in that. (R.3)

In respect to the office of vice-chancellor, Australian universities are among those social institutions where precedent and convention can be as influential as legal and formal provisions.

Appointment Procedures and Selection Criteria

Because universities are extremely labour intensive organisations, much can be learned about individual institutions by the way in which personnel matters are transacted. Personnel in a broad sense includes two principal groups of constituents internal to a university: students and staff, the latter in Australian universities being usually classified into academic and research staff, and administrative and general staff. The way in which a university advertises a staff

vacancy and then takes action to fill it not only helps to define the position but also makes a statement about the university, explicitly and implicitly. In this context, the interdependent relationship between a position and the organisation is arguably most acute at the level of the chief executive officer, the vice-chancellor.

Thus this section examines appointment procedures and selection criteria for the position of vice-chancellor in all of Australia's nineteen universities in which advertisement action was taken during 1984 and 1985. The total is eight and the institutions subject to study are:

> Deakin University
> Griffith University
> The James Cook University of North Queensland
> Monash University
> Murdoch University
> The University of Newcastle
> The University of New England
> The University of Western Australia

These institutions are sufficiently diverse to represent a profile of Australian institutions. There is diversity in location – from Townsville in North Queensland to Perth in Western Australia; and in the range of adjacent population concentrations – from the University of New England in rural New South Wales to Monash University in metropolitan Melbourne. There is diversity in size as reflected by student numbers with enrolments ranging from 3,000 to in excess of 14,000 students. Organisational diversity is also indicated by the mix of disciplines offered, some institutions offering degrees in from two to all of arts, law/medicine, science, social science and technology. In terms of the classification of universities identified in Table 2.2, all groups are represented except for the group of 19th Century Institutions. It should be noted that three of the eight institutions – Deakin, Griffith and James Cook Universities – were taking action to appoint a successor to the foundation vice-chancellor.

Data Sources and Collection. To obtain data about selection procedures and appointment criteria relating to all of the eight positions of vice-chancellor which were advertised in the preceding two years, telephone contact was made in March 1986, with the registrar or convenor of the selection committee in each of the universities concerned. In one instance the registrar requested that a letter also be sent and in all cases the university was asked to supply:

> 1.   A copy of the advertisement as it appeared.

2. Information given to enquirers, applicants or nominees including details about the post and the university in general.

3. Any initial briefing document or statement of selection criteria prepared as guidance for the selection committee.

Assurances were given that any information not publicly available would not be used in a way that would allow identification of particular institutions or persons. To ensure anonymity each institution and respondent was assigned a code. This also permits an assessment of the frequency and range both of responses and of the use of data from one or more institutions.

All eight universities co-operated in providing the materials requested with the exception that one declined to supply its council's statement of selection criteria. A further letter of explanation and request was sent to the chancellor of that university but to no avail. Several respondents also sent useful material additional to that requested, for example, background papers about contemporary university management prepared for selection committee members, or an evaluation report of procedures which had been followed. Clarification about incomplete or ambiguous data was sought by telephone and/or in personal interviews conducted later in 1986. The data assembled were comprehensive and probably the first and most complete survey of its kind undertaken in respect of the post of vice-chancellor in Australian universities. What follows is an analysis of the data under specific items.

Advertisement Formalities. A forthcoming vacancy in the vice-chancellorship is first noticed beyond a university when an advertisement appears in the press. Until recent years the form of this notice would be more correctly termed a notification of vacancy rather than an advertisement inviting applications. The difference is subtle and seems to connote a movement from a relatively sedate institutional location with its own network of contacts and communications to a more market-place orientation in terms of recruitment at this level.

Of the eight institutions surveyed, only one, the University of New England, aligns itself with the style of a notification of vacancy. It is illustrative to quote extensively from this and several other advertisements to show several different modes. The University of New England's advertisement as it appeared was:

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW ENGLAND
ARMIDALE NSW 2351
AUSTRALIA

VICE-CHANCELLOR

The University is proceeding to the appointment of a Vice-Chancellor
to replace Professor R.C. Gates who will be retiring late in 1984.

The Chancellor will welcome enquiries from persons who may wish to consider applying for the position.

Letters should reach the Chancellor, under confidential cover, by 15 February, 1984.

T.C. Lamble
Registrar

In marked contrast to this quasi-traditional notification, in which the university tells the world what it is doing and invites people to participate in those actions, is the forthright job advertisement of the James Cook University:

JAMES COOK UNIVERSITY OF NORTH QUEENSLAND

APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHANCELLOR

The Council of James Cook University of North Queensland invites applications for appointment to the position of Vice-Chancellor which will become vacant on January 31 1986 when Professor K.J.C. Back leaves the University to take up the position of Executive Director of the International Development Program of Australian Universities and Colleges Ltd. Suggestions of suitably qualified persons who may be interested in being considered for the position will also be welcomed.

The Vice-Chancellor is the Chief Executive Officer of the University and should possess suitable administrative and academic qualifications. The University reserves the right to accept applications after the closing date, to re-advertise the position or to fill it by invitation. Further information, including details of the information required of applicants, may be obtained from the Registrar.

Applications and nominations should be forwarded, under confidential cover, to the Chancellor, C/- The Registrar's Office, James Cook University, Townsville, Q. 4811, Australia so as to reach him by August 16, 1985

K.N. Chester
Registrar

This form of advertisement, which inclines towards the practice of professional labour force recruitment while retaining some university conventions, is not generally used, the University of Newcastle being the only other one among the eight institutions to advertise in a similar way. The remaining five universities advertised in a form similar to that used in the following which attempts to encompass the conventions of notification and advertisement:

DEAKIN UNIVERSITY
VICTORIA AUSTRALIA

VICE-CHANCELLOR AND PRINCIPAL

The University is seeking to appoint, from January 1986, a successor
to its foundation Vice-Chancellor Professor F.R. Jevons.

The person appointed will be qualified by experience and ability to
manage the further development of this expanding University.

Persons interested in being considered for the post or wishing to
suggest anyone for consideration are invited to write, in confidence, to
the Chancellor, Mr Justice Austin Asche, C/- the Registrar, Deakin
University, Victoria, 3217, Australia not later than 31 July 1984.

Further particulars of the post may be obtained from the Registrar.

In each case the five universities began with the phrase "seeking to appoint a successor" or
"seeking a successor to" and then referred to the previous incumbent. With the one or two
exceptions noted above, the eight advertisements are distinguished by their brevity, a likely
assumption being that anyone of sufficient competence to apply for or to undertake the post of
vice-chancellor would necessarily hold a general view of what the appointment entailed.

This self-defining, almost self-limiting characteristic of most of the advertisements is
sustained by two other factors: the first relating to the publications in which it was chosen to
advertise the position - most frequently, the local press, the national press, the *Times Higher
Educational Supplement* and/or the Association of Commonwealth Universities' *A Bulletin of
Current Documentation*; and secondly, the absence in four of the eight advertisements of any
mention of qualifications required for or information about the position, not even to the extent
of the brief mention made in the advertisement of Deakin University and several others. Details
of information made available to enquirers or nominees will be reviewed later.

In seven of the eight advertised positions it was specified that persons interested in
applying or in proposing names for consideration should write directly to the chancellor who is
the senior officer of the university and chairperson of the university council. In several
instances, additional information about the position and the university was stated to be available
from a designated university officer other than the chancellor. The advertisement by Griffith
University is exceptional not only because communications are to be directed not to the
Chancellor but to "the Secretary, Vice-Chancellorial Selection Committee", but also because 60
percent of the advertisement is about the academic orientation and organisation of the
university. Only two other advertisements – those for Deakin and Murdoch Universities –
made any reference to organisational characteristics of the university and this was in terms of a
person being sought who would be able "to manage the further development of this expanding

University". The apparent emphasis in the information included in the Griffith University advertisement may be explained by that University's distinctive approach to undergraduate education which is based on interdisciplinary study of themes and sets of problems rather than on conventional disciplines. The explicit declaration by Deakin and Murdoch Universities, quoted above, represents both a mission statement and a stakehold by two smaller universities in the turbulent domain of Australian higher education and also a signal to attract possible appointees with planning and entrepreneurial skills.

In addition to public advertisement action, the vacancy was usually also advised to the Secretary General of the Association of Commonwealth Universities, Australian learned academies and the CSIRO. Chancellors often wrote to fellow chancellors seeking advice of suitable persons for consideration. Given the relatively high number of vacancies occurring within a two year period, the slate of names being exchanged was, as one chancellor reported, much the same. One university was distinctive in the cast of its participative net by formally inviting staff and student organisational units including their unions to nominate persons for consideration. In another university a decision was made that the university would not issue any invitations to apply.

After this initial survey of advertisements, what follows is a summary of the ostensible characteristics in the Australian pattern of notifying vacant vice-chancellorships and inviting applications or the proposal of nominations:

1. The appointment is significant and it would seem to be understood by those eligible to apply or otherwise competent to be considered. Little is said in the advertisement either about the position itself or about specific qualifications.

2. Advertisements are generally characterised by brevity of words and smallness in physical dimensions. They are universally of lesser magnitude than advertisements for much more junior academic positions.

3. The dominant mode of application to the chancellor confirms the significance and seniority of the appointment and is indicative of the relationship of the position to the governing council.

Further consideration will be given each of these ostensible characteristics and particularly to the last one in the analysis that follows.

Information Provisions. This section examines both the range of information provided to enquirers and the extent of information requested of persons who became firm applicants. The amount of information provided to persons interested in the appointment varied considerably, as the variation in advertisement style might suggest, although a similar basic set of institutional

publications was issued. All institutions provided such publications as the university calendar, the annual report or a statistical profile; some also provided copies of other official publications including faculty and student handbooks, financial statements and excerpts from administrative manuals; a few included intra-mural magazines and visitors guides and tourist style information brochures about the locality or state.

A brochure variously entitled "Appointment of Vice-Chancellor", or "The Vice-Chancellorship" was prepared and issued by six of the eight universities. These brochures ranged in size from an A4 sheet folded to give a leaflet of two pages to a printed booklet of sixteen pages plus covers. The other two universities issued "Information for Candidates" in the form of one or more sets of duplicated sheets. The brochures or their equivalent generally furnished information about: the primary function of the office; salary details and other emoluments such as house, car and entertainment provisions; tenure and other entitlements, for example, appointment expenses, sick, holiday and other leave and superannuation; and advice about the preferred mode of application.

In the brochures and information statements about the vice-chancellorship one university made no mention of the legal basis to the office, six universities stated, in passing, that the appointee would hold office in accordance with the university act and/or bylaws and only one directly provided the full wording of the relevant vice-chancellorial bylaw. In view of the analysis undertaken in the initial part of this chapter, which concluded *inter alia* that there is an increasing awareness of legal matters in the higher education domain, one speculates whether different information about the legal and formal basis to the office is being provided to those enquiring about more recently advertised vice-chancellorships. It can be argued that all applicants for the eight positions advertised in 1984 and 1985 who received copies of the university calendar would thereby have had access to the relevant legislation. In most of the brochures a description of the office comparable in form to the following was provided:

> The Vice-Chancellor is the Chief Executive Officer of the University, and is *ex officio* a member of the Council and every committee and board of the University. The Vice-Chancellor is responsible to the Council for the academic and administrative affairs of the University and for maintaining and promoting the efficiency and good order of the University. The Vice-Chancellor is also a member of the Australian Vice-Chancellors' Committee and plays an active part in Australian higher education.
>
> (U.17, 1984)

Deakin, Griffith and James Cook Universities provided applicants with the most comprehensive portfolio of information; and in respect of Deakin and Griffith Universities, this included statements outlining institutional aims and academic organisation. That they possessed a statement of institutional aims is unusual among Australian universities and is probably

explained by the fact that each was less than fifteen years old and each was imbued with a sense of specific mission – Griffith University in the area of interdisciplinary studies (as previously discussed) and Deakin University in the area of off-campus or distance education studies. The comprehensiveness of the information supplied by the three universities may have partial explanation in the institutional novelty of the procedures, for each was appointing a successor to its foundation vice-chancellor.

Details of conditions of service were given prospective applicants. These included salary levels which for vice-chancellors in Australian universities are set nationally by the Academic Salaries Tribunal in two classifications according to the size and complexity of the university. Early in 1985 these salaries were either \$69120 or \$72670 per annum according to classification. An expense-of-office allowance of the order of \$2500 to \$3000 was also indicated by most universities.

Recreational leave was specified in one case as being "as for professors" (U.14, 1985), in one other university it was not mentioned, while the remaining six indicated four weeks' recreational leave annually. Long service leave and superannuation entitlements, which in Australia apply to classes of occupations, are applicable to vice-chancellorial appointments and were specified. Access to study leave including continuity of previous eligibility and/or access to additional discretionary leave "after a substantial period in office" (U.10, 1985) was mentioned in the conditions of service of four of the eight universities.

An official car was provided in all appointments as was an official residence except in one case where a housing allowance or purchase agreement would be arranged as required. Appointment fares, removal expenses and other, miscellaneous matters were also mentioned in the conditions of service.

Probably the single most important condition of service to someone willing to undertake the office of vice-chancellor would be the tenure provision, the initial period of office and the subsequent prospect for reappointment. Of the eight universities surveyed, it was found, from the information provided to applicants, that five different patterns of appointment were available as follows:

1. An initial appointment for a period of five years with the prospect of renewal for a further period or periods – one university. (U.8)

2. An initial appointment for a period of seven years with eligibility for an extension – four universities. (U.2, U.14, U.15, U.17)

3. A negotiable initial period of appointment of not less than five years or more than ten years which may subsequently be extended – one university. (U.7)

4. A negotiable initial appointment for a period of seven or ten years (implicitly with the prospect of renewal) – one university. (U.9)

5. An appointment for a period of up to ten years to be determined in conjunction with the appointee – one university. (U.10)

Four of the universities specified that 65 years was the age of retirement from office while the issue of retirement age was not mentioned in the brochures of the other four institutions. It can be assumed that 65 would be the common maximum age for the retirement of vice-chancellors as was the case for professorial appointments in Australian universities. Given that initial appointments are in the range of five to ten years, it can be concluded that the eight universities would be unlikely to appoint someone older than the range of 55 to 60 years of age. Appointees could be expected to be some years younger than these ages which are at the top of the possible range. This factor of age at appointment is examined in relation to a larger population of vice-chancellors in Chapter 5 where incumbency patterns are analysed.

Another condition of service related to tenure is the length of notice required to be given by a resigning vice-chancellor. From the brochures it was found not to be stated by two universities and that another two required twelve months' notice while the majority of four universities stipulated that six months' notice was required. A clear intention of the universities surveyed is that the office of vice-chancellor is a full-time appointment even though this was not explicitly expressed by four institutions. Four universities used statements comparable with the following:

> The appointment is a full-time one and the appointee may not accept any professional appointment outside the University or engage directly or indirectly in any private or commercial undertakings or extra-mural work without the prior approval of the Council. (U.15, 1983)

Two of the eight universities made no mention of any way in which formal applications were to be submitted, while three stated in the original advertisement that a full *curriculum vitae* and the names and addresses of three referees should be furnished. The other three provided in their brochures specific advice about the content required in applications. These were to include:

1. Full name and title, address, telephone number (and if applicable, other contact addresses for the next six months).

2. Country of permanent residence.

3.   Date and place of birth.

4.   Citizenship.

5.   Marital status and dates of birth of a dependant family.

6.   Present appointment. Notice required.

7.   Details of education, academic and professional training and qualifications etc. including a summary of academic record.

8.   Details of relevant experience and previous appointments.

9.   Details of particular academic, professional, or research interests, and list of publications.

10.   Relevant information on offices held in professional bodies, community service etc.

11.   Details of war service, if any.

12.   Names and addresses of at least three referees to whom the University might write direct.

Applicants to these three universities were asked to submit a photograph and were also invited to address any matters they wished to put before the selection committee.

To conclude this section it should be noted the information made available to enquirers, nominees and applicants was adequate, especially if one accepts the premise that persons likely to make formal application would already be familiar with the operation of universities. It must be acknowledged that the conditions of service were provided in outline only in some instances; and that there was a strong implication that many details of contract could be the subject of negotiation between the appointee and the chancellor or council. The following sections examine selection processes and criteria which would lead to an appointment being offered and a contract concluded.

Selection Processes and Criteria. There has been insufficient study of the processes and criteria for academic staff selection. Mention of criteria is usually either incidental to other research or proposed as ideal values rather than operational standards. The Australian Vice-Chancellors' Committee periodically issues a circular to member universities summarizing appointment procedures, for example, *AVCC Summary of Information No 19/81 Selection and Appointment Procedures*. As the title implies this deals largely with committee membership and procedures.

A recent comprehensive discussion of criteria affecting academic staff, which also acknowledges the deficit of published evidence, may be found in the stimulating paper by Eustace (1988) "The Criteria of Staff Selection: do they exist?" The response to this question, if applied to Australian vice-chancellors, would be in the negative, or, at least, not in any accessible form.

In what follows data concerning the eight vice-chancellorial vacancies are examined to determine: initial action taken, composition of the selection committee, identification of selection criteria, selection processes pursued and any other considerations that may have been influential. On the basis of this analysis a number of propositions are stated to conclude this section.

The action taken by a university leading to the appointment of a new vice-chancellor was, in all institutions reviewed, initiated and controlled by the council, ostensibly at the chancellor's behest. In all cases a committee (or committees) was established to act on behalf of council in procedural matters without diminishing council's authority to conclude the appointment. In at least four of the eight universities (U.2, U.8, U.15 and U.17), a background briefing paper was compiled by the chancellor or more commonly on the chancellor's behalf by the registrar. These papers, generally written for the council meeting at which the selection committee was constituted, often suggested a committee membership, an action time line in relation to the incumbent's termination date and, in three cases, outlined characteristics desirable in an appointee. In other institutions which did not formally compile a background paper, council minutes record the chancellor referring to previous procedures and to desirable characteristics.

Among notable matters also detailed in these briefing papers were the following: a proposed statement of institutional aims and likely major developments for approval by council as guidance for the selection committee and as information for enquirers and applicants; issues to do with representativeness of the selection committee; mechanisms by which expression of views about the role and desirable characteristics of a vice-chancellor might be obtained; and the degree to which committee proceedings should be open or confidential.

Concerning the latter there was a marked contrast with the reported style of American presidential searches which have been likened to "an Easter egg hunt: many people want to participate, and thousands want to watch" (Hyde, 1969, 186). Selection processes in the Australian universities studied were all confidential apart from such aspects as bringing applicants to on-campus interviews, which were not necessarily given publicity.

Rather than any wish to be secretive, selection committees pursued confidential processes to protect enquirers and applicants, for only one among those short-listed and interviewed would be appointed. From materials examined, the writer has reasonable confidence that all selection committees would affirm the statement made by one that,

> the Committee would wish to assure itself that in making a recommendation to Council it had consulted as widely as possible with those most closely affected by its decision. (U.8)

Before committee representation – one aspect of the obverse of confidentiality – is reviewed, two distinctive characteristics of initial action undertaken by separate universities deserve mention. One is where a registrar (no doubt with the chancellor's approval) prepared for committee members a second background paper which included excerpts from the literature dealing with the university president or vice-chancellor, recommended readings and a bibliography on such topics as the comparative role of a vice-chancellor, a rector or a president, organisational settings, and support systems for a chief executive officer. The second is where a council established two committees: firstly a steering committee to recommend selection procedures, conditions of appointment and the composition of the selection committee; and then a selection committee to process applications. Each of these distinctive actions should enhance the competence of the selection committee and the prospect for making an esteemed appointment.

Membership of selection committees ranged from 10 to 12 persons, with the average being 10.75. By comparison the range in the total membership of councils of Australian universities during the period under review was from 26 to 44 persons. More significant than either committee numbers or their relationship to council numbers – the equivalent of 43 percent of one council being on its selection committee – was the composition of selection committees in terms of constituency representation. Where this could be obtained in detail it was found to include: the chancellor, the deputy chancellor, lay members of council, academic members of council, a student member of council, and except one university, a representative of the administrative and general staff. Constituencies providing representation on selection committees varied among universities. In most instances representation was via a category of council membership such as, a professorial member elected by academic staff or a student member elected by students. The constituent rather than the personal nature of representation is indicated by persons ceasing to hold office being required by council to give their place on the selection committee to the elected successor in that constituency.

If the constituency of the chancellor and deputy chancellor are set aside, in all cases representation of academic members of council at three persons was equal to or greater than that of lay persons. The concern of academic staff in the appointment of a vice-chancellor is thereby

accorded recognition; and in some universities their numbers were augmented by inclusion on the selection committee of officers of the academic board.

From the data gathered it would seem that most effort was expended by universities in search of a vice-chancellor in two areas: in attracting a suitable field of applicants and in defining the criteria for selection. While these two elements interpenetrate, the latter influences and in certain respects is definitional of the former. Universities, like other complex organisations in modern, democratic societies, often exhibit in certain undertakings a divergence between espoused values and values-in-use. Such divergence is evident, for example, in the operation of promotion procedures where the balance among desirable criteria generally gives equal weight to teaching as to research accomplishments at the official level but not always at the operational level. Promotion rather than initial appointment was chosen as an example because the criteria are more identifiably public and contestable. As Eustace (1988) found, appointment criteria are quite elusive.

In the case of the eight vice-chancellor positions under review, such criteria as were expressed in advertisements are the primary public statements; and there could be debate whether these were met or not. Given that selection committee deliberations and selection criteria to which the writer has access were confidential, two inferences are drawn: firstly, that there is probably less ambiguity surrounding these criteria than any other which may stand in the public domain; and secondly, that there is greater prospect for congruence between espoused values and those in use. The gravity attached to making a correct appointment at the level of vice-chancellor exceeds that associated with any other position in a university and would also influence the formulation of selection criteria. To ensure absolute anonymity not even codes will be used in the following analysis.

Statement of selection criteria for vice-chancellors ranged from documents of six pages to a simple listing of points. An item analysis of criteria allows them to be classified into four unranked categories as follows:

1. Characteristics Appropriate to the Institution.
2. Personal Attributes.
3. Task Skills.
4. Interpersonal Competencies.

In each university greatest emphasis was placed on enunciating criteria in Category 2, Personal Attributes. Overall, Category 1 and Category 4 criteria are ranked equal second while Category 3, Task Skills, accounts for the smallest number of criteria identified overall. One university represents an exception at first sight with respect to the ranking of Task Skills;

however, its criteria in this category are more a listing of administrative functions for which a vice-chancellor is ultimately responsible, than an identification of personal capabilities thought to be desirable.

Within Category 1 characteristics, likely appointees were expected, at the highest level of concern, to fit in well with Australia and its system of higher education. This criterion was expressed by such phrases as: "have an adequate working knowledge of, and familiarity with, the Australian economic, social and political environments" or "experience of and affinity for the Australian academic scene" or more tersely "Australian experience preferred". When the focus of this concern was reduced to the institutional level, criteria such as the following were identified: "sympathy with the aims of the institution", or "sympathy with the teaching and organisational structure of the University" or "be aware of local educational considerations".

To interpret any of the above criteria as expressions of xenophobia or academic nationalism would be far off the mark; rather, in the turbulence encompassing Australian universities, selection committees would have been keen to target an appointee who could become productive and contributory in minimum time after assuming office. Further evidence of this interpretation is found in other statements by two universities which used some of the above criteria. These included a willingness "to consider a North American style President, a leader of a management team" and a declaration that "the search process should not be limited to academic environs" and that "a prospective candidate should not necessarily have succeeded in a similar position elsewhere". In the event, none of the eight appointees were from outside academe and each had some Australian experience although three came directly from positions in overseas countries, and two were not Australian citizens.

Of the Personal Attributes in Category 2, what could be generically classified as leadership qualities were paramount criteria. Although different wording was used, leadership in terms of scholarly and academic distinction was identified on the one hand, while on the other leadership entailed a breadth of academic interests and a sense of vision. For instance: "high scholarly repute and breadth", "scholarly leadership", "academic prestige", "commitment to scholarship", "vision, however defined", "an understanding of the liberal tradition of the university" and "broad academic interests beyond own speciality". Two selection committees overtly identified some Personal Attribute criteria as those required for external leadership and those required for internal leadership as in: "political, entrepreneurial and other skills for external leadership" and "vision and planning skills for internal leadership". The writer found this division to be a useful analytical template and one which was implicit in the criteria of several other institutions. Although not always specified as a criterion, it could be deduced from other documents that preferred age at appointment would be 55 to 57 years except in one case where the appointee could be up to 60 years. Such was the vertical range of concerns that

the desirability of an appointee being married ("in order to ease the substantial burden of official entertaining") was discussed by one selection committee; and it was agreed that this was not a decisive factor.

The identification of Task Skills among selection criteria was minimal. Except for the university which detailed functional domains of responsibility, where mentioned, only a single criterion was specified under Category 3 in such phrases as: "an appropriate background and management skills", "academic and management skills", "relevant administrative experience" and "university administrative experience". Rather than representing any judgement by selection committees about the balance of duties undertaken by a vice-chancellor, this minimal specification of Task Skills criteria probably assumed that applicants, whether from inside academe or elsewhere, would have a sober appreciation of what the appointment entailed. This assumption is confirmed by the analysis of previous employment experience of Australian vice-chancellors undertaken in Chapter 5: an increasing and a major proportion of incumbents – 64 percent in 1983 – had previously been either vice-chancellors or deputy vice-chancellors.

Some of the criteria already discussed could be also classified, at least partially, in Category 4, Interpersonal Competencies. As universities are people-intensive organisations with participative and democratic modes of operation, it can be expected that these criteria suffuse others. The vertical range of Interpersonal Competencies specified by selection committees includes: "a record of involvement and interaction outside the University"; those qualities implicit in a vice-chancellor's responsibility "for developing and maintaining effective links with governments and government agencies, and with the external academic community, not only in a state or federal context, but also internationally" or for "public relations"; "an appreciation of the complementary roles played by academic and administrative staff"; and directly an "ability to relate to students and staff". Quite evidently selection committees do not envisage the appointment of a chief executive officer who would be a cloistered academic administrator.

The actual selection processes followed can be reviewed under several procedures, the first of which concerns the creation of a short list of applicants. Nominations and applications were reviewed, sometimes by a sub-committee rather than the whole selection committee, to create a list of possible and sometimes a list of doubtful appointees. In a number of institutions evidence explicitly indicates that committee members could consult all available papers and initiate a change of status for a candidate; and it can be assumed this procedure operated elsewhere. In some cases independent referees reports were sought and telephone consultations between committee members and appropriate persons associated with an applicant occurred. The procedures recognized both the seniority and distinctiveness of the appointment and the possible difficulty in relying exclusively on standard refereeing practices where one's

peers or seniors offer an appraisal. In one university the selection committee asked each candidate on the short list "to submit a brief statement responding to two questions:

1. Which of your qualities do you think equip you for the position of Vice-Chancellor and why?

2. What do you think should be the role of a major university in the twentieth century?"

This novel action should have furnished information about applicants and their values which could be compared with interview results. There was evidence to suggest that all universities would provide applicants to be interviewed with whatever specific information they requested.

The second major procedure concerns the interview at the university of candidates on a short list of not more than three which had been approved by the council on the recommendation of the selection committee. To conclude arrangements to interview several candidates, including possibly some from overseas, at much the same time at any Australian university requires more co-ordinative effort than perhaps any other aspect of the appointment process, such is the size and location of the continent. The program arranged for each candidate over a two to three day period would usually include meetings with principal university officers and heads of academic and specialised units such as research institutes or residential colleges. In at least one instance meetings were also arranged with staff and student associations and with administrative personnel. The formal interview by the selection committee was usually complemented by a private meeting with the chancellor. In one university, the selection committee was provided with an interview evaluation schedule which they might complete for each candidate. This comprised a matrix listing six principal selection criteria against a four column scale - high (3), medium (2), low (1), zero (0) - indicating evidence of these criteria. Members were invited to use the matrix as a guide to identify different profiles of each candidate, with the caution that different criteria would require weighting.

The final major procedure associated with interviews intended to give candidates, and their spouses where applicable, an appreciation of campus physical facilities and social ambience. Among functions arranged were luncheons or receptions with groups of university people and a reception or dinner with members of council. Opportunities were provided for candidates and spouses to visit the vice-chancellorial residence and facilities in the general community. One respondent noted that social occasions involving university people, particularly members of council, require thoughtful planning to prevent them becoming a *de facto* second interview. But with the increasing demands made upon a vice-chancellor to

interpret and to engage in public life, the social aspects of the interview program, including social functions, are an appropriate part of selection processes.

These processes reach conclusion when a council accepts the recommendation of its selection committee. An appointment is then offered by the chancellor usually initially by telephone and subsequently in writing. Details of employment conditions are discussed and finalised and an announcement of the appointment is made. The time taken from the placement of an advertisement to the assumption of office by a new vice-chancellor is rarely less than 12 months, but more often 15 to 18 months as most appointees must give six months' notice.

Summary. This section presents nine propositions which summarise significant results from the analysis of appointment procedures and selection criteria for Australian vice-chancellors that were followed in eight dissimilar universities after advertisement in 1984 and 1985. In the conclusion that follows further comment is offered on these procedures.

Proposition 3.9 **A university council, within correct jurisdiction as the governing authority of the university, controls and directs appointment procedures and selection criteria for the position of vice-chancellor acting on the initiative of the chancellor.**

The analysis indicates no suggestion that any authority or body other than the council and its selection committee should be responsible. Among a council's ultimate responsibility for the appointment of staff, the approval of courses and curriculum, the attestation of graduates and the approval of plans including financial budgets, there can be no action of greater significance or gravity than the appointment of a vice-chancellor.

Proposition 3.10 **The pattern of notifying a vacant vice-chancellorship is generally characterised by an advertisement that is both brief and small, with little being said about the position itself or about specific qualifications.**

This pattern underlying the invitation to apply or to propose nominations suggests that the position is understood by those eligible for consideration. The form of notification tends to be a dignified proclamation rather than a professional recruitment advertisement. The seniority of the appointment and the relationship of the office to the governing council are confirmed by the dominant mode of application to the chancellor. In addition to newspaper advertisement, a network of bodies such as learned academies and university associations is advised of the vacancy. Until 1986 at least, Australian universities have not used the services of a consultancy or executive search company to appoint a vice-chancellor.

Proposition 3.11 **Information provided to enquirers and applicants by all universities included basic institutional publications, while standard information about the position, its legal and other specific responsibilities and the conditions of appointment varied greatly.**

Overall the information provided was factual, bland and generally colourless, metaphorically and literally. Someone enquiring about a position would want to become a vice-chancellor and, implicitly, know about the office generally rather than depend on the attractiveness of most information that was furnished. The three universities providing the most comprehensive information are imbued with a sense of specific mission and were each appointing a successor to its foundation vice-chancellor. Candidates interviewed and probably others were provided with additional information as requested.

Proposition 3.12 **Membership of selection committees ranged from ten to twelve persons with constituencies represented, in addition to the chancellor and deputy chancellor, being lay, academic, student and usually administrative, with a bias towards academics as the largest single group.**

Selection Committee membership included constituents likely to be affected by and/or involved with the vice-chancellor to be appointed thus formally observing democratic values espoused by most universities. Based on available data, membership was not personal but representative of an office or constituency. One university utilised a two-committee, two-phase process with an initial committee recommending selection procedures, conditions of appointment and the composition of the selection committee which then dealt with applications.

Proposition 3.13 **The deliberations of selection committees were confidential and, with one exception, opportunities for participation and consultation were fairly narrow and structured processes.**

While committees were formally receptive to advice, much of this was provided via committee members as individuals or through processes of informal consultation. In one university arrangements were made for quite elaborate consultations with constituent groups; in another, committee members had available a background briefing paper about the comparative role of a university chief executive officer in several different systems of higher education.

Proposition 3.14 **Most effort was expended by selection committees in attracting a suitable field of applicants and in defining criteria for selection which, being confidential, were probably less ambiguous than criteria in the public domain.**

That making the best possible appointment to the office of vice-chancellor was a matter of utmost significance is evident from all available data and from the time and importance attached to these two focal activities. The prospect for congruence between espoused values and those in use in respect of selection criteria seemed to be increased by the adoption of confidential procedures.

Proposition 3.15 **Selection criteria for vice-chancellors could be classified into four categories: characteristics appropriate to the institution, personal attributes, task skills, and interpersonal competencies, with greatest emphasis apparently being placed upon personal attributes and least on task skills.**

Preference was to be given generally to someone having experience of or familiarity with the Australian education system and a sympathy with institutional purposes. No weighting could be attached with certainty to any criteria or to those classified under personal attributes compared with others. Enunciated criteria indicated a concern that a vice-chancellor should possess high levels of personal and interpersonal competence and be able to exercise leadership in both the internal and the increasingly important external dimensions of the office.

Proposition 3.16 **Selection procedures for short-listed candidates included the obtaining of independent assessments, an on-campus interview program and participation in several social functions.**

The formal interview by the selection committee was usually complemented by meetings with specialist staff or groups of staff and a private meeting with the chancellor to discuss issues including possible conditions of appointment. Social occasions provided opportunity for the candidate, and spouse if accompanied, and the members of the university community to gain further reciprocal understanding of each other and an additional measure of expectations.

Proposition 3.17 **The time taken to conclude an appointment from the public notification of vacancy to the assumption of office by the new vice-chancellor was generally fifteen to eighteen months.**

The procedures followed are necessarily detailed. Australia's size and relative isolation from northern hemisphere applicants, as these influence arrangements for interviews, may be part of the explanation. Another factor is the usual requirement of a person at this level to give six months' notice of resignation. Given Australia's location and relatively small system of higher education, one is predisposed to think that the time-line for appointment procedures may be longer than in Europe or North America.

Conclusion

Both the rate and the direction of changes affecting critical issues in Australian universities have altered significantly in recent years. Since these data about appointment procedures and selection criteria were collected in 1986, initiatives taken by the Federal Minister for Employment Education and Training have changed profoundly the organisational framework and the mode of operation of post secondary education. These changes will impinge on the office and role of vice-chancellor, one aspect of which is likely to be a reduction in the length of incumbency, an issue which is examined in Chapter 4.

The incidence of change in council membership as much as in vice-chancellors is likely to be such that older institutions may not necessarily have greater residual experience than newer universities. While environmental and other factors will alter the context and the requirements for any subsequent appointment, the institutional memory would be enhanced through recourse to an evaluative record.

For these among other reasons a compelling case exists for vice-chancellorial selection committees to consider their responsibilities discharged only when a record of appointment procedures and operative selection criteria has been compiled together with an evaluation of their effectiveness. This evaluative record would stand not as a prescription but as a guide to future action. Of the appointments analysed only one university attempted such a compilation.

The office of vice-chancellor is often written and spoken about in normative and idealized terms. Just as no scholarly appraisal of the position has been completed, neither is there a well defined model of what the office demands nor a clear set of attributes, fulfilment of which would ensure success for the appointee. As external forces of change envelop Australian universities, a council could seek in a vice-chancellor to be appointed a set of attributes which are tolerable within a given organisational culture that complement, rather than continue directly, the qualities of the retiring incumbent. If the recent discontinuities in Australian higher education are potentially greater than in the past, the opportunity is presented for councils and their selection committees to deal with the appointment of a vice-chancellor even more thoroughly than previously. From information made available to the writer it was apparent that several new universities pursued comprehensive procedures and that their espoused values and their values-in-use seem to be approaching congruence. The novelty of procedures is an inadequate explanation of these phenomena.

The related matters of participation and consultation processes and the membership of the selection committee are not simply trends of university governance from the 1960s which will soon fade in the present light of economic rationalism. These matters raise questions about

the authenticity and legitimacy of a vice-chancellor's role, particularly in leadership dimensions. Universities are seldom homogeneous organisations. A critical issue for a council is to ensure that the various constituent groups with which a vice-chancellor will have to work are accepting of the authority of the office and the legitimacy of the appointee to fill it. Confidentiality is a separate and a subsidiary consideration. Questions about the office and role of a vice-chancellor are complex and unlikely to be answered satisfactorily by a small group appointed to a selection committee. Consultation by the selection committee with diverse people having a common commitment to the university, however variously expressed, should produce a range of insights and answers for consideration by the committee.

Like the electoral processes associated with democratic government, the procedures to appoint a vice-chancellor in an Australian university are often attenuated and sometimes involve high levels of direct and opportunity costs in terms of time, energy and money. Devising and implementing appropriate appointment procedures and selection criteria can be frustrating and have not always been entirely successful. But given the complexity of the exercise, involving systemic and university issues of both general and specific significance, there is nothing better as an acceptable alternative. How these procedures and criteria compare with those followed in say, Britain, New Zealand or Canada, is unknown and represents an incentive for further research.

Chapter 4

A SOCIAL CHARACTERISTICS PROFILE

Introduction

During 1984 no fewer than five of Australia's nineteen vice-chancellors had formally advised their resignation. Before the end of 1985 another three were to make similar announcements. Generally a consequence of having reached retirement age, the departure of so many vice-chancellors within several years attracted publicity in the press and placed the office under scrutiny in a manner unknown since the tense years of the anti-Vietnam War moratorium movement.

Selection committees became active following advertisements discreetly inviting application or nomination. If institutional propriety would allow, there would have been mutual benefit and economy were universities to compare short-lists. In most institutions the membership of the vice-chancellorial selection committee had changed in terms of representation since the last appointment. In the writer's own institution, the University of New England (which was among the five vacancies), the committee for the 1984 vacancy included, for example, two members of the university's general staff.

Whether selection criteria also altered in response to institutional and environmental conditions which were quite different from those of the 1970s in Australia would be difficult to establish. Espoused criteria expected of a vice-chancellor, as reviewed in the previous chapter, included: a distinguished academic record, evidence of leadership qualities and managerial ability, good at working with people, especially politicians inside and outside the university, and desirably a planner. In sum, a person for all seasons was sought, someone of the kind indelibly described by Kerr (1963, 29-30) in his vignette of the American university president. We could assume that operative criteria — even if not formally discussed by a selection committee — would embrace such considerations as: academic discipline, professional and personal interests outside major career, political inclination if any, nationality, range of contacts, marital status and, of more contemporary significance, gender.

Who deserved to gain these hitherto prestigious appointments? Could Ladbrooks or a government totalisator agency gamble on the vice-chancellorial sweep-stakes in Australia and expect a profit? Are there acknowledged ways in which contenders for such an office might groom themselves or be easily identified in the stables of academia? The extensive literature about the presidency in universities of the USA was outlined in Chapter 1, but very little has

been written about the comparable office elsewhere in the English-speaking world. The record of characteristics of Australian vice-chancellors is a blank card.

In the absence of systematic research about Australian university executives this chapter analyses data about social characteristics of vice-chancellors in the total system of Australian universities. These data respond to the second of the three basic questions that motivated this research, *viz.*, who are occupants of the office of vice-chancellor, and the analysis may be viewed as a contribution to the "social arithmetic" of higher education. Because of the size of the number of persons and institutions involved, conclusions based on these data need to be considered together with information in other chapters.

Data Sources

All Australian universities were included in this social characteristics profile of their vice-chancellors. The classification of institutions used as a basis for analysis and comparison is that presented in Chapter 2 and displayed in Table 2.2. That classification identified four groups of universities among the nineteen existing in the 1980s: 19th Century Institutions; Early 20th Century Institutions; Post War Institutions; and New Institutions. This classification was used to examine data about incumbent vice-chancellors in the years 1983, 1973 and 1963. The base of 1983 was chosen because in the years 1984-85 more than 35 percent of Australian vice-chancellorships were subject to imminent change of incumbent. Like comparable British (Collinson and Millen, 1969) and Canadian (Muzzin and Tracs, 1981) surveys, the principal source of data is *Who's Who in Australia* and *Who's Who*. Other sources from which information was obtained or verified are: university calendars and reports; correspondence with university registrars; records of interview with retired and incumbent vice-chancellors; and also telephone conversations with university personnel. Data from publications such as a reference compendium may, through their brevity and incompleteness, be misleading. Also some entries may not be entirely up to date. Where a particular entry was apparently brief, or unchanging over a number of successive entries in *Who's Who*, clarification was sought elsewhere — for instance, from university records or by telephone to the person concerned. The data are relatively complete for the analytical tables used; and totals were obtained for most tables or stated to be not given or otherwise unavailable. There being nineteen universities in 1983, seventeen in 1973 and ten in 1963, the total population surveyed was 46 vice-chancellors.

Presentation and Analysis of Data

Social attributes considered to be characteristic of vice-chancellors in Australia are presented in the following sixteen tables. In most tables a criterion is analysed by type of

university. That is, the criterion is considered in relation to incumbent vice-chancellors grouped in the classification of universities in Table 2.2 for each of the three years under review. In other tables, a characteristic is surveyed among all incumbents in each of the three years. These alternative presentations ensure anonymity for individual vice-chancellors. Percentage figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

The study begins by examining the educational backgrounds and attainments of vice-chancellors. Table 4.1 provides data on the secondary school attended by each of the 46 subjects. Looking at the figures in this table we can see that a greater number (42 percent) of vice-chancellors in 1983 attended government schools than either in 1973 (18 percent) or in 1963 (30 percent); and that the proportion going to independent schools has declined. The data in Table 4.1 particularly with reference to those vice-chancellors educated overseas, correlate generally with information in the following table and also Table 4.9, Country of Birth.

What could be of significance to Australians, which the data in Table 4.1 do not convey, is some detail about schools attended in their country. Of the eleven 1983 vice-chancellors educated in Australia, eight were schooled in Sydney and Melbourne and one in Canberra. Another two attended schools in regional cities, one in Tasmania and the other in South Australia. Eight 1973 vice-chancellors attended Australian secondary schools, seven in Sydney and Melbourne and one in a regional city in New South Wales. Of the 1963 vice-chancellors educated in Australia, five attended schools in capital cities of four states and the other in a regional city in Victoria. Melbourne schools have pre-eminence in nurturing Australian-educated vice-chancellors: 45 percent of this group in 1983, 63 percent in 1973, and 17 percent in 1963 attended school there. By comparison, those of this group being schooled in Sydney number 27 percent in 1983, 25 percent in 1973, and 17 percent in 1963. No vice-chancellor in the years studied attended school in Queensland or the Northern Territory.

An analysis of universities from which vice-chancellors took their first degree appears in Table 4.2. The number completing undergraduate degrees at Australian universities increased slightly to 58 percent in 1983 over that in previous years, viz., 47 percent in 1973 and 50 percent in 1963. Incumbents in 1973 included several foundation vice-chancellors in the New Institutions group who were born and educated overseas. Their appointments to "non-traditional universities" were presumably based on education and experience different to that available to persons who had graduated from Australian universities. The changes in formal educational characteristics between these inaugural appointments and subsequent ones included with 1983 incumbents reflect findings of management development research as applied to higher education (St. John, 1980). Such research indicates that different attributes are required of executives at an early stage of an organization's development to those demanded of the same office in later phases.

Table 4.1 School Attended

School	University													
	1963				1973					1983				
	19th C (%)	Early 20th C (%)	Post War (%)	All (%)	19th C (%)	Early 20th C (%)	Post War (%)	New (%)	All (%)	19th C (%)	Early 20th C (%)	Post War (%)	New (%)	All (%)
Government	25	50	25	30	0	0	25	29	18	50	0	50	44	42
Independent	50	0	25	30	75	50	0	14	29	25	0	50	0	16
Overseas	25	50	50	40	25	50	75	57	53	25	100	0	56	42
N(=100%)	4	2	4	10	4	2	4	7	17	4	2	4	9	19

Table 4.2 Undergraduate University Attended

U/G University	1963				1973					1983				
	19th C (%)	Early 20th C (%)	Post War (%)	All (%)	19th C (%)	Early 20th C (%)	Post War (%)	New (%)	All (%)	19th C (%)	Early 20th C (%)	Post War (%)	New (%)	All (%)
Sydney	0	0	25	10	0	0	0	43	18	25	0	25	22	16
Melbourne	50	0	0	20	75	50	25	0	29	50	0	0	11	32
Tasmania	25	0	25	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	0	5
Queensland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5
All Australian	75	0	50	50	75	50	25	43	47	75	0	50	44	58
Oxford	25	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cambridge	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	6	0	0	0	44	21
London	0	50	0	10	0	0	0	14	6	0	50	0	0	5
Other UK	0	50	50	30	25	50	50	14	29	25	50	50	11	16
Other overseas	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	14	12	0	0	0	0	0
All overseas	25	100	50	50	25	50	75	57	53	25	100	50	56	42
N(=100%)	4	2	4	10	4	2	4	7	17	4	2	4	9	19

More Australian vice-chancellors have taken their first degree from the University of Melbourne than elsewhere as the figures in Table 4.2 show: 32 percent in 1983, 29 percent in 1973, and 20 percent in 1963. Australia's oldest university, Sydney, has by comparison, provided undergraduate education for a fairly constant number of vice-chancellors: 16 percent in 1983, 18 percent in 1973, and 10 percent in 1963. One Australian-born vice-chancellor in the survey took his first degree overseas and that from the University of London.

Commonwealth universities have nurtured Australian vice-chancellors. Of the 46 officers researched only one completed undergraduate education other than at a Commonwealth university and this in the USA. This pattern suggests something about the distinctiveness of organisational culture and the governance patterns of British derived universities. In particular, it indicates that more than technical management or leadership competence is demanded of vice-chancellors. Of overseas universities attended by Australian vice-chancellors as undergraduates, Cambridge has been *alma mater* for most — 23 percent in total. Next comes Manchester (included among Other UK) with four vice-chancellors or 18 percent of the total; and London has provided undergraduate degrees for 14 percent of incumbents in the years surveyed.

What can be summarised about observations based on data in Table 4.1 and Table 4.2? Some comment concerning vice-chancellors who completed both secondary schooling and their undergraduate degree in Australia is appropriate. The capital cities of the oldest states, New South Wales and Victoria, were the location for schooling for the majority (68 percent) of this group, 24 percent attending schools in Sydney and 44 percent in Melbourne. It was also in these cities that 83 percent of the Australian-educated group were undergraduates with 29 percent attending Sydney University and 54 percent attending Melbourne. One might conclude that the foundation of universities in these cities in the 1850s, which arose from an emerging concern for general education in the colonies, had a flow-back effect on secondary schooling through the aspirations it generated to locally available university education. Whatever the mix of reasons, the secondary schools in, and the University of, Melbourne have furnished almost double the number of Australian educated vice-chancellors in the years researched to that of the next contender, Sydney.

The Universities of Sydney and Melbourne were founded about 60 years before comparable institutions in Queensland and Western Australia, the establishment of which completed the pattern of a university in each Australian state. One among the 46 vice-chancellors surveyed completed his undergraduate degree from the University of Queensland and he is a 1983 vice-chancellor in the New Institutions group. By the mid 1980s a system of higher education had developed in Australia. It was relatively stable — in some respects, to do with access, articulation, and accreditation, excessively so. Universities in the Early 20th

Century and Post War Institution groups, and some among the New Institutions, were sufficiently mature chronologically and scholastically to allow their alumni to enter the vice-chancellorial stakes. If Australians were appointed to most of the five vice-chancellorships vacant in 1984 (and those anticipated by the end of 1985), it should then be possible to be more definite about the pattern of schooling and undergraduate education suggested by the present data. The data indicate that increased eligibility for appointment as vice-chancellor cannot be separated from having attended Melbourne or Sydney University as an undergraduate.

The next two tables present further information about the formal academic attainments of Australian vice-chancellors. Table 4.3 has an analysis of the final degree earned by all incumbents in each of the three years surveyed. The single bachelor's degree was held by someone with a distinguished record as a colonial civil servant who had received, among other awards, a knighthood prior to being appointed vice-chancellor. He is thus unique among the 46 vice-chancellors in these two characteristics.

Table 4.3   Final Earned Degree

Degree	1963 (%)	1973 (%)	1983 (%)
Bachelor	0	6	0
Masters	40	18	21
Doctorate	60	76	79
N(=100%)	10	17	19

In a comparison of final degree attainments between 1963 and 1983 incumbents it could be concluded that the masters degree declined in proportion to an increase in doctorates. The writer believes that this also reflects the expansion of higher education in Australia since the 1960s and the emergence of a system. The Ph.D. has steadily become the accepted qualification one associates with scholarly work in Australian universities. This acceptance — almost so that the Ph.D. is a specified prerequisite for academic appointment in most disciplines — is a relatively recent phenomenon. The first Australian Ph.D. was awarded in 1947 by the University of Melbourne and that to Sir Rupert Myers, subsequently Vice-Chancellor of the University of New South Wales.

In future studies it should be useful to compare the attainment of an earned doctorate with information in Table 4.13 Honours and Awards. A comparison of present data suggests that the attainment of an earned Ph.D. may be linked to an apparent decrease in the award of honorary doctorates to vice-chancellors by Australian universities. However, such comparisons must be tentative as it would be uncommon, for instance, for an employing

institution to award any honorary doctorate to its vice-chancellor before the completion of service at the university.

Table 4.4 Major Academic Field

Academic Field	1963 (%)	1973 (%)	1983 (%)
Arts	20	12	11
Law/Medicine	10	18	0
Science	20	23	58
Social Science	30	29	26
Technology	20	18	5
N(=100%)	10	17	19

The figures in Table 4.4, Major Academic Field, are surprising to the writer, who had absorbed the conventional wisdom that Australian vice-chancellors usually come from academic areas of medicine, the law, and engineering — or at least from the core professions. The classification used in this table is somewhat arbitrary but should be easily understood. What Table 4.4 presents is an overall decline (apart from *Law/Medicine* in 1973) over the survey period in appointments from all academic fields, excepting *Science*, which shows a significant increase. In 1983 the major academic field of 58 percent of incumbent vice-chancellors was *Science*. This is double the percentage of scientists in either 1973 or 1963. It also exceeds by 100 percent the next ranking classification in 1983, *Social Science*, in which 26 percent of incumbents are classified.

Despite the apparent trend which indicates a majority of scientists being preferred for appointment as vice-chancellor, to consider these figures conclusive without other supporting information could be misleading. During the decade to 1986, higher education in Australia had declining political priority with an associated decline in resource funding. In that post-OPEC era of higher education, the Australian situation was in parallel with the reported experience of universities in most other OECD countries. In the 1970s and 1980s there had been a progressive decline in the percentage of postgraduate students enrolling in science; and in respect of bachelor degrees it was not until 1982 that the number of undergraduates in science equalled the percentage enrolled nationally in this degree in 1973 (CTEC, 1984). In other faculties, increase in student numbers was often accompanied by increasingly adverse staff/student ratios — that is, staff doing more teaching with less time for research and other university undertakings.

The framework of much scientific teaching and research — with demonstrators to assist in laboratory classes and research assistants and graduate students to help with research — may free scientists to a greater extent than other academics to participate in institutional governance. Simultaneously this supporting framework, and in particular collaborative research, enables scientists to gain system rewards and wider recognition through publication, the attraction of grants, membership of national and international bodies, and so on. It might be the opinion of some observers that scientists lead better organised academic lives and/or are, by their training, potentially better executives than academics from other fields. Such evidence is unavailable.

Table 4.5 Major Career

Major Career	1963 (%)	1973 (%)	1983 (%)
Academic	80	88	95
Government Service	10	12	5
Industry, Finance, Commerce	10	0	0
Other	0	0	0
N(=100%)	10	17	19

Table 4.5 shows the distribution of vice-chancellors over four major career groupings at three dates. Quite evidently, academic life is the major career for the executives of Australian universities: in 1983, 95 percent had pursued it as their major vocation. The appointee, represented by the remaining 5 percent, had a notable career in *Government Service* as an educational planner and administrator. The primacy of an academic career declined a little to 88 percent in 1973 and 80 percent in 1963. Within the years surveyed only one of the 46 vice-chancellors (Sir Phillip Baxter, UNSW) had a major career in industry. As shall be seen in Table 4.7, the pursuit of an academic career as the major vocation did not preclude employment in areas outside the university immediately before appointment as vice-chancellors.

From the sources of available data, Table 4.6 presents information about the principal activity of each vice-chancellor outside his major career. A judgement was made concerning the greatest proportion of time spent outside the major career either in other employment prior to becoming vice-chancellor or in adjunct activities after attaining office. The classification of activities is self explanatory and will be amplified by the following observations.

Involvement in *Government Advisory and Statutory Bodies, Parliamentary Committees of Enquiry* and the like had become a principal activity for Australian vice-chancellors — 42 percent were so committed in 1983, 29 percent in 1973, and 30 percent in 1963. One might be excused for accepting the popular theorem: the smaller the university and the greater its

distance from Canberra, the more numerous are the government assignments likely to be accepted by its vice-chancellor. But the benefits and communication patterns between university and government are reciprocal; and, through their vice-chancellors serving on such committees, Australian universities make a significant community contribution. It should be noted that compensation for these services was more of an expenses honorarium than a consultant's fee. Among the numerous government bodies chaired by vice-chancellors were, for example: Australian Atomic Energy Commission, National Commission of UNESCO, S.A. Council on Technological Change, Committee of Inquiry into Education and Training, Committee on Overseas Professional Qualifications.

Table 4.6 Activity Outside Major Career

Activity	1963 (%)	1973 (%)	1983 (%)
Academic	10	2	5
Government Service	10	18	11
Industry, Finance, Commerce	0	0	0
Armed Forces	20	6	5
Government Advisory and Statutory Bodies, etc.	30	29	42
The Arts, Social Service, Philanthropy	30	35	26
None of Above	0	0	11
N(=100%)	10	17	19

By comparison there is no tradition of involvement by Australian vice-chancellors in private sector corporations. This position contrasts with that of college and university executive officers in the United States. Furthermore, this pattern of non-involvement in industrial, financial or commercial enterprises as indicated by the zero entries in Table 4.6 continues beyond retirement from public office. Only two former vice-chancellors record holding appointments as a company director and one of those was for a two year period. This characteristic could suggest, inter alia, something about the transferability of the managerial and executive skills exercised by a vice-chancellor.

Vice-chancellors, similar to other leading public figures, are customarily associated with governing bodies in the area of the Arts, Social Service and Philanthropy. That such an association is likely to be characteristic of personal interest rather than of the office can be seen in the range of activities identified by the vice-chancellors studied. These include: trustees of museums, art galleries or major public libraries; members of hospital boards of governors or

the councils for theatrical and cultural groups; Director of the Winston Churchill Memorial Trust, Councillor for the Boy Scouts Association and patron of an overseas aid organization. The marginal decline of involvement in these activities — 30 percent of vice-chancellors in 1963, 35 percent in 1973 and 26 percent in 1983 — might simply be the differing interests of different incumbents. If this involvement were to decline among vice-chancellors in future years, two other factors could provide explanation. Firstly, with the expansion until 1975 of the number of universities and the development of a maturing system of Australian higher education which included the colleges of advanced education, there was available a wider pool of appointees to advisory posts in the *Arts, Social Service and Philanthropy* than was so in either 1963 or 1973. Secondly, in the same period in which higher education had been developing systemic characteristics, a number of organizations in the domain of the arts and social service became statutory bodies with professionally qualified full-time directors and executive staff.

The number of vice-chancellors whose principal activity outside their major career was solely *Academic* is small. In 1983 this was 5 percent which was the same as those whose principal activity was or had been an involvement with the *Armed Forces*. The decline in the latter activity from 20 percent among vice-chancellors in 1963 is a factor of time since the Second World War. Many vice-chancellors participate, though not as the primary activity outside their major career, in the governance of professional, research and academic organizations within Australia and internationally. This participation may be viewed as a continuation of prior careers as professors and researchers. Two among the survey group held office as vice-chancellor of an Australian university and chancellor of an overseas institution — Professor Peter Karmel as Chancellor of the University of Papua New Guinea (UPNG) and Sir Louis Matheson as Chancellor of the PNG University of Technology. Another (whose incumbency is not within the years surveyed) who attained a similar distinction is Sir John Crawford who was simultaneously Vice-Chancellor of ANU and Chancellor of UPNG. He subsequently became Chancellor of ANU. There were no data available from the sources used to identify activities outside major career for two 1983 vice-chancellors and these are shown under None of Above. Their biographical entries may be incomplete or intentionally brief. Explanation may derive from each being a relatively recent appointee to a large university, the internal management of which has so far left insufficient time for outside activities.

A national survey of higher education executives in the United States (Moore, 1983) indicated a primary concern of the study by the sub-title of its report: *The Top-Line: A Report on Presidents', Provosts' and Deans' Careers*. In the present analysis a similar concern is pursued in Tables 4.7 and 4.8 where attention is given respectively to the post held by vice-chancellors immediately before appointment and to their academic experience. In Table 4.7 the immediately prior posts of all incumbents in the three years studied fall into five groups. For

the purpose of this classification, included in the group *Vice-Chancellor, Deputy Vice-Chancellor* are one vice-chancellor in 1963 and two in 1973 who had been warden of a university college to which they were immediately appointed as vice-chancellor upon its attaining university status.

Table 4.7   Post Immediately Before Appointment

Post	1963 (%)	1973 (%)	1983 (%)
Vice-Chancellor,			
Deputy Vice-Chancellor	10	47	53
Other Academic	70	41	31
Senior Administrator	10	6	0
Government Service	0	6	16
Other	10	0	0
N(=100%)	10	17	19

The number whose immediately previous appointment had been that of vice-chancellor, or deputy or pro vice-chancellor, grew from 10 percent in 1963, to 47 percent in 1973, and 53 percent in 1983. The 16 percent of 1983 incumbents whose prior post was in *Government Service* included two persons who had previously been vice-chancellor in other Australian universities and one for whom education administration had been a major vocation. Were these two former vice-chancellors to be included in the classification, *Vice-Chancellor, Deputy Vice-Chancellor*, a total of 64 percent would be counted as having previously held an appointment at these levels. Of this group 26 percent had been vice-chancellors and 38 percent deputy or pro vice-chancellors (the percentages being of the 1983 total). Clearly evident is the emergence of a system of university education in Australia with associated career paths for executive administrators. The data form a pattern which can be interpreted to support this contention. Among the 1963 incumbents no one had previously been a vice-chancellor. In 1973, 12 percent of incumbents had been vice-chancellors immediately before appointment and 35 percent had held office as deputy or pro vice-chancellor. It is from such positions that one could expect future vice-chancellors to be selected. By comparison the group *Other Academic* provides a decreasing number of appointees directly to the office of vice-chancellor. The 1963 total of 70 percent declines to 41 percent in 1973, and further to 31 percent in 1983. Additional details about the group not presented in Table 4.7 are illuminative. Direct appointment from the position of chair professor — that is, without also being a dean or a chairman of the academic/professorial board — also declines markedly from 30 percent in 1963, to 24 percent in 1973 to the figure of 11 percent in 1983. In Australia, a career structure has developed for

the senior academic administrators with the elaboration in recent years of a system of higher education.

In Table 4.8 the academic experience of vice-chancellors is presented by type of university. The New Universities are not included because the nineteen years between the foundation of the oldest in this group (La Trobe, 1964) and 1983 was insufficient time to furnish a vice-chancellorial appointee. (See also Table 4.11 Age at Appointment). Whatever can be interpreted from the data in Table 4.8 must be tentative. One general observation is that there was a decline in the percentage of vice-chancellors with internal experience, either as a student or as an academic, in the university to which they were appointed. The group having *No Previous Internal Experience* rose from 40 percent in 1963, to 60 percent in 1973 and then to 70 percent in 1983. Another overall observation is that internal experience seems to be more evident as a characteristic of vice-chancellors of 19th Century Institutions than of any other group: 100 percent had internal experience in 1963, 50 percent in 1973 and 75 percent in 1983. Perhaps this phenomenon derives from a standard of excellence, real and symbolic, associated with these more venerable institutions making them attractive to academically more able students, some of whom may become vice-chancellors. With respect to 1983 vice-chancellors with *No Previous Internal Experience*, it should be noted that the sole incumbent of the 19th Century Institution in this category, and two among those in office at Post War Institutions, had previously been vice-chancellor of Australian universities.

The overall decline in internal experience among vice-chancellors, while also another aspect of diversity in the maturation of Australian universities, is most likely not a selection criteria of institutions so much as a characteristic of applicants.

The data shown in Table 4.9 Country of Birth relate closely to that presented in Table 4.10 Country of Residence Immediately Before Appointment. Other comparable studies have not recorded data of this kind. To do so is not xenophobic. An explanation may be found among Australia's history as a penal settlement and a British Colony, until recent years the "tyranny of distance" experienced as an isolated member of the Commonwealth of Nations, and the rapid expansion of higher education during the past thirty years.

The overall pattern in Table 4.9 is not particularly noteworthy: by country of birth most vice-chancellors are Australian or British (UK). There is a small increase in 1983 of about ten percent over the number born in Australia in 1973 or 1963. The distribution by type of university deserves some comment. The 19th Century Institutions display a preference for appointing Australian-born vice-chancellors — 75 percent in each of the three years surveyed. Of the 1983 incumbents in this group of institutions, the one born in the UK had previously been vice-chancellor of an Australian university and had lived all but five of the past seventeen

Table 4.8 Academic Experience

Experience	University											
	1963				1973				1983			
	19th C (%)	Early 20th C (%)	Post War (%)	All (%)	19th C (%)	Early 20th C (%)	Post War (%)	All (%)	19th C (%)	Early 20th C (%)	Post War (%)	All (%)
As student only	25	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
As student and academic	50	0	0	20	25	0	0	10	50	0	0	20
As academic only	25	0	50	30	25	0	50	30	25	0	0	10
No previous internal experience	0	100	50	40	50	100	50	60	25	100	100	70
$N(=100\%)$	4	2	4	10	4	2	4	10	4	2	4	10

Table 4.9 Country of Birth

Country	University													
	1963				1973					1983				
	19th C (%)	Early 20th C (%)	Post War (%)	All (%)	19th C (%)	Early 20th C (%)	Post War (%)	New (%)	All (%)	19th C (%)	Early 20th C (%)	Post War (%)	New (%)	All (%)
Australia	75	50	25	50	75	50	25	43	47	75	0	100	44	58
U.K.	25	50	75	50	25	50	50	43	41	25	100	0	56	42
Other commonwealth	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	0	6	0	0	0	0	0
Other overseas	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	6	0	0	0	0	0
N(=100%)	4	2	4	10	4	2	4	7	17	4	2	4	9	4

years in the country. In establishing new universities the preference has been to appoint persons not born in Australia as inaugural vice-chancellor. This could reflect the sense of mission with which many institutions were established in contrast to the existing "single-state" universities; and it might also reflect the absence of Australians with appropriate experience to fulfill the charter of these new institutions. In 1963, 75 percent of the Post War Institutions had vice-chancellors who were born other than in Australia. This percentage was the same for Post War Institutions in 1973 when 57 percent of vice-chancellors of the New Institutions were also other than Australian born. By 1983, all incumbents of Post War Institutions were Australian-born; and 56 percent of the incumbents of New Institutions were born in the UK. Of this latter group 33 percent of the total were foundation vice-chancellors. It is the writer's prediction that most, if not all, of these will be replaced upon retirement by Australians; and that such action will be seen by some as a further step in the process of academic and intellectual decolonisation. A vice-chancellor's country of birth should not be a significant criterion *per se* in his or her appointment; rather it may be associated with a capacity to exercise effective leadership in an Australian university. It can be argued that there are characteristics of Australian higher education that are distinctively system, if not culture bound, and that these may be better appreciated by a national.

The country of residence of vice-chancellors immediately before appointment is shown in Table 4.10 by type of university. A number of interesting comparisons can be made between data in this and the previous table. For instance, the number of vice-chancellors resident in Australia is equal to or greater than the number who were born in Australia in each group of universities in each of the three years except for the 19th Century Institutions in 1973. A comparison of totals between Table 4.10 and Table 4.9 reveals that Australian-resident exceed Australian-born incumbents by 16 percent in 1983, by 12 percent in 1973 and by 40 percent in 1963. A more detailed comparison of these two tables, for example, between the birth and residence data for 1983 vice-chancellors of New Institutions, indicates that 23 percent of UK-born incumbents were Australian residents at the time of their appointment. What Table 4.10 does not reveal is the number of Australian-born vice-chancellors who were living overseas at appointment. This was the case of the one exception (19th Century Institution in 1973) referred to above.

Only one non-Commonwealth national was appointed vice-chancellor in the years surveyed, which implies something about the source of conventional wisdom with which Australian vice-chancellors operate. Despite this and the continent's antipodean location, Australian universities demonstrate selective excellence as a part of the international higher education community. Scholars emigrate to Australia as they do from it to elsewhere. Some, particularly those from the UK subsequently accept appointment as vice-chancellor. An ardent nationalist might observe that numbers of Australians — including the two previous Prime

Table 4.10 Country of Residence Immediately before Appointment

Country	University													
	1963				1973					1963				
	19th C (%)	Early 20th C (%)	Post War (%)	All (%)	19th C (%)	Early 20th C (%)	Post War (%)	New (%)	All (%)	19th C (%)	Early 20th C (%)	Post War (%)	New (%)	All (%)
Australia	100	100	75	90	50	100	50	58	59	75	50	100	67	74
U.K.	0	0	25	10	50	0	25	14	23	25	0	0	33	21
Other commonwealth	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	14	12	0	50	0	0	5
Other overseas	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	6	0	0	0	0	0
N(=100%)	4	2	4	10	4	2	4	7	17	4	2	4	9	19

Table 4.11 Age at Appointment to Incumbent Vice-Chancellorship

Age	University													
	1963				1973					1983				
	19th C (%)	Early 20th C (%)	Post War (%)	All (%)	19th C (%)	Early 20th C (%)	Post War (%)	New (%)	All (%)	19th C (%)	Early 20th C (%)	Post War (%)	New (%)	All (%)
40-44	0	50	0	10	0	0	25	14	12	0	0	0	0	0
45-49	50	0	75	50	50	50	50	14	35	25	50	25	56	42
50-54	0	0	0	0	25	50	25	43	35	0	0	50	33	26
55-59	50	0	25	30	25	0	0	29	18	25	50	0	11	16
60-64	0	50	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	50	0	25	0	16
N(=100%)	4	2	4	10	4	2	4	7	17	4	2	4	9	19

Ministers (Hawke & Fraser) — have gone to Britain for university studies; and then the question could be asked: how many Australians have been appointed vice-chancellor there. That research is properly the subject of another enquiry.

The age of appointment to incumbent vice-chancellorship is shown by type of university of Table 4.11. There is a wide spread of ages across all of the 46 vice-chancellors and also within each of the three years. The age of the youngest appointee included in this table was 42 and that of the oldest 62 years. The range of ages is greatest within the 1963 group. At the same time, the proportion of vice-chancellors appointed under 50 years of age is largest in 1963 — 60 percent. The comparable figure in 1973 is 47 percent with 42 percent of 1983 incumbents being appointed under the age of 50.

To be vice-chancellor of an Australian university is to undertake a complex executive office of heavy responsibility. In recent years with capricious government financing, considerable stress has often been placed on many incumbents. Notwithstanding location at the nexus of most internal/external information and policy transactions, a vice-chancellor may experience isolation. A required combination of significant professional distinction, relevant experience, and personal attributes is seen in Table 4.11 as being achieved by most appointees in the age grouping 45-54 years. Of the 1983 incumbents, 68 percent were appointed in this age bracket; 70 percent in 1973; and 50 percent in 1963. Few persons younger than 45 years could be expected to have acquired the experience or executive stamina to be an effective vice-chancellor. Most vice-chancellors incumbent in 1963 were appointed *sine die*. Contracts for five or seven years, renewable by mutual agreement, and retirement at age 65 (and optionally at 60 years) became a feature of appointments in later years. A detailed analysis of the length of incumbency for vice-chancellors is presented in the following chapter.

Perhaps the most notable observation about any pattern of vice-chancellors' ages at appointment by type of university is that younger institutions tend to select younger vice-chancellors. Thirteen universities were established in Australia between the Second World War and 1983 and these are included in the Post War and New Institution classifications in this study. The foundation vice-chancellors of twelve of these were in office in either 1963, 1973 or 1983. The average age of foundation vice-chancellors at appointment was 48 years which can be compared with the average age of 1983 incumbents of 52 years. The inverse observation — that the older established universities attract older appointees — is more noteworthy in 1983 given that contemporary vice-chancellors are appointed on contract with specified retirement ages. From Table 4.11 it can be seen that 75 percent of 1983 vice-chancellors at 19th Century Institutions and 50 percent at Early 20th Century Institutions were 55 years or older at appointment. Explanatory factors include: the eminence of institution and appointee; the existence of load-sharing offices in an administrative superstructure of deputy

and pro vice-chancellors; and, in a developing national system of higher education, the fact that an increasing number of appointees had previously been vice-chancellor. This latter characteristic will now be examined in Table 4.12.

There are several important differences between data in Table 4.11 and those in Table 4.12 which shows age on appointment to first-vice-chancellorship for incumbents in each of the three years. Just as in Table 4.7 an immediately prior appointment as warden of a university college was recognized *de facto* as equivalent to deputy vice-chancellor, so in Table 4.12 those wardens of a university college, to which upon attaining university status they were immediately appointed as vice-chancellor, are included. This inclusion is justified because the characteristics enabling them to become warden were acceptable for appointment as vice-chancellor. Three persons are in this category, one of whom is represented in 1983 and in 1973 incumbents; and he is the youngest "vice-chancellor", having been appointed warden at 38 years of age.

Table 4.12   Age at Appointment to First Vice-Chancellorship

Age	1963 (%)	1973 (%)	1983 (%)
35-39	0	6	5
40-44	20	18	16
45-49	40	35	32
50-54	0	29	26
55-59	30	12	16
60-64	10	0	5
N(=100%)	10	17	19

Note: Includes persons who were warden of a university college to which upon attaining university status they were immediately appointed as vice-chancellor.

The range of ages for initial appointment is wider in each year surveyed than for current appointment: overall in Table 4.12, ages range from 38 to 62 years. The proportion of vice-chancellors attaining their first appointment under 50 years of age, compared with data in Table 4.11, increases by 9 percent to become 51 percent of 1983 vice-chancellors and by 12 percent to be 59 percent of 1973 incumbents. The figures for 1963 appointments in both tables are the same at 60 percent under 50 years. Most vice-chancellors attained their first appointment in the age group 45-54, though a reduced number when compared with incumbents in Table 4.11; for 1983, 58 percent compared with 68 percent; for 1973, 64 percent compared with 70 percent; and for 1963, 40 percent compared with 50 percent. To complete this selected comparison, the average age at which 1983 incumbents attained their first appointment as vice-

chancellor was 50 years, which is two years less than the age at which they attained their present appointment.

Until 1970 no vice-chancellor had resigned an appointment to go directly to another vice-chancellorship. Most had retired from or died in office. Sir (then Professor) Zelman Cowen, after the shortest incumbency in the survey period, resigned from the post of Vice-Chancellor of the University of New England (1967-1969) to become Vice-Chancellor of the University of Queensland (1970-77). That action, and not only in terms of executive staffing, can be regarded as a major threshold in the further delineation of a system of higher education in Australia. Differentiation among universities could now be measured by another dimension — the career path of vice-chancellors beyond an initial incumbency; and such factors as institutional status, job satisfaction, career challenge, and educational orientation may be included in the assessment.

None of the 1963 incumbents had previously been a vice-chancellor. Among 1973 appointees, one in addition to Sir Zelman Cowen had been a vice-chancellor — and he of a New Zealand university. Of the 1983 vice-chancellors represented in Table 4.11, four persons — *i.e.*, 21 percent — had previously been vice-chancellor of another Australian university. Two had moved directly from smaller universities. The other two had held senior government appointments between vice-chancellorships. By 1983 Australian higher education had developed so that differentiation was evident not only between university and advanced education sectors, but also amongst institutions with the university sector.

An analysis appears in Table 4.13 of the honours and awards which have been received and earned by vice-chancellors in each year surveyed. This presentation is by type of university and, as the frequency percentages indicate, an individual incumbent may be a recipient in more than one category. Plainly evident is the fact that Australian vice-chancellors were no longer the monarch's men in respect of knighthoods conferred upon them. The decline in the giving of this honour is remarkable: 90 percent of 1963 vice-chancellors were knighted; 41 percent of 1973 incumbents were similarly recognized; while none of those in office in 1983 had been knighted.

In Table 4.13 *Knighthood* is used in reference to an honour conferred by Queen Elizabeth II as Queen of Australia on the advice of either a state or the federal government. *Other Imperial Awards* were granted through the same process. As policy, Labor Party governments do not recommend imperial knighthoods and other awards. Governments of all parties recommend Order of Australia awards which formerly included knighthoods. These are listed under *Australian Award* in Table 4.13. Only one incumbent, Sir Zelman Cowen, vice-chancellor of an Early 20th Century Institution in 1973, had received an AK (Knighthood of the

Table 4.13 Honours and Awards

Country	University													
	1963				1973					1983				
	19th C (%)	Early 20th C (%)	Post War (%)	All (%)	19th C (%)	Early 20th C (%)	Post War (%)	New (%)	All (%)	19th C (%)	Early 20th C (%)	Post War (%)	New (%)	All (%)
Knighthood	75	100	100	90	100	50	50	0	41	75	0	0	0	0
Other Imperial Award	75	50	75	70	50	0	75	43	47	75	0	50	0	16
Australian Award	0	0	0	0	50	50	0	0	18	0	0	50	11	16
Other Overseas Award	25	0	0	10	25	0	0	0	6	25	0	0	0	0
Military Decoration	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	12	0	0	0	11	5
Honorary Degree – Australian	100	100	100	100	100	50	75	43	65	100	0	75	22	32
Honorary Degree – Other Commonwealth	75	0	50	50	25	50	75	0	29	75	0	25	0	5
Honorary Degree – Other Overseas	0	0	0	0	0	50	0	14	12	0	0	0	0	0
Emeritus Professor	25	0	25	20	25	50	50	43	41	25	0	100	22	37
Fellowship	0	50	100	50	75	100	75	71	76	0	50	100	67	74
N(=100%)	4	2	4	10	4	2	4	7	17	4	2	4	9	19

Note: Fellowship includes any fellowship honorary or elected in a scientific, professional or learned society.

Order of Australia). This followed an imperial knighthood and was granted as Sir Zelman left university life to become Governor-General of Australia.

It could be that knighthoods, imperial awards and other honours are yet to be gained, especially by 1983 incumbents. But the evidence to support this prospect — particularly applying to knighthoods — is not strong. One of the knighted vice-chancellors had this honour prior to appointment. Nearly all others received their knighthood whilst in office. Only two were knighted after retirement — one two years and the other one year subsequently. And in respect of 1983 incumbents the average number of years since this group of nineteen attained their first appointment as vice-chancellor is seven. The Federal Labor Government had only been in office since March 1983 so the effect of its policy in not recommending such awards would not have been reflected in the 1983 publications from which much data have been derived. The likelihood that few, if any, vice-chancellors will receive a knighthood is further supported by the data in Table 4.6. This showed that as a major activity outside their career, Australian vice-chancellors serve on government advisory and statutory bodies most of which are federal not state. Prior to March 1983, a non-Labor government held office in Canberra for seven years and one can assume that recognition by means of a knighthood could have been awarded vice-chancellors during that period. The granting of *Other Imperial Awards* is shown in Table 4.13 also to be in marked decline: in 1963, 70 percent of incumbents held such an award; in 1973 the percentage reduced to 47, and this declined further to 16 percent of 1983 vice-chancellors. There has, to date, been no corresponding increase in giving *Australian Awards*. The conclusion reached by the writer is that the failure to grant knighthoods and other similar honours to incumbent vice-chancellors was further testimony to higher education's loss of political priority in Australia during the period surveyed.

Before leaving this discussion of imperial honours and awards it should be noted that vice-chancellors of 19th Century Institutions seem more likely than others to receive knighthoods; and that among the survey group, no vice-chancellor of a New Institution has yet been awarded a knighthood. There had been a decline in the holding of overseas awards and military decoration by vice-chancellors. Although not significant among awards held by Australian vice-chancellors, this decline is probably a fact of history as the time span from World War II lengthens. The possession of some awards may be quite personal — for example, military decorations; but a contention of this study is that most other honours are characteristic of the office of vice-chancellor mediated by the sort of person usually appointed.

What the data in Table 4.13 suggest is the development of a pattern of awards sustained by the Australian university system itself and associated scholarly bodies. There is room for the viewpoint that the awards of *Honorary Degree-Australian*, *Emeritus Professor*, and *Fellowship* are an increasingly important part of a recognition system for vice-chancellors who

have attained distinction for their institution and their office. With the exception of the honorary degree category, the 1983 and 1973 frequency for the other awards significantly exceeds comparable 1963 figures. It can be expected that more *Honorary Degrees-Australian* will be awarded to 1983 incumbents as this has become an accolade given for a signal contribution to higher education near or after a vice-chancellor's retirement. Those 1983 incumbents upon whom honorary degrees have already been conferred form two distinct groups: the first comprises persons who had previously been vice-chancellors in another university; and the second group is made up of members each of whom has received his award from the same university. A tentative conclusion to the analysis of the characteristic of honours and awards is offered. As honours from the state apparently decline, at the same time as a loss of political priority is experienced by higher education generally, Australian universities have developed — as another aspect of a maturing system — their own pattern of honours and awards with which to recognize vice-chancellors.

The remaining three tables help complete the social characteristics profile of vice-chancellors both as higher education executives and as human beings. Table 4.14 concerns Membership of Clubs and data are presented for each year for the total number of incumbents. As membership percentages show, some vice-chancellors were members of more than one club in the year surveyed; others of none. Certain clubs located in Canberra, the national capital, were included in the category *Major Metropolitan*.

Table 4.14   Membership of Clubs

Club	1963 (%)	1973 (%)	1983 (%)
Major Metropolitan	70	47	37
Sporting or Recreational	0	24	16
University Clubs	0	0	5
UK Clubs	0	12	5
None Listed	30	41	53
N(=100%)	10	17	19

Little explanatory comment can be added to the trends suggested by the data in Table 4.14. That club membership has become a matter of declining significance for Australian vice-chancellors is indicated in two dimensions: firstly, the decline in membership within the largest category, *Major Metropolitan* clubs from 70 percent in 1963, to 47 percent in 1973, and then to 37 percent in 1983; and secondly, the increasing practice of not listing membership of any clubs which rose from 30 percent in 1963, to 41 percent in 1973, to a level of 53 percent of incumbents in 1983. What account can be given to explain this overall decline? It may be that

vice-chancellors are now coming from a different background, but from Tables 4.1 and 4.2 this does not seem to be so; or that, based on data from Table 4.4, vice-chancellors with *Science* backgrounds (58 percent of 1983 incumbents) are less "clubable"; or that club membership itself has been altering over the same period of years. Speculation aside, it is more likely that peculiarly Australian circumstances relating to geography and demography could provide one explanation: namely, that there are relatively few universities, many separated by enormous distances, and that vice-chancellors nowadays travel more often and more rapidly between campus and Canberra than previously. The increasing pressure of work to be done for university and government committees leaves a vice-chancellor with little time for clubs which might offer cigars and port and a dignified ambience. Furthermore, the close relationships vice-chancellors experience as members of the Australian Vice-Chancellors' Committee probably obviate the need to find a venue for discussion such as common membership of a club provides.

To nominate recreations is an expectation of a well balanced biographical entry in a publication like *Who's Who*. Some private recreational activity would seem essential for as public an officer as a vice-chancellor who, as a multi-dimensional person, is expected to be equally at ease sipping champagne during opera intervals, opening a campus childcare centre, or presenting Blues awards at the Student Sports Union.

Table 4.15   Nominated Recreations

Recreation	1963 (%)	1973 (%)	1983 (%)
Sports	50	59	53
Music, Reading, the Arts	10	29	47
Gardening	20	0	5
Photography, Trains	10	0	11
Philately, Numismatics	10	0	5
Bridge	0	6	11
Craftwork	10	12	0
Other	20	12	21
None Nominated	30	29	21
N(=100%)	10	17	19

Table 4.15 shows data for recreations nominated by incumbents in each of the three years surveyed. *Sports* are reasonably consistent as the most frequently cited recreation of vice-chancellors — 50 percent in 1963, 59 percent in 1973, and 53 percent in 1983. The details behind these percentages are that golf and swimming are most favoured. *Gardening* has

declined as a recreation from 20 percent in 1963 to a mere 5 percent in 1983 whereas *Music, Reading and the Arts* have been designated by an increasing number of vice-chancellors over the survey period: from 10 percent in 1963, to 29 percent in 1973, and a further sharp rise to 47 percent of 1983 incumbents. Perhaps this increased popularity says as much about the coming-of-age of Australia's representational and dramatic art forms in recent years as it does about the recreational preferences of vice-chancellors.

The remaining range of recreational interests is suitably varied. The table indicates a progressive decline in the category *None Nominated* from 30 percent in 1963, to 29 percent in 1973, and to 21 percent in 1983. Not surprisingly, among those not nominating any recreation are the vice-chancellors whose service on statutory bodies and government committees has been at a most distinguished and sustained level. One of these vice-chancellors, a 1973 incumbent, told the writer during an interview, that he often took files home in the evening but rarely at the weekend; he tried to keep Saturday and Sunday free for writing. For such incumbents, professional activities outside the vice-chancellorship could well absorb time available for recreations in a way that was no less satisfying.

Table 4.16 Marital and Parental Status

Status	1963 (%)	1973 (%)	1983 (%)
Married, no children	0	6	0
Married, 1 child	0	0	5
Married, 2 children	30	23	42
Married, 3 children	40	47	26
Married, 4 children	30	18	16
Married, 5 children or more	0	6	11
Married twice	0	6	16
N(=100%)	10	17	19

The presentation and analysis of data end with some demographic data about Marital and Parental Status which appear in Table 4.16. A column about gender is not required as all incumbents in the three years were male; as indeed have been all vice-chancellors of Australian universities since their foundation until 1986. All incumbents have been married and all except one of the 46 have been parents. Concerning vice-chancellorial fecundity, the data indicate a pattern of either two or three children in the case of 70 percent of incumbents in both 1963 and 1973, and 68 percent in 1983. Most vice-chancellors in 1983 had two children (42 percent) compared with most having three in 1973 (47 percent) and 1963 (40 percent). However the range in family size is greatest in 1983, being from one child families to those with five or more

children. Not to have any vice-chancellors who had been married more than once would have been atypical compared with Australian statistics. To learn that incumbents who have been married twice increased from zero in 1963 to 6 percent in 1973 to become 16 percent in 1983 reflects generally a trend in Australian society.

Conclusion

This social characteristics profile of Australian vice-chancellors is a contribution to the much neglected social arithmetic of higher education. It should be useful of itself in providing basic data about a group of influential people in Australian society at three points in time. While the total population of 46 incumbents is small, it does comprise the leadership group of a total system — the university sector of Australian higher education. Caution has already been expressed about interpreting the data of this survey in isolation from other information relating both to vice-chancellors and to the contexts in which they are active.

The research has gone farther than intended in that this analysis of social characteristics among vice-chancellors has placed into sharper relief a number of issues concerned with Australian higher education. Some of the more significant of these are noted below, often as questions. The paper raises the extent to which a system of higher education had assumed definitive shape and characteristics, particularly in the university sector since the foundation, within the survey period, of the most recent university in 1975. Had Australian higher education in fact lost political priority? In a relatively stable system — with room for few financially endorsed initiatives — was differentiation, including a status ranking among the nineteen universities, becoming more overt; and in what ways had the movement of vice-chancellors between institutions, and in and out of the sector, influenced the development of a pecking order? Quite different attributes are required of foundation vice-chancellors to those subsequently appointed. The account that was taken of this by 1984 selection committees would have been of vital importance, particularly as the vice-chancellorial office may have become circumscribed by, among other factors, an administrative superstructure of deputy or pro vice-chancellors. Can the pattern of academic awards — fellowships and honorary degrees — engendered by Australian universities and associated scholarly bodies be seen as evidence of a maturing and national system of higher education?

Incidentally, if one were an investment advisor to Ladbrooks, the writer thinks a loss would be experienced if too many wagers had been accepted on starters in the vice-chancellorial stakes who possessed most of the following characteristics: male, Australian by birth, aged 45-54 years, married once with two children; likely to have been educated in a government school in Melbourne or Sydney (definitely not Queensland or the Northern Territory), an undergraduate major in science preferably from the University of Melbourne and completion of

a Ph.D.; a career as an academic and present employment as a deputy vice-chancellor; possession of a learned fellowship, willingness to forego a knighthood; the expectation of serving on government advisory and statutory bodies; and the ultimate prospect of an honorary doctorate. Any contender with these attributes would have been a short-listed favourite for one of the vacant vice-chancellorships during 1984-85.