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ABSTRACT

The aim of the research in this MA by Research thesis has been to shed light on the development of the notion of “management” and its associated “sociometrics” at UK universities.

The research looked at the transformation of university operating strategies in England and Wales, with the objective of capturing the various managerial movements from a traditional collegial administrative operating system to a more diverse entrepreneurial model more aligned with contemporary corporate management beliefs. 8 diverse universities were selected for the case-study to provide “colour and contrast” – namely, Oxford and Cambridge as “Ancient” universities, Cardiff and Royal Holloway as “19th Century-Founded” universities, Birmingham to cover the “Red Brick” category, Lancaster to spotlight the so-called “Plate-Glass” universities, Hertfordshire to embrace the “Post-Polytechnic” universities and Open University to include the “E-University” category.

The methodology utilized was a triangulated middle-ground approach to examine qualitatively and quantitatively the universities websites, strategic documents, government committee reports, regulations and financial performance information that reflected surplus/deficit results as outcomes for the targeted group.

The lessons learned from this investigation showed that these universities modus operandi and performance reflected an ongoing trend of transformation imposed by continuous government regulatory change requirements on the one hand, and most likely also, the changing sector climate in the higher education community in England and Wales.

The findings from the research indicate that scholastic writings and the literature have extensively chronicled the movement from ‘collegial’ administration to academic
entrepreneurialism. However, it appears to be an open question as to whether a common corporate strategic wording language had emerged by 2002: though it had basically, by 2012. In both 2002 and 2012 a recognizable core of sociometric wording language was discernible. And finally some slender evidence was uncovered that indicates where substantial effort was put out by the universities in strategic planning, better financial results accrued.

Significant contributions to overall knowledge have been uncovered as a result of this thesis research. The movement by UK universities from ‘academic collegial administration’ to academic entrepreneurialism’ has been verified by multiple academic writings. UK universities have developed a measurable increase in the use of common ‘strategic sociometric wording’ and a greatly increased the use of strategic management and corporatised-wording in their published literature. And lastly, some modest evidence supports a finding that better financial results do appear to have emanated where considerable strategic planning effort was put out.

Key words: collegial administration; strategic™ management; strategic™ sociometry; benchmarking/monitoring; development/improvement; performance.
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NOTE:

- Two systems of referencing are used in this dissertation due to the complexity of the material covered here. Subscript numbers throughout the thesis text reference the previous sentence or phrase. This procedure has been followed as it is the standard methodology utilized in much of the literature cited.

- The Harvard Referencing System (HRS) is used, where appropriate, throughout the thesis.

- Some of the research for this thesis has been carried out in the United States. In quoting such literature in this thesis, American spellings have been used in order to remain true to the original text. In all other cases the policy followed has been to utilise English spelling.
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Motivation for this Research:
Motivation to carry out the research resulting in this thesis traces its history back some 25 years at the time of the author’s embarkation on a PhD dissertation in economics about business culture. Thereafter the writer chaired a ‘blue ribbon’ panel at Royal Holloway University of London that, over a period of 3 years, developed a 55 page model ‘Values and Governance Charter’ for universities. Later following discussions with 2 CEOs of Royal Holloway University of London and the CFO of the University of Reading, the author developed 2 other planning models for the profitability of higher education universities and colleges – one relative to an accounting-based department-by-department/school-by-school student numbers planning model and another relating to global student recruitment methodology.
Shortly thereafter, 2 then faculty members of the University of Hertfordshire suggested that the writer research and prepare a document about the corporatized evolution of UK universities. Those discussions resulted in the present thesis.

1.2 The Research Problems Related to This Thesis:
The amount, nature and scope of research in and for a Master’s level thesis is necessarily more circumscribed by University regulations than for PhD dissertations, but in ‘intensity’ is no less demanding. In the present case, the topic area desired to be researched required the challenging utilization of both qualitative and quantitative research techniques and measures to realize the desired goals.
The review, reporting and interpretation of the scholastic writings and literature in this particular area had to serve extended purposes rather than the normal single usage of portraying the prior framework history of writings in this field. Because of the nature of the subject-matter, it had to be utilised as the agent to prove or disprove Hypothesis I - III of this thesis. Thus, its very
character had to be expanded beyond the single purpose ‘literature review’ normally found in theses. Therefore, its function, whilst relatively straightforward, necessarily had to be and became multi-faceted: historical, a framework for the whole research project and a qualitative form of research inquiry as well.

The culling of word and phrase usage from the internet-published 2002 strategic documentation and the 2012 Strategic Plan documentation of each of the 8 selected test-case UK universities here also proved to be a very challenging, long-winded, frustrating and trying research problem.

Because of the lack of standardization of language employed by these universities, simple package language-stripping programmes could not be employed. Decisions about direct and implied word and phrase meaning frequently had to be inferred from the surrounding context. This caused the research to be excessively time-consuming and very arduous, in turn causing reliance on qualitative judgmental interpretive skill – never without some element of subjective, even if unconscious bias, instead of easily gathered and quantitative objective mathematically-collated computer analysis.

Thus the chosen triangulated back-bone of the research (the explicit and implied use and frequency of ‘found’ terminology) was semantic and qualitatively based and the distillation process relative to such ‘found’ terminology was then quantitative. The reconciliation process of the summed qualitative data and the financial information compiled was thereafter, of course, quantitative.

1.3 The Aim of the Research Relative to this Thesis:
The fundamental aim of the research and analysis in this thesis has been to shed light on the development of this notion of ‘management’ and its associated ‘sociometrics’ in and of UK universities – moving, as it has, from ‘academic collegial administration’ prevalent in the olden
days and up through the 1960s - to a contemporary approach which is evidenced more and more by the mantle of ‘strategic management’ - see Figure 1 and Table 1.1 (in Appendix 1) - together with a hugely expanded associated inventory of ‘sociometric’ wording – see Table 1.2 (in Appendix 1).

To achieve the aims and purposes of this thesis, the objectives of the research here will be directed as follows:

(1) literature on the administration of UK universities back to 1963 – the year of publication of the Lord Robbins Report – will be reviewed and contrasted with that on the new ‘management’ which is used to refer to how and to what extent UK universities are and have been adopting the organisation forms, technologies, management practices and values commonly found in the commercial business sector;

(2) an analysis will be undertaken of strategic ‘planning’ ‘management’ and ‘operations’ language employed in key planning and management documents put up on the internet by 8 time-era selected UK universities – see Table 1.3 (in Appendix 1) - and to review the presence or absence of such strategic ‘planning’ ‘management’ and ‘operations’ language as published in their 2002 documents and in their 2012 Strategic Plans, on their individual websites; and

(3) an analysis will be undertaken to review the presence or absence of ‘strategic sociometric’ language as published in their 2002 documents and in their 2012 Strategic Plans as published on their individual websites;

(4) to chart the extent to which strategic ‘planning’ ‘management’ and ‘operations’ language - as published on the 8 time-era selected UK universities websites - is employed consistently or whether in fact there are differences from university to university in the
**EQUATION**

**THE METAMORPHOSIS OF 'MANAGEMENT' IN UK UNIVERSITIES**

**DURING THE LAST 50 PLUS YEARS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ERA</th>
<th>POLITICAL PARTIES IN POWER</th>
<th>PRIME MINISTER(S)</th>
<th>STAGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1965 and Before:</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Harold Macmillan (1957-1963)</td>
<td>STAGE I  Academic 'Collegial' Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(&quot;The White Heat of Technology&quot;) (&quot;Getting Even with the US&quot;)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980 to 1997:</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Margaret Thatcher John Major</td>
<td>STAGE III Public Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(&quot;Corporatisation Thrust&quot;)</td>
<td>NEW MANAGERIALISM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SOFT MANAGERIALISM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HARD MANAGERIALISM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PERFORMATIVITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997 to 2010:</td>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>Tony Blair Gordon Brown</td>
<td>STAGE IV Strategic Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(&quot;New Labour - Strategic Management&quot;)</td>
<td>STRATEGIC™ MANAGEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PLANNING MANAGEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MANAGEMENT OPERATIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 to Present:</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>David Cameron</td>
<td>ACADEMIC CAPITALISM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(&quot;Fiscal Responsibility Thrust - Continued Strategic Management&quot;)</td>
<td>ACADEMIC ENTREPRENEURIALISM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1.
extent to which such ‘strategic ‘planning’ ‘management’ and ‘operations’ language has become adopted;

(5) to chart the extent to which ‘strategic sociometric’ language - as published on the 8 time-era selected UK universities websites - is employed consistently or whether in fact there are differences from university to university in the extent to which such ‘strategic sociometric’ language has become adopted; and

(6) to ascertain whether there appears to be a relationship between the combined 2012 increased use of ‘strategic management’ and ‘sociometric’ wording-language found on the 8 time-era selected UK universities websites and their 2012 reported financial profit (surplus).

1.4 The Overall Thesis Objectives:
The objectives of this thesis are to prove the hypotheses and adjunct subsidiary hypotheses set out below, or indeed, disprove one, more or all of them. They all essentially deal with motion in the evolution or metamorphosis of UK universities ‘governance’ in the second half of the 20th century and additionally profitability (surplus) in the early years of this present century.

1.5 Background of the pre-1963 Problematic Circumstances of UK Universities:
Explicit and overt ‘management’ of academic staff and their work by academic ‘managers’ and career ‘administrators’ is now common but was not always so. In one sense, of course, universities have always been ‘managed,’ but however, in a ‘collegial’ culture and without the term ‘management’ being used.
50 plus years ago - in the 1960s - the organisational forms and cultures of UK universities were very different. In the eyes of many – in the UK and elsewhere - they were seen as arcane and largely out of sync with rising post-World War II expectations. Indeed, prior to the Robbins 1963 Higher Education Report, in the history of UK universities “the activities of universities [had] been remarkably immune from interference and control by the government[s] of the day.”

The institutional world of academia, with its noble rituals, was a commitment to the “life of the mind,” with an understanding that an academic career was indeed “a calling” and one “built on generously pensive rumination.” It was a “high-minded” environment with minimal attention paid to the “hum-drum” rituals of daily management.

To-day - because of ongoing increasing interference, pressure and control from the UK government - an evolutionary ‘sea-change’ in the governance of these institutions has generally occurred, resulting in a more pragmatic businesslike approach, observable in tandem with increased ‘managerial’ market orientation.

To understand the overall context, purpose and raison d’être of this thesis, it is crucial to be aware of the environment in which UK universities were operating some 50 years ago. Fortunately, a major UK government-commissioned ‘white paper’ – a truly extraordinary piece of research undertaken by Lord Robbins and a team working with him – was published in 1963 with the noticeably simple short title of: “Higher Education Report.” This Report concentrated “on leading aspects and leading problems of UK universities at that time.”

The Robbins group essentially stated that all higher education institutions had, by 1963, become ‘bloatedly’ dependent on large annual grants from the state to enable them to carry out their
functions and that the higher education being provided was not adequate and unless “speedily reformed…there is little hope of this densely populated island maintaining an adequate position in the fiercely competitive world of the future.” 7

It went on to state that “it is misleading to speak as if there were already a system [of higher education in the UK].”  “What system there is has come about as a result of a series of particular initiatives, concerned with particular need and particular situations”… and… “it is difficult to defend the continued absence of coordinating principles and a general conception of objectives.”8 Relative to the…“largely uncoordinated activities of the past, we are clear that from now on these are not good enough”…the needs of the present and still more of the future demand that there should be a system.”9

The 1963 Report was and is, in effect, the genesis for the cataclysmal ‘sea-change’ in the nature and management of UK universities that has been gradually occurring over the last 50 plus years. It is the foundation for where higher education is to-day.

1.6 The Robbins 1963 “Higher Education Report” in Context:

How prescient was and is Robbins? (See Appendix 10 – Summary of the Robbins Report).

Firstly, it should be noted that a generalized critical malfunctioning in the UK Higher Education system was recognized by both the Harold Macmillan and Alec Douglas-Home Conservative administrations. An in-depth study and report was resultingness commissioned by the UK government - initially by the Macmillan administration. The outcome was the Robbins Report – published during the Douglas-Home administration.

The 1963 Lord Robbins Report on Higher Education in the United Kingdom is, in fact the ultimate yardstick by which - in philosophical terms - all subsequent progress made by UK universities in the last 50 plus years, can and should be measured and judged.
The Report covered universities in England, Scotland and Wales, teacher training colleges, colleges of Advanced Technology, technical and commercial colleges, schools of art and colleges of agriculture.

The Committee held hearings, conducted surveys and made statistical inquiries. However, in the financial and statistical areas of its recommendations, the Report greatly underestimated the nature and extent of later ‘boom’ developments in UK higher education. Nevertheless, and most importantly though, the Committee well understood and admirably forecast - in the main – the need for and the nature of future change required in the UK universities environment. The Committee’s recommendations have, in hindsight, evidenced a remarkable degree of foresightedness and accuracy.

The 1963 Robbins Report is the ‘bedrock’ analysis upon which the educational policy of successive UK governments (Conservative and Labour) have been based for the last 50 plus years.

The Report ushered in what has become a permanent presence of graduated – if not always consistent – ongoing and increasing UK government leadership, direction and interference in the governance and affairs of UK universities.

Initially, the Robbins precepts - (Macmillan/Douglas-Home administrations (1957-1964)) –were taken up by the Harold Wilson (Labour administration)(1964-1970: 1974-1970) under the banners of:

1. ‘incremental governance’ – “the white heat of technology;” and
2. ‘getting even’ with US delivery levels of higher education.

These concepts were later endorsed and further implemented by the Heath (Conservative)
administration (1970-1974). This ongoing “fresh-air” philosophical approach was continued by the Callaghan (Labour) administration (1976-1979).

In terms of overall directional ‘drift,’ the incremental governance/management era (which succeeded the generalized concept of ‘collegial academic administration’ evolved over a period of 17 years (1964-1980).

With the advent of the Margaret Thatcher (Conservative) administration (1979-1990), UK universities governance gradually metamorphosed into a generalised conceptual philosophy personified as public management. From this emergence was borne the term new managerialism – evidenced in turn by the sub-concepts of soft management, hard management and performativity.

In terms of general directional ‘movement’ and ‘evolution,’ the public management-new managerialism (soft and hard management plus performativity) approach at UK universities transitioned into existence over a period of 18 years (1979-1997) permeating through the Thatcher and Major Conservative administrations.

In the era of Tony Blair and Gordon Brown (Labour administrations - ‘new Labour’) (1997 – 2010) and David Cameron (Conservative administration – ‘fiscal conservatism’) (2010 to present), a further ‘raft’ of managerial concepts have begun to emerge in the management environment of UK universities. These have been ‘coined’ with the following appellations: strategic management, academic capitalism and academic entrepreneurialism.

And so, to give this thesis appropriate historical and foundational framework, it is relevant to dwell on the Robbins Committee’s Report and recommendations in a significant manner – over and above many other intervening developments. Therefore its contents have been
summarized hereafter, as has the decaying environmental operating conditions of UK universities by the early 1960s, in some contextual detail.

Further, a summary iteration of the convolutions through which, in general, UK universities have subsequently graduated, to arrive at the present, is also given. Conclusions are also offered as to where, in general terms, the UK higher education system currently ‘is,’ in the final chapter of this dissertation.

1.7 Key ‘Strategic’ and ‘Sociometric’ Terms Used in this Thesis: 13

Various key ‘strategic’ and ‘sociometric’ terms have been coined as markers throughout this thesis. The strategy-related ones are: collegial administration, strategic™ Management, Strategic™ Sociometry, planning, benchmarking/monitoring and performance. The sociometrically-related ones are: development/improvement, teaching/learning, research and development (R & D), excellence, internationalism, and community/environment. Definitions of each of these are included in Appendix I of this document. 14

1.8 The Contributions of the Research Emanating from this Thesis:

The contribution of the research deriving from this thesis are as follows:-

The research findings relative to this thesis clearly evidence from scholastic writings and literature that UK universities have moved from non-management academic ‘collegial’ administration through ‘public’ government/management, and thereafter through so-called soft management, hard management and performativity to strategic management, academic capitalism and academic entrepreneurialism.

However, as late as 2002, based on the research here, one could argue and somewhat justify either way that there was or was not a ‘bank’ of stated elements amounting to greater or lesser
manifestations of ‘strategic management’ – corporate-wording language – in the stated publications of UK universities. By 2012 this situation appears to have decisively changed based on the research here; indeed, a major increase in the use of ‘strategic management’ – corporate-wording language – in the stated publications of UK universities can be inferred.

On the other hand, the use of strategic ‘sociometric’ social science-related language in the stated publications of UK universities – appears from the research done for this thesis - to have been evident back in 2002 and continues on through 2012.

And finally, some slender evidence from the current research does support the proposition that better financial results emanate where more strategic planning effort is put out by UK universities.

1.9 Summary:

Essentially, 3 epochal themes have been elucidated in this introductory chapter. To recapitulate, they are:

(1) First – the administrative and cultural conditions that generally existed in the pre-Lord Robbins Report era (1963 and before) relative to UK universities; 11

(2) Second – The Robbins Report on UK Higher Education institutions phenomenon; the Harold Wilson Labour administration initiative at the time – “the white heat of technology;” and the drive to catch up with US Higher Education delivery; and

(3) Third – the importation into UK universities of management concepts and systems drawn from the private sector – “Thatcherism” as it has been dubbed – with their ‘performance’ and other ‘business measurements.’

Basically, these emergent ‘management systems’ phenomena have revolved around a ‘quartet’ of
issues:

(1) the ‘scale’ of UK universities – size;

(2) the ‘productivity’ of UK universities – faculty-to-student ratios;

(3) the ‘quality’ of teaching at UK universities – appropriate staffing levels along with the nature, relevance and sophistication of skills taught;

(4) ‘curriculum relevance’ at UK universities – courses being taught that are appropriate to a technology-led, science–based economy.

The agenda – as this relates to UK Higher Education – of both political parties – Conservative and Labour – have tended to fuse, resonate in a similar manner and build upon each other.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction:

The purpose of this literature review is to demonstrate through applicable and detailed references, a relevant and appropriate relationship of previous history and published work to the research which is the core of this dissertation. The structure of this Chapter will centre around three themes: historical issues that have plagued efficient operation of United Kingdom universities, the Lord Robbins Committee Report prescription of 1963, and the subsequent developments flowing from that Report. These threads will then be brought together and summarized at the end of the chapter.

The conceptual term ‘university’ is an old-old one – derived from the Latin universitas (meaning a group of scholars):1 it was originally tied to the Roman Catholic Church – and is said to date back to Pope Innocent III, in the early 1200s.2 Explicit and overt management of academic staff and their work by academic managers and career administrators in UK universities is now common, but was not always so.3 Historically, universities have been difficult places to ‘run,’ because of their complex cultural environment and many sub-cultures, aggravated further by their highly intricate and cumbersome ‘collegial’ decision-making machinery. (see 4) Fifty plus years ago - in the 1960s - the organisational forms and cultures of UK universities were very different. They were permeated with traditional notions that universities were “protected space for unhurried scholarly contemplation, conjuring images of ‘ivory towers’ in which time move[d] at a leisurely pace.”5

In the eyes of many in the UK and elsewhere at that time, they were seen as arcane and largely out of alignment with rising post-World War II expectations.6 Indeed, the Victorian precepts expressed a century earlier by the immortalized and venerable Cardinal Newman, in his The Idea
of a University (1854), still basically obtained: to the effect that the institutional world of academia, with its noble rituals, was a commitment to a “life of the mind,” with the understanding that an academic career was indeed “a calling,” one “built on generously pensive rumination,” and not merely just another category of professional job.

In effect, it was a closed “high-minded” environment with minimal attention paid to the “humdrum” rituals of daily management: it was imbued with the mythical ‘collegial’ spirit as its defining cultural artefact; it bespoke an ingrown and ongoing ‘collegiality’ that its members, (as different from the general public), believed had served universities well for centuries. Its research was essentially ‘curiosity-driven,’ and little time was devoted to ‘applied’ investigation for political, sociological, scientific, industrial or other purposes.

Authority within universities was essentially ‘intellectual authority:’ consultative processes were deemed ‘sine qua non,’ and leadership was essentially consensual. Indeed, the whole atmosphere intimated an aura of self-contented pious ‘organisational narcissism.’

Prior to the 1963 Robbins Higher Education Report, “the activities of [UK] universities [had] been remarkably immune from interference and control by the government[s] of the day.”

Essentially, they were self-governing institutions with minimum management, subject only to peer validation. Further, “the notion that the activities and cultures of universities either required managing or were, in any meaningful sense, ‘managed,’ would have been regarded as heretical... those running universities were regarded as ‘academic leaders’ rather than as managers or chief executives.” In one sense, of course, universities have always been ‘managed,’ but however, in a ‘collegial’ culture and without the term ‘management’ being used.
Thus, The 1963 Robbins *Higher Education Report* initiated a shattering ‘break’ with the past. It concentrated “on leading aspects and leading problems of UK universities at that time,” and has continued - by legacy - to propel a high-powered ongoing ‘engine’ of reform and growth in the way UK universities go about their daily business.

The *1960s to present* transmutation process at UK higher education institutions funded as universities by HEFCE (the Higher Education Funding Council of England) from academic administration to more corporatized strategic management is, by any yardstick, a truly extraordinary one. Three crucial questions flow from this: why did a clarion call for UK universities ‘reform’ crescendo from a meek insignificant sound to a grand fortissimo? What did the 1963 Robbins Report prescribe? And, what has happened since then – what have UK universities actually tried to do so far in response?

To put this chapter in context therefore, it is important to be aware of the crucible in which UK universities were operating fifty plus years ago, what the 1963 Robbins Report recommended, and also to know in the meantime and in to-day’s context, the manner and mode in which they have in general changed their modus operandi in response to Robbins itself and to successor studies and reports. Two brief introductory comments are thus applicable here to lay the groundwork for later more in-depth explanations.

Firstly, the Robbins group basically stated that all higher education institutions had, by 1963, become ‘bloatedly’ dependent on large annual grants from the UK government to enable them to carry out their functions and that the higher education being provided was not adequate and that unless “speedily reformed…there is little hope of this densely populated island maintaining an adequate position in the fiercely competitive world of the future.”
Secondly, the Report went on to state that “it is misleading to speak as if there were already a system [of higher education in the UK].” “What system there is has come about as a result of a series of particular initiatives, concerned with particular need and particular situations”… and… “it is difficult to defend the continued absence of coordinating principles and a general conception of objectives.” The 1963 Report was and is, in effect, the genesis for the cataclysmal ‘sea-change’ in the nature and management of UK universities that has been gradually occurring over the last 50 years. It is the foundation for where UK higher education is to-day.

2.2 Pre-1963 – The ‘Heart’ of The Problem:

Essentially, prior to the 1963 UK Higher Education Report chaired by Lord Robbins, it is probably relatively safe to say that in the main, the ‘running’ of higher education institutions the world over – and UK universities and higher education colleges/institutions in particular – was achieved through a form of ‘academic collegial administration.’

In very broad terms, and with obvious exceptions, this kind of ‘administration’ was characterized by the following approaches:

2.2.1 Student Issues:

Access Problems: Élitism Trammeled Participation - historically, only the more elite, privileged, well-connected or very bright students attended UK universities. If a young person was born into the right circles and educated in the ‘right way,’ then his or her chances of ‘obtaining a place at a UK university were inestimably greater than one not so pedigreed.

Inadequate ‘Student-Focused’ Entry-Level Administration - the administrative machinery in Place for students to gain university entry was grossly inadequate at this juncture. There was a lack of prospectus and entrance-associated information generally available to prospective
students. There was an unnecessary variety of requirements for university ‘entry’ from university to university. There was no central machinery for handling student applications. *Failure to Plan for and Meet the ‘Educated People Needs’ of the Nation* - there was, at this time, no sense of planning to cater for the amount and kinds of highly educated men and women needed to make and keep vibrant, the UK economy, society and culture. *Inadequate Number of Student ‘Places’* - the pool of qualified potential undergraduates during this era greatly exceeded the number of university and higher education places available. The number of boys and girls obtaining the minimum university entrance qualifications had grown much faster than the number of university places available - because of poor planning – essentially very little planning at all - by the latter. *Low Numbers of Overseas Students* - in 1963 there were only around 7% of undergraduates who were from overseas (32% in graduate school), because of lack of planning and financial necessity. To-day, most universities have 20-30% of their undergraduate student population from overseas (and as many as 40-50% doing graduate degrees). *Overloaded Student Numbers at Lectures* - lecture courses were generally overloaded, as regards student numbers, at this time. It was common to see large numbers of students sitting in tiered rows facing a stern member of faculty gowned in a black academic robe pontificating in solemn ‘ivory tower’ tones! *UK Universities: a Poor Comparator to US Universities in Terms of Postgraduate Students* - The Robbins Report indicated that at the time of its publication, the proportion of UK postgraduate students to that of the US “compares so unfavourably.” There were, then, some 2,300 full-time US postgraduate students per 100,000 of population, compared to only 650 full-time UK postgraduate students per 100,000 of UK population. Relative to
part-time postgraduate students, the figures were similarly disappointing – 500 per 100,000 of population in the US compared to only 200 per 100,000 of population in the UK. This was deemed to be a particularly acute problem in the light of the scientific, technological, cultural and information technology revolutions then ‘breaking,’ and this along with increasingly fast moving social change and economic organisation.

2.2.2 Curriculum and Teaching Issues:

Too Much and Too Narrow 6th Form Specialization - Universities had been and continued during this period to require too much and too narrow 6th form specialization to get into them. There was, at this time, no sense of a broader study subject structure;

Lack of Training of Academic Teaching Staff - almost no training in teaching or presentation techniques existed as regards academic staff at this time period, or indeed, earlier. Everyone faculty member was left to his or her own devices, and not surprisingly, usually a certain level of chaos and inconsistency existed relative to educating students and operating academic departments on a day-by-day basis. Complete absence of a course syllabus was not unknown.

Too Narrowly-Conceived Postgraduate Degrees - at this time, postgraduate degrees were “frequently too narrowly conceived” and divorced from the practicalities of daily endeavour. Many times, they were of limited value as a qualification in the ‘real’ world of job-seeking; often, they were geared to some detached sense of scholarship and not as professional training for a student’s career. Furthermore, there was a very limited variety of postgraduate degrees that were available in any case. Much of the time there was little effort, and even less desire, among faculty as to any attempt to cater to the practical value of higher education beyond the Socratic sensibilities of classroom and of campus arguando and discussion.
Narrow ‘Degree’ Study Options - up to and during this time period, concentration of degree course studies was permitted in one subject-area only instead of a wider range of courses conforming to a planned range of choices. The latter approach had long been a permanent feature of the curriculum of US universities and degree-granting colleges, and so, the UK’s lagging behind on such a fundamental cornerstone of higher education and its obvious depressing effect on international student recruitment made this issue a keystone matter in the quest for ‘change.’

‘Dead Wood’ Textbooks - there was too much ‘dead wood’ in many of the textbooks then in use especially in physics, mathematics and languages. Many university-level teachers were lethargic and not writing enough in this area of the educational arena. The drive for academic research at UK universities was muted, at best, at this point in time. Out-of-date textbooks were indeed a symbol of threadbare irrelevancy of higher education institutions at the time. These bastions of learning had strayed into indifference and remoteness from the fundamental raison d’être for their existence.

Unsuitable Course Offerings - many of the student course offerings taught were “not suitable for many of the students who now take them.” They were often too narrowly focused and not relevant to the practical world and lifetime skills. Further, little emphasis was being given to professional or professional-related training. A fundamental rationale for the very existence of institutions of higher learning has always been that of there having some connection of relevance to the outside world.

2.2.3 Management Issues:

University Clan Control - as a generalized concept, there was an indulgence to allow faculty to perfect and practise their skills largely free of interference from those with less expertise.
This do-nothing, don’t-rock-the-boat, stand-pat culture, of course, was in some measure a ‘slow march’ recipe for, in effect, bringing institutions to a gradual halt.

Poor Deployment of Academic Staff - there was an extremely low and very inefficient student to academic staff ratio of 7.6:1 in 1963. This situation, in the face of annual post-World War II inflation, could not go on. Costs of operation needed to be reined in, and some kind of reasonable rate of return mechanisms built into the UK university system generally. Quite apart from the overall cost of running the UK higher education system, there was the issue of fair compensation of faculty and administrative and operations staff at a level more in accord with government civil service employee compensation rates. From a student point of view, more in-depth, directed and efficient learning could also be obtained by the harnessing of new, more effective and cost-responsible techniques capable of being developed in the field of education.

2.2.4 Campus and Financial Issues:

Structural Inefficiency (Financial and Management): on Account of Small Overall Size - all universities at this time were under 10,000 in student size, except for the University of London. Even that institution was split up into relatively small free-standing colleges. The rest of the higher and further education institutions were generally relatively small, piecemeal and fragmented. This situation naturally resulted in unproductive duplication of effort at individual institutions and also often resulted in the ‘unaffordability’ of better facilities and conditions for students, faculty, administrative and operations staff alike.

Facilities Inadequacy: Student Residences:15 - pre-1963, 40% of higher education students were part-time at UK universities because of housing/residency problems. This compared unfavourably with the US during the same period, where the part-time numbers were only 15%. Such lack of homogeneous facilities in itself inherently produced dilution and fragmentation of
the UK higher education experience.

*Fiscal Insufficiency: Not Enough Funding for Postgraduate Degrees* 15 - the Robbins Commission found that government and private funding for postgraduate degrees was totally inadequate at this time. This factor was, of course, in addition to all the other inadequacies noted earlier in this whole area.

It was, in short, these and other ‘problem’ issues that had begotten what Saul (1997) called ‘the insidious creep of *corporatism*’ into universities’ culture,16 reflecting, in turn, a growing governmental concern with immediate practicalities rather than with theory. The apparent divorce between practicality, efficiency and relevance in the UK universities’ higher education system could no longer amble along happily in light of the tremendous competitive changes overtaking the globe in the post-World War II era.

2.3 The ‘Core’ of The Robbins Solution:

*How prescient was and is Robbins Report?*

The Lord Robbins Report on Higher Education in the United Kingdom is, in fact the ultimate yardstick by which - in philosophical terms - all subsequent progress made by UK universities in the last 50 years, can and should be measured and judged. It established for Lord Robbins an almost hagiological place in the 20th and 21st century evolution of UK higher education. The Report covered universities in England, Scotland and Wales, teacher training colleges, colleges of Advanced Technology, technical and commercial colleges, schools of art and colleges of agriculture.15

The Committee held hearings, conducted surveys and made statistical inquiries.

However, in the financial and statistical areas of its recommendations, the Report greatly
underestimated the nature and extent of later ‘boom’ developments in UK higher education. Nevertheless, and most importantly though, the Committee well understood and admirably forecast - in the main – the need for and the nature of future change required in the UK universities environment. The Committee’s recommendations are summarized hereafter under broad ‘key area’ headings: student issues, curriculum teaching and research issues, management issues and campus and financial issues. They are further set out in detail in Appendix 10.

In all, The Robbins Report detailed some 178 different recommendations, on a disparate variety of UK higher educational governance topics. It essentially debunked the notion that noble university collegial traditions are incompatible with ‘managerialist’ philosophy. Further, it felt that higher education should be regarded as an ‘investment.’ In Committee’s words: “On a broad view of history…communities that have paid most attention to higher studies have in general been the most obviously progressive in respect of income and wealth."

2.3.1 Student Issues:

For students, The Robbins Committee opined that higher education should “provide a background of culture and social habit” in partnership with the family, upon which a healthy society depends. The aim of teaching at this level, they said, should be to produce cultivated men and women. Students, they believed, should be actuated by a sense of obligation to work at their studies in the light of the fact that so much of UK university education is funded out of the public purse. They were also of the view that students should be expected to spend a substantial part of their vacations on work related to their fields of study.

On the subject of access to higher education, The Robbins Report declared that higher education
should be available in the UK for all those who are qualified by ability and attainment to pursue it and who wish to do so. It was also of the opinion that there should be more part-time study in the UK higher education environment. (In its view, part-time education should be growing at the same rate as full-time education). Equally, it advocated that there should be more higher education availability to ‘adults.’ “There is here a considerable reserve of unused ability, which must be mobilized if critical shortages in many professions are to be met.” In general keeping with these views, it additionally indicated that there must be full opportunity for all students to transfer from one institution to another, where appropriate. On the matter of numbers the Robbins Committee recommended that the enrolment of higher and further education students should be doubled – from about 4.5% of the population in 1963 to about 10% by 1980, in order to meet the full range of national needs for educated manpower. It also recommended that there should be more adjunct amenities at UK universities, and in particular, more university-based housing accommodation.

Relative to domestic students fees the Committee thought that these should be higher – whether such additional monies are raised ‘out-of-pocket’ directly from students/their families, or from local authorities or other grant-making sources. (Students in 1963 accounted for approximately 20% of UK higher education institutions expenditures). On the issues of domestic student loans, the Report indicated that there should be some experimentation in this area. Strangely though, the Robbins Committee recommended that higher student fees should not be charged to overseas students.

It should be noted additionally that The Robbins Committee was an early advocate of “no” discriminatory barriers: it stated unequivocally that there should be equal academic awards for equal performance.
2.3.2 *Curriculum, Teaching and Research Issues:*

In the curriculum area, the Committee felt that there should be instruction in ‘skills’ suitable to play a part in the general division of labour. They advocated a balance between ‘teaching’ and ‘learning.’ Teachers, they indicated, should be actuated by a high sense of professional obligation in the light of the fact that so much of UK university education is funded out of or the public purse. As to research, the Report stated that the proper place, position and prominence of ‘research’ at UK universities is that there should be “a balance between teaching and academic research.” “Published work [currently] counts for too much in comparison with other kinds of excellence.”

As regard curriculum variety and diversity, the Committee said that there should be more and varied courses. On the one hand, these should be in arts and humanities – subjects to deepen the intellectual and spiritual life of the country. And, on the other, they should be in scientific subjects – “as developments in science are increasingly part of daily life.” Industry, commerce and public service are, they stated, all in need of more people with a general education in scientific subjects.15

Interestingly, the Committee additionally recommended that there be more intimate cooperation between professional bodies and institutions of higher learning in order to substantially boost the provision of continuing professional education for the many professional bodies that exist in the UK.

As to academic staffing levels, the Committee felt, and so stated, that they were of the opinion that the then staffing of UK higher education was, in general, relatively appropriate and should not be allowed to become less generous overall in the future. “There need be no serious shortage of potential teachers,” it said. Having said that, it did recommend that there should be
more academic professors per department. Further, it did indicate that there should be more utilization of part-time teachers in the UK higher education environment. Equally, it advocated that there should be better support staff back-up for academic departments. Nevertheless, it warned that there should be some necessary limitations – which can be set by the government – relative to UK universities’ scope of freedom in setting staffing ratios.

Finally, it should be noted that the Robbins Committee deliberately declined to make any recommendations relative to curricula content and standards or regarding academic appointments and processes or, indeed, on some actual percentage balance between teaching and research at UK universities.

2.3.3 Managerial Issues:

In general, The Robbins Committee felt that the UK higher education system should be managed so as to produce as much excellence as possible and that any designations or limitations that cause differentiation between institutions that are performing similar functions should be removed. To this end it said that there should be no freezing of higher education institutions into established hierarchies.

2.3.3.1 Nationally:

Where there is common provision, The Robbins Report recommended that there should be coordinating principles and that central government decisions should be coherent and take account of all UK higher education sectors. Decentralization, the Committee said, should be inspired by common principles. Further, in its view, whilst there must be free development of higher education institutions within the realm of co-ordination, some principles of policy must be commonly accepted, and there must be some organisation providing for rational allocation of scarce resources. The Committee deemed it reasonable to expect that the government, which is
the source of finance, should have the right to co-ordinate and have influence: and that claims of
and to academic freedom must be consistent with the maintenance of coherence throughout the
UK university ‘system.’

The Robbins Committee Report went on to say, too, that the government must have the right to
intervene financially, because salaries are such a huge proportion of total UK universities
expenditures, and because such salaries are largely funded by public money. The Committee
also felt that such control was important in order to keep the remuneration of various professions
and occupations within the government, and those of UK universities, on a par.

As to the machinery through which the central government exercises its direction and co-
ordination of UK universities, the Committee recommended that it should
continue to be the University Grants Committee, but that this entity should have financial
autonomy. (This is now HEFCE). They additionally advocated that the then current
quinquennial financial allocation system should be changed. To support the University Grants
Committee properly, they proposed that the government erect and continue an adequate
statistical service.15 (this now exists in the form of HESA). (According to the Robbins Report,
in 1963 there was a paucity of information on higher education in general). Despite all of the
above though, the Committee still recommended that the central government should have the last
word in the determination of the aggregate amount of money to be spent from
public funds.

The Report also suggested that there should be various ‘standing’ and ‘ad hoc’ committees.
They felt that the National Advisory Council of Education and Industry and Commerce should
be continued. They suggested the establishment of a ‘Consultative Council’ to decide on “high
Policy” in the higher education field, with a series of support committees to facilitate coordinated
action in specific fields. Further, whilst they recommended that the government should have
some say in the establishment of basic salary and compensation structures at UK universities,
they asserted that a specifically constituted ‘independent body’ should be permanently
empanelled to review academic salary structures – but – importantly - not other conditions of
academic service: these should remain, they said, within the sole province of
UK universities.
A quite bold idea that was additionally floated was that there should be created a new
autonomous ‘Ministry’ – headed up by a ‘Minister of Arts and Science’ – for the above bodies,
etc., to report to.

2.3.3.2 Professionally:
The Report was of the opinion that the Committee of UK universities Vice-Chancellors and
Principals should be reconstituted to make it an effective agency for the dissemination and
resolution of problems referred to it. Safeguards for academic freedom, it said, should be
promoted by having an intermediate granting body between the government and UK universities.
(In 1963 there was the Universities Grants Committee: to-day there are, inter alia, HEFCE and
SRC (The Economic and Social Research Council)).

2.3.3.3 Locally:
On a localized basis, as to the level of financial accountability, the Robbins Report
recommended that there be no detailed public justification of particular universities’
expenditures. On another plain, the Committee stated that: “whilst there are some functions
which must properly remain the responsibility of the professorate” – such as the University
Senate – “there are others where both senior and junior non-professional staff can and should
play an important part.”
As regards decision-making, the Committee indicated that the head or chairman of an academic department should be the person responsible for making decisions. In regard to the position of Vice-Chancellor, the Committee recommended that governing bodies give serious attention to generally improving the ‘organisation’ of the position (presumably strengthening its managerial responsibility and authority) – though it declined to make any precise suggestions in this regard. As to Registry departments, the Report suggested that such departments would benefit from the advice of modern business consultants.

On another front, The Robbins Committee advocated that UK universities should have an ‘open’ communications imperative – widely disseminating information about policies and plans. They also felt that UK institutions of higher education should be free to stipulate their general entrance requirements, subject to the obligation to consult with the government.

2.3.4 *Campus and Financial Issues:*

The Robbins Report concluded that there must be extensive development of existing types of institutions, and particularly more universities in large UK centres of population and particularly in great cities. Indeed, in the big cities it suggested that there should be multiple universities. Further, UK universities should be enlarged to 10,000 plus students apiece. There should, too, be a tripling, it said, of annual government expense on higher education over a period of 17 years (i.e. 1963-1980) – from £206,000,000 to £742,000,000. And there should be £1,400,000,000 in capital expenditures over the same 17 year period.

At the same time, however, The Robbins Report suggested that less financing should come from direct UK government subsidy. (Strangely, though, there were no recommendations relative to UK universities and other higher education institutions in the area of loans/borrowing for capital expenditures on buildings and equipment). But, the Report did say that UK university Finance
Departments would benefit from the advice of modern business consultants. In a somewhat coy comment or recommendation, however, the Robbins Committee spoke of ‘gifts’ and ‘endowments’ to units of the UK higher education system as follows: “we should be glad to think that all institutions of higher education had nest-eggs of this sort.”

2.4 The Robbins Report – Summary Conclusion:

Thanks to the Robbins Committee, UK universities to-day still have, by convention, ‘some’ minimum level of immunity from direct government ministerial intervention and inappropriate influences. The Report tried to balance off “the necessity of freedom for academic institutions and the necessity that they should serve the nation’s needs.”

However, the many recommendations made by the Robbins Committee implied – in reality spoke directly to - a much greater degree of ‘survey’ and ‘co-ordination’ of higher education to be exercised by the central UK government than had been the case in the past – and, indeed, this is precisely what has happened up to and including the present.

2.5 The Post-Robbins Metamorphosis of ‘Managerialism’ in UK Universities:

UK universities to-day have come to be regarded as operating under ‘quasi-market conditions’ (Le Grand Grand & Bartlett (1993)). Competition between them has arrived, and with it, demands for a more overtly aggressive approach, rather than the old ‘gentlemanly’ manner. The evolution of new approaches to the governing of United Kingdom universities has, in general, moved them from being the personification of ‘academic administration’ to – in some early stage measure – engines of ‘strategic management.’ The emergence of the latter and the constituent elements which define it and the extent to which it is being institutionally publicized
by different UK universities constitute the ‘field’ research of this dissertation, the results relative to which are set out in Chapter 5 of this thesis.

Though there are many ‘currents’ running through the term ‘management,’ Kimber (1997) has defined what he calls the ‘practices of managerialism,’ as follows: 20

1. devolution and centralisation;
2. corporate and strategic planning;
3. mission and goal orientation;
4. outcomes;
5. customers;
6. performance;
7. benchmarking;
8. best practice;
9. enterprise bargaining;
10. contract employment; and
11. performance pay.

From the above, it can be seen that ‘managerialism’ – the ‘new managerialism’ – is a hybridisation of a range of organisational forms, practices and cultures – and this view broadly conforms with those of Ferlie, Ashburner, Fitzgerald and Pettigrew (1996)21 and Clark and Newman (1997).22

It should be mentioned, incidentally, that the gradual ‘corporatisation’ of universities, in general, is a truly international phenomenon 23 – found both in the USA and all over the globe.

The following paragraphs elaborate in summary form, the various ‘managerial’ hermeneutics which have broadly defined the stages of governance actuality and evolution of UK universities in the last 50 plus years.

2.5.1 Academic ‘Collegial’ Administration:

The word ‘academic,’ as used here, means the environment of higher education, and specifically, that in the UK.

The sense of the term ‘collegial’ here, is one of relating to the higher educational environment
and marked by power or authority vested approximately, respectfully and more or less equally in each of a number of colleagues.24 There are a number of definitions of the word ‘administration’ which speak to different uses of the term, but the following specific definitions are set out as being relevant to the present context of discussion:

“The directing, managing or governing of an institution’s affairs.”1

“The administration of processes and things, where the administrator is subordinated to a collegium of academics, powerful professors, heads of departments or generally to academics who do the work.”14

It can be observed from the above that the implications of the definition essentially involve day-to-day management/administration - response to the daily ‘on-the-job routine’ problems - rather than ‘strategic direction’ in terms of planning, management, and operations – in other words, little thought given over to systematic forward thinking, translation of such into practical plans, goals, objectives and performance standards, monitoring and measurement of implementation, and fine-tuning of future management planning in the light of past results.

‘Academic Administration,’ an approach widespread in the pre-1992 era, was and is personified by “more laissez-faire ways of organizing teaching and research….collegiality of academics of equal status working together with minimal hierarchy and maximum trust….rather ‘hands-off’….[and with]‘gentlemanly’ governance practices”3

However, the former UK polytechnics - now universities - had in the pre-1992 era, much less of an ‘academic administration’ culture. According to Deem (1998), they were more bureaucratic, more hierarchical and more rule-bound in the ‘local authority tradition,’ but with “some professional autonomy, trust and discretion” up to at least 1989 (when polytechnics and colleges
were removed from ‘local authority’ control).3

2.5.2 Incremental Governance:

‘Incremental Governance’ – a post Robbins Report evolutionary accommodation - much in vogue in the 1970s – was something of an offshoot and successor to ‘Academic Collegial Administration’ – though not as paralyzing.

Essentially it embodied:

*Incremental:* “Change …through hundreds of tiny little steps, no one of which is heavy-footed enough to rock the boat.”25

*Governance:* the acts of guiding, influencing, directing and controlling the affairs of an organisation.1

Keller (1983) indicated that: Incrementalism is usually consensual, and in a way democratic….it includes ‘steps’ which need to appear as remedies, as small, reasonable responses to great pressures…which in turn need to consider self-interest and people’s territories.

The ‘steps’ often require bargaining. And thus, “an incremental approach to running an organization dodges values and theories because they create cleavages and feuds.”25

Omnisciently, however, Keller insisted (in 1983) that: “the future is becoming as important as the present and the past, and administration is yielding to management.”25 Indeed, he saw ‘incrementalism’ as a disappearing universities governance phenomenon, giving way to ‘managerialism’ - and in fact, it is gradually disappearing - though the ease of operating in such an environment is hard to completely shake off. So often, ‘incrementalism’ is used as a ‘crutch’ to avoid the ‘pain’ and ‘difficulty’ of long-term strategic contextual thinking and action.

2.5.3 Public Management:

Public Management (or New Public Management (NPM) as it has been termed by others)21 - as a phenomenon in the orbit of UK universities - arguably began to find favour and emerged in the
1980s. As the embodiment of the government’s policy on UK higher education, it gained
greater and greater momentum and authority – and thus conformity by the UK higher education
community. It became personified in association with various sub-set ‘managerial concepts’
which have been written about in the academic establishment - at length. To some, the era of
Public Management heralded in a ‘post-bureaucracy period’ - one of emancipatory change:26 to
others it merely ushered in a ‘post-collegial’ management period.5 To these latter persons,
universities have always incorporated elements of bureaucratic organisation and
always will.

As of 2006 it is still in vogue, though perceived as being slowly forced to give way in the UK
university environment, to the construct of ‘strategic management’.

The aggregation of the term ‘public management’ implies ‘quasi commercial management:’ the
two words have many different individual interpretations, but their juxtaposition here is believed
to encompass the following meanings:

Public: “relating to the organization and administration of a
community” “not private or secluded.”1

Management: “The management of “new courses, programs…
new habits, financial and strategic planning, performance
controls and collaborative decisionmaking.”25

“deal[ing] with or handl[ing] successfully or competently…
succeed[ing] in doing or producing…the skill or practice
of controlling.”1

“The ordered organisation of resources, people and processes
[but] not necessarily centralized or autocratic.”14

Various sub-sets of nomenclature have gradually emerged in connection with the umbrella term
‘Public Management’ over the years of existence of this phenomenon in the lexicon of UK
universities. The most significant of these are briefly reviewed below:
2.5.3.1 New Managerialism:

The term New Managerialism, as a subset here, has generally been defined to refer to the adoption by public sector organisations – in particular UK universities, in this context – of organisational forms, technologies, management practices and values more commonly found in the private business sector.21 and 22

2.5.3.2 Soft Managerialism:

The term Soft Managerialism is a second subset here, and has been defined by Trow (1993) as “the recognition of inefficiency and ineffectiveness, [but] with the invention of rational mechanisms for the improvement of university performance, with the explicit agreement and consent of those involved.”27 Miller (1998) expands on this definition, indicating that the term: “…draws on elements of collegial and professional forms of self-management and can be best operated by an academic acting as a manager who retains credibility with his colleagues by his or her research and/or teaching record.”14

The above definition, of course, bears some similarities to ‘collegiality’ and ‘academic collegial administration.’

2.5.3.3 Hard Managerialism:

The term Hard Managerialism is yet a third subset here, and is seen by Deem (1998) as involving: (1) the imposition of discourses, and (2) techniques of reward and punishment on those employees who are considered to be fundamentally untrustworthy and incapable of self-reform or change.3 By Miller (1998), it is seen, simply, as a top-down controlling form.14

The above definitions seem, in their way, to align themselves somewhat with ‘new Managerialism.’

2.5.3.4 Performativity:

Performativity is yet a fourth subset here, and has been defined by Cowen (1996) as the
measurable performance of core activities, or the appearance of such performativity in the form of measurable products of research, student learning outcomes and student and quality inspector assessments of teaching.28

Audits (financial and non-financial) have been the principal mechanism to ascertain this ‘performativity’ information, though they have also – more ominously - been used by the government to justify the provision of less public funding for UK universities despite the former’s demands for substantially more student enrollments, more research and a host of other items.

This concept has gained central momentum in the crucible of UK universities managerial activities, as the principal method for ascertaining whether operations, projects and initiatives have been successful or a failure or somewhere in between.

2.5.4 Strategic Management:

There are believed to be over 90 different books that, as of this date, have been written in the area of strategic planning, management and operations. Each has its own somewhat variant definition of ‘strategic planning.’ The following explication by Harrison (2003) - believed to be of ‘mainstream’ dimensions - is offered here:

“A process through which organizations analyse and learn from their internal and external environments, establish strategic direction, create strategies that are intended to move the organization in that direction, and implement those strategies, all in an effort to satisfy key stakeholders.”29

Porter (1980), similarly, sees strategic ‘choices’ and ‘management’ as concentrated effort based on specific generic strategies to reduce chaos and provide a unifying vision to guide activity.30

“Strategic Management,” as a appellation in the lexicon of UK universities, began to make the
first glimmer of its presence known in the early 1990s. Since then, it has slowly, but inexorably, seeped into the management consciousness of all UK universities. Some take it seriously: other give it lip-service. Nevertheless, in the media at least - in the hardcopy and internet publications of UK universities - it is taking up more space –and significantly in a few cases (for example: The Universities of Oxford, Bristol, Leeds, Hertfordshire, Lancaster and Bournemouth). HEFCE-mandated planning and management requirements have definitely accelerated at least its symbolic usage and acceptance – even if grudging in some cases. Similarly to the concept of ‘Public Management,’’ as reviewed above, some sub-sets have also emerged under the umbrella of ‘Strategic Management.’ They are the terms: ‘Academic Capitalism’ and ‘Academic Entrepreneurialism.’ To these, the author would additionally add: ‘Strategic™ Management’ and ‘Strategic™ Sociometry.’ The above four terms are elaborated upon below:

2.5.4.1 ‘Strategic™ Management’

The term “Strategic™ Management” is a one that has been coined by the author to reflect what he perceives and believes – and this is reflected in numerous corroborating citations elsewhere in this thesis - is an emerging trend and happening within the hallowed precincts of today’s UK universities. This appellation is an ‘umbrella’ phrase that essentially embodies 3 underlying concepts, namely:

(1) ‘Strategic’ behaviour by the senior managers – making decisions and ‘driving’ actions today in the light of short-term, intermediate term, long-term and generational-term institutional plans and hoped-for outcomes;

(2) ‘Metric’ appraisals – monitoring and measuring outcomes and results emanating from the carrying out of decisions and implemented actions
in the light of short-term, intermediate term, long-term and

generational-term strategic institutional plans; and

(3) ‘Management’ – senior managers, through their decisions, working to achieve,

mediate and control positive outcomes, rather than letting things simply just happen by

osmosis.

The concept of Strategic Management implies a more corporatised, managerialist, modern,

less bureaucratized style in the running of a university – UK universities in this case – a

management approach that endeavours to anticipate truly effective future outcomes in the

crucible of a current decision-making environment that is methodical, controlled, thoughtful,

planned and solidly evolutionary. It is an approach that leaves less to chance: it is a way of

working – with quality input - to achieve more credible performance and superior results. It is

imbued with the conceptual aura of value-added management, embodying private sector values

and practices: it is sensitive to competition and the environment in which business is and can be

done, and is organized domestically but within the context of a global perspective. And in

order to generate continuous improvement, it monitors and measures performance outcomes in

order to glean insights which will facilitate more informed and effectual decision-making relative

to future managerial initiatives.

Whilst it is believed that the above is a gradually developing professionalised trend and

methodology amongst senior directional management of the more progressive and forward-

looking UK universities, there is no question that UK universities, in general, are a far way off

from achieving day-to-day management of such a truly superior nature - at least at this point in

time, namely in the first two decades of the 21st century.
2.5.4.2 ‘Strategetic™ Sociometry.’

The word “strategetic™” in terms of strategic behaviour, metrics and management has already been explained at length and will therefore not been restated as it has the same connotations here.

The term “sociometry” as utilized in this context, however, requires appropriate definition. The following definition has been adapted from Chambers Encyclopedic English Dictionary and the term garnered to mean here: *a technique for mapping a network of social science terms.* The sociology-type terms that form the network have been culled by the author and will be extensively explained and interpreted later in Chapter 7. These multiple sociological concepts to be found in the internet publications of the 8 time-era selected UK universities will be elucidated, classified and ranked as to their presence or absence on the websites of the 8 time-era selected UK universities.

Originally, it had been the author’s intention to only search for ‘strategic management-type’ terms being utilized on the websites of all the 8 time-era selected UK universities.

However, in surveying for this aspect of the research, it became very obvious that another major dimension of language expression existed and exists on these websites which is interrelated to but separate, different and distinct from the ‘strategic language’ hitherto being investigated.

And so, as the secondary “language” was so prevalent in the parlance of these UK universities, and of such obvious import, it was decided to address and analyse this separate but complementary ‘vocabulary’ of expression in Chapter 7 of this dissertation.

This so-called “strategetic™ sociometric” language is obviously an important part also of the total picture of *emerging management language* coined for use by UK universities. Thus, tracking its emergence, expression and classified framework is important and relevant too and
this will be carried out in Chapter 7 hereafter. However, like ‘strategic management,’ – relative to its implementation and use in real-time practice - there is believed to be a considerable gulf between the language sentiments of such ‘sociometric’ expressions set out by the 8 time-era selected UK universities on their websites, and their actual embodiment and realization in the real-world UK university environment.

2.5.4.3 Academic Capitalism:

The term ‘Academic Capitalism’ was first coined by Slaughter and Leslie in a 1997 article. In their lexicon, this phenomenon began to appear in the 1990s. In turn, it seems to have emerged, in their opinion, out of the late 20th century government quest for modernisation of UK public university institutions - to make them less bureaucratic and more responsive to consumers. See 31 & 32

Further rationale ‘drivers’ for recognition of the existence of this concept have been:

(1) A greater reluctance to use public money for public services – and thus the expectation of a credible rate of return/value added and received for public purse monies spent - than at any time since World War II;32 and

(2) An expectation by society-in-general that publicly funded institutions enter or create a marketplace, and adopt the practices and values of the private sector in so doing.32

‘Academic Capitalism’ as a managerialist methodology, has been defined by its progenitors, Slaughter and Leslie as:

where academic staff of publicly funded universities operate in an increasingly competitive environment, deploying their academic capital, which may comprise teaching, research, consultancy skills or other applications of forms of academic knowledge.31

“They are academics who act as capitalists from within the public sector; they are state-subsidized entrepreneurs,” and they tend to conduct more applied research for industry.31 and 32

Slaughter and Leslie see the structure, organisation and management of academic work changing
– as above noted - in response to the emergence of global markets, though Deem (2001) indicates that ‘teaching’ still remains the larger component of many academics’ workloads.32

2.5.4.4 Academic Entrepreneurialism:

The concept of ‘academic entrepreneurialism’ is another 1990s phenomenon: Clark (1998) has divined it as having now become a part of the UK universities Managerialism ‘mosaic.’33 He sees this management sub-variant as having been engendered by the continuing need for universities to engage in the ‘hard work of entrepreneurially-led change’ to adapt their curricula faster, rapidly adjust their faculties to keep up with ongoing emergent change in higher education, and to modernize, as necessary, expensive physical plant and equipment to keep up with - even to anticipate - the future needs of UK university education.33

In the above context, Clark (1998) sees UK universities as having to behave more entrepreneurially and take more risks and to have in place a managerial infrastructure that facilitates this. He ascribes the transpiration of this managerial sub-variant as resulting from a more diverse student population, an expanding professional labour market based on knowledge/IT etc., new fields of knowledge, the internationalisation of higher education and to combat growing university insufficiency.33 (See also Neave (1998) on the internationalisation issue).34

Clark (1998) sees the manifestations of this ‘academic entrepreneurialism management’ in the form of:

(1) the taking on of entrepreneurial activity - ongoing search for new, more effective and efficient ways of doing things (for example: teaching large numbers of students through distance learning, flexible learning and foreign franchised teaching and degree-granting arrangements – in Asia and the Far East, etc.);
(2) Having an integrated entrepreneurial culture characterized by ‘a work culture that embraces change;’
(3) The setting up of new organisational forms – an expanded development periphery (e.g. special/specific, cross-departmental and non-departmental inter-disciplinary research centres and institutes which work closely with industry and the professions); 
(4) Having a strengthened steering core (that utilizes speed and flexibility); 
(5) Having a diversified funding base; 
(6) Having a stimulated ‘academic heartland’ in which academics accept the need for transformation (and a transformation of beliefs); and 
(7) The heightened importance of managers (i.e. by having departmental and research heads responsible for managing their budgets).33

Clark (1998) believes that international and global forces are pushing all universities – the world over - down this similar road, albeit that some of them have not yet traveled far down that road.33

Both ‘Academic Capitalism’ and ‘Academic Entrepreneurialism,’ suggests Deem (2001), are playing a part in reconceptualising UK universities as ‘managed’ income-generating units in the local and global growth contexts of the ‘knowledge industries.’32 (The huge University of Herefordshire School of Business - some 8,500 students strong - led by an Executive Dean - is a good example of these concepts in action).

2.6 1965 to 1980 – “The White Heat of Technology” and “Getting Even with the US:

In Great Britain, as the government began to assert itself in an ever more forceful manner to ‘re-shape’ the thrust, course, content and nature of higher education in the country, the essential ‘anatomy’ of what was involved in the term ‘running’ an institution, metamorphosed gradually, first into ‘incremental governance,’ and then into ‘public management.’

In the 1960s and 1970s, Toyne (1991) - Vice-Chancellor of Liverpool John Moores University - stated that the structural running of UK universities was largely as follows:

“….hugely democratic, participative, consultative and
collective decision-making systems. No decision, or at least very few, would be taken by a single person without it having been through endless committees, endless debates, endless hierarchical decision-makers each of whom could prevaricate and do, so that ultimately very little decision-making would take place rapidly. Vice chancellors and rectors were … largely impotent. Because while the academic board, the senate or some other group has the power and the authority to take some decisions they often, because of these democratic processes, rarely do so, at best, they take a long time to make decisions.”

These structures bespoke that:

“Accountability and managerial responsibility are somewhat secondary and are subsumed in the collective decision-making. They do not need to be overtly accountable, overtly making managerial decisions because the collective will make them. Thus colleague administrators are subservient and often not directly themselves in decision-making, that comes back to the academic community of scholars.”

Toyne conceded that the above picture might be an over-generalisation, but argued that it was a ‘fair representation’ of the organisation structure in higher education institutions at the time.

By the early 1970s, however, a growing feeling had developed to the effect that the relatively poor performance of the UK economy since the Second World War, was due, at least in part, to the remoteness of higher education from the requirements of the industrial and commercial life of the country. This view was indeed later buttressed by Boyer – writing in 1990 – who criticized research universities, in general, for historically poor teaching and irrelevant research output. It was also joined in by Hossler, Lund, Ramin, Westfall and Irish discoursing in 1997.
2.7 1980 to 1997 – “The Corporatisation Thrust:”

Predictably therefore, by the 1980s, a ‘new managerial emphasis’ was beginning to emerge, its concepts being built up and enunciated in a series of official Reports.

For instance, the Jarratt Report of 1985 – came out with a number of novel propositions – namely that:

1. Vice-chancellors/principals/rectors should be regarded as chief executives;
2. Governing bodies should act and be seen as more akin to boards of directors;
3. The good of the institution should be put before that of individual academics and academic disciplines; and
4. Universities are first and foremost corporate enterprises to which subsidiary units and individuals are responsible and accountable.39

Similar recommendations were made, inter alia, by the National Advisory Board in 1986 in its Good Management Practice Report.40

Yet further recommendations were made by the Croham Committee in 1987 to the effect that:

1. There should be performance indicators for universities’ finances, management, teaching and research;
2. There should be major changes in the way that universities receive grant monies – for example, a new University Funding Council having multiple contract agreements between individual institutions and itself – for teaching and research etc.41

It is to be noted that to-day, a number of such statutory instruments exist – including HEFCE and HESA (The Higher Education Statistics Agency – formed in 1993)). 41

3. UK Higher Education institutions should be encouraged to seek contract from other sources and thus reduce dependence on public funding.41

According to Walford (1988) it was the overall intent of the Croham Committee that accountability for the use of public funds should be sharpened, and that Higher Education
called ‘open market.’

Toyne (1991), comments in the same era that:

“higher education in the United Kingdom needs to move beyond being producer-based to being customer-based or if you like led by market forces, and that as well as being customer-orientated, we should all work and operate as an accountable business.”

In overall direction, by the late 1980s the above structures—but with multiple exceptions—were moving towards ‘public management’—New Managerialism—in its various incarnations—essentially manifested in the following broad internal and external government-backed strokes:

(1) Requirements for hard data;
(2) Requirements for business plans;
(3) Demands for more form filling;
(4) Demands for consistency in procedures; and
(5) Response to cost constraints.

(It is to be noted that by the late 1970s and throughout the 1980s, there was intense downward pressure by the government on costs, not only in higher education, but in all forms of public expenditure).

Thus, by the early 1990s, whilst ‘management’ of UK universities was still a relatively new phenomenon, it was beginning to deal with what the government saw as the ‘central problems’—constraining public expenditures, maintaining quality and increasing access to higher education.

An early glimmer of the concept and status of ‘strategic management’ in the UK universities arena appeared in 1991 in an article that year emanating from the University of Ulster. By 1998, Miller (1998) claimed that this 1991 article—as personified in the following excerpted abstract—summarized the then UK government and dominant official view of ‘management’ in universities:
“Planning has been in the forefront of thinking about management… integrated corporate planning, modeled on the best practices of commercial enterprises… strategic and operational plans with well defined objectives, procedures for monitoring outcomes relative to targets, full economic costing of teaching, research and other activities, the need to ensure value for money, a commitment to quality assurance and staff appraisal schemes, are but some attributes of planning which are increasingly prevalent in higher education…”

2.8 1997 to 2010 - “New Labour” and “strategic Management:”

The Dearing Report (1997) further echoed these sentiments by touching on themes of:

(1) Long-term strategic aims;
(2) Accountability;
(3) Effectiveness;
(4) The need to review institutional performance; and
(5) The necessity for a stronger code of good governance in the UK higher education sector.46 & 47

It should also be noted that The Dearing Committee had been asked to report, inter alia, on “value for money and cost effectiveness” in the use of public funds by UK universities.48 It was additionally briefed to take account in its recommendations, of the fact that higher education in the UK is a major contributor (through the direct management and multiplier effect of institutional resources, funding and expenditures) to local, regional and national economic growth and regeneration.48

Further, the 2003 White Paper embodied in the House of Commons Education and Skills Committee’s Report: The Future of Higher Education, advocates that:

(1) “The challenge from other countries is growing…we face hard choices on funding, quality and management;”
(2) “Higher education must expand to meet rising skill needs;”
(3) “Universities need stronger links with business and the economy.”49

As of 2006, UK universities, degree-granting colleges and further education institutions have all, in greater or lesser measure, gradually been drawn and continue to be drawn more and more, by
the ongoing ‘high voltage magnetism’ of government policy, direction, authority and control towards a ‘specialty strain’ of ‘quasi-commercial management’ - an academic form of business ‘strategic management’ adhesed onto a traditionally nonprofit mentality. Government policy-makers, politicians, vice-chancellors, pro-vice-chancellors, principals, vice-principals, rectors, presidents, vice-presidents, deans and heads of departments are all increasingly taking on, in some combined elemental format, the role of manager relative to higher education.

Once more, the rhetorical question can and must be asked: what is meant by – what are the general drift of manifestations - of this quasi commercial management strain of ‘strategic management’ evolving in the UK higher education environment during the period 1992 to 2010?’ This phenomenon – in the first years of the twenty-first century - is still very much in the evolutionary stage, as will be shown by research statistics which will be offered later to buttress this important point, in Chapter 5 of the instant dissertation. The following two overarching elements seem to additionally illustrate and embody this interesting ongoing and evolutionary ‘conceptual fusion:’

(1) The Dearing Report (1997) emphasized that “better management must replace…missing resources;46 and
(2) Top-up domestic and EU per undergraduate student fees of £3,000 per year are now payable - having become mandatory in the autumn of 2006. In nature and effect, they personify a kind of individual student commercially-driven ‘deductible’- like that found in property and casualty insurance policies - on top of the current myriad web of UK government tuition grants to higher education institutions. This development is personifying the gradual abandonment of the old subsidized, low cost public tuition model in favour of a new higher tuition-higher financial aid model.50
2.9 2010 to Present - “Fiscal Responsibility” Thrust and Continued “Strategic Management:”

Three further Reports have been generated in the last 2 plus years. They centre around the umbrella thrust of ‘fiscal responsibility’ in the UK higher education arena – yet continue in the overall vein of ‘strategic management.’

2.9.1. *The Universities at Risk and the Lord Browne Report (2010)* (see Appendix 11):

This was an ‘earth-shattering’ explosion in the face of traditionalist UK higher education institutions. Essentially it sounded the ‘death knell’ to ‘old guard don’t-rock-the-boat’ complacent UK universities management. Arts-based and teaching-focused universities and university colleges, it predicted, will face an uncertain future. Only the ‘fiscally fittest’ of such institutions will survive. It even went on further to forecast that UK universities will gradually disappear from the central arena as major participants in the global knowledge economy. This is probably an ‘over dire’ forecast of gloom. However, there is cause for concern in the Browne recommendations – if fully implemented - for removing government funding from arts, humanities and social sciences at UK universities/university colleges - as this would, it is estimated, eliminate some 80% of current teaching budgets in these areas. The Report estimated that 37.7% of English universities (49) – new universities and specialist institutions- will be in serious financial trouble if the Browne Report recommendations are implemented.

2.9.2. *Impact of ‘Cuts’ – European Universities (2011)* (see Appendix 12):

Students will now be required to cover the government reduction in universities/university colleges funding by their having to pay up to £9,000 annually in tuition fees. A comprehensive student loan and subsidy system – similar to that which operates in the United States – will have to be speedily implemented. Fees will be raised for students from other parts of the country – e.g. students from England and Wales going to Scottish universities. This will be similar to the
US practice of universities and colleges charging higher fees to out-of-state students. There will also have to be many more collaborative projects between UK universities and ‘industry.’ And lastly, there will have to be a huge increase in philanthropic foundation funding relative to people and projects throughout UK universities.

2.9.3. Financial Sustainability of University Education in Great Britain – National Audit Office (2011) (see Appendix 13):

This Report indicates that there will be major shifts required by the government’s adoption of the Lord Browne of Madingley Report in UK universities managerial ‘modus operandi’—starting with the academic year 2012-2013.

UK universities will have to move to a more ‘market-based’ and ‘financially self-supporting’ form of corporate operation. UK undergraduate education will essentially be student tuition-fee based. (Undergraduate students can now be charged tuition fees of up to £9,000 per year). Overall government funding to UK universities/university colleges will become a very much smaller part of their annual revenue. By 2014 some UK universities will receive little direct ongoing government funding. Others, however, depending on their mix of science/liberal arts course offerings and their aggregate amount of government-backed student loans, may still see an equivalent amount of government monies coming their way. Nevertheless, through 2014, there will be a huge onus on English universities/university colleges to adapt very quickly to this rapidly changing fiscal environment.

Generous government funding in the future will only be available for high-cost subjects, like sciences and targeted policy areas – e.g. to widen participation.

The ominous implication of these giant shifts is that the transition and the new fiscal environment will potentially cause a number of UK universities/university colleges to be at high risk of financially failing.
2.10 Why the Externally-Driven Necessity for These Managerial Changes?

To answer the above question, the signal ‘drifts’ of the economic, political, technological and societal landscape which have evolved out of two catastrophic world wars in the twentieth century - and a number of other regionally-based conflicts of lesser proportions but nevertheless potent ‘change agents’ - must be briefly referenced in the context of the complex tapestry fabric of our evolutionary world. These and other less momentous ‘global factors’ have inevitably influenced on a macro basis, the ongoing evolution of universities the world over: yet, however, there are, of course, other factors that are specifically driven and influenced by the ‘local’ environment and issues faced by and in the UK.

2.10.1 ‘Global Factors’ in English-Speaking Countries That Have Promoted Change in the Way that Universities and Higher Education Institutions Have Been Governed in the Second Half of the Twentieth Century and Early Twenty-First Century:

As Deem (1998) has indicated: “the conditions of higher education institutions in the United Kingdom undoubtedly owe much in general terms to the kinds of global economic pressures experienced in recent years by Western economies.” Indeed, worldwide, there appears to be pressure to provide an educated and skilled workforce and research to meet the needs of competitive corporate capitalism. Further, there seems to be pressure throughout the population of capitalist societies for the provision of extensive higher education expressed as vocational needs and citizen and consumer rights.

A few examples, hereafter, will suffice to illustrate this view - bearing in mind that there are many similarities between the UK, the USA, Australia and Canada, in particular:

2.10.1.1 The United States – Getting Even with the US:

For instance - the accounting practices of US universities and colleges have been painted as a source of frustration for capital market participants, particularly in financial performance measures, and thus have caused chaffing,
which in turn, has precipitated general evolutionary changes in the way that such US institutions have and are being managed and accounted for. 51 and 68

Inevitably, these developments have, because of the primacy of the US in the world affairs, caused ripple effects and influence in the way that UK universities manage themselves.

US universities and degree-granting colleges have, likewise, not always been, nor even are they to-day, ‘paragons’ of ‘corporatised’ management virtue.

There are, of course, the great research universities – the ‘ivy-league’ and ‘step-child ivy-league’ institutions and ‘the Big Ten’ Universities (the ‘land-grant’ institutions) and many only slightly less prestigious ‘research-driven’ higher education entities whose financial resources are the envy of all. However, there was and is still, a huge emphasis and concentration on “teaching” in US higher education institutions and many lesser universities and colleges still fight to maintain ongoing financial solvency in such an environment.

The acute need for bringing to bear the ‘reins’ of ‘management’ at US universities and degree-granting colleges was fathered by Ronald Reagan – initially as the Governor of California when he eliminated free student tuition in that state – and later as President of the United States, at which point he proceeded to largely ‘dysfund’ the federal Department of Education, which in turn, put all US institutions of higher education at enormous financial peril and served to usher in the science of ‘fundraising and development’ which has been articulated and refined to become the envy of the world, as when properly managed, this is the nonprofit equivalent of investment/merchant banking. Those institutions that failed to achieve a minimum level fast-track proficiency in ‘nonprofit investment/merchant banking’ and corporatised management during this adjustment period slid out of existence or were absorbed.
To understand the measure of adjustment made necessary in the above Reaganite environment, the example of The giant Pennsylvania State University with its 25 campuses is a potent one. In the mid-1980s, some 64% of its total revenues were still emanating from federal and state government sources. By 2007, however, its government revenue sources only accounted for some 12% of its total budget (some $3 billion dollars per year). The application of the management science of ‘Nonprofit investment/merchant banking’ - i.e. fundraising and development - has been harnessed to fill this critical humungous gaping void (some 52%). And to-day, the University’s President, victoriously describes his University as a “public-private” institution.

And so, US institutions of higher education have been forced to ‘corporatise’ to survive and in many cases, prosper. The fact that they are still in business is testimony to a considerable level of success over the last 25 years.

British universities have been estimated by the UK press to be some £50 billion underfunded – or ‘dysfunded’ at this time – and at worst, described as a “sinking fleet.”

Are there any ways in which UK universities have caught up with their American counterparts? The answer is that in ‘quality of research’ - based on much more modest budgets - there has been a considerable degree of success – thanks in great measure to the constant and authoritative ‘cheerleading’ of the British government. In ‘teaching innovation’ there have also been major improvements in the ‘quality’ of classroom and distance learning, much of this development spearheaded by the new universities.

Thus, on issues of ‘quality’ there have been considerable advances in the UK in ‘getting even’ with the US. And in many such ‘quality’ areas it can be credibly argued certain UK higher education institutions equal or exceed their US counterparts. However, in terms of sheer fiscal
expenditure to achieve research and end-product results, US universities have inevitably dwarfed their British counterparts. UK universities are still in their relative infancy as regards ‘nonprofit investment/merchant banking’ to help fund their critical financial needs. (Few show a surplus of more than 3% of annual revenues). Whether, from a ‘quantitative’ point of view, it will be possible for the UK to close the higher education spending gap – at least on a per capita basis – between the two countries, is an open question: the ‘jury is out on this one, at the present time.’ In the view of the author, however, the outlook for this is not promising.

Nevertheless, many believe that the UK professoriate is more obsessed with ‘research,’ and its American counterpart is still more committed to student ‘teaching’ as its central role.

2.10.1.2 Australia:

Australia, too, has undergone considerable reform of its university system, initially flowing from the 1957 Murray Committee Report which found that “…Australian universities [are] short-staffed, poorly housed and equipped, with high student failure rates, and weak honours and postgraduate schools.” The then Menzies government in fact adopted all the financial recommendations of that report.

The 1988 Dawkins Policy White Paper took the above findings and implemented actions a major step further, indicating inter alia, that Australian universities would be encouraged to implement ‘strong managerial modes of operation’ and ‘streamlined decision-making processes.’

Much later, these findings – with interim studies in the meantime - were followed up by the Hoare Report (1995) and the West Review (1998).

The former highlighted the following ‘management’ issues: accountability and reporting relative to the use of public funds; ineffectiveness of universities structures and those of education-related government departments; employment and personnel policies; and financial and asset management.
The latter, more broadly, covered: competition, market-driven issues, corporate matters, management shortcomings, internationalization, financing sources, general demand trends, specific industry demands and quality assurance.56

As McClenaghan (1998) has pointed out: there is an increasing emphasis on public scrutiny and demands for accountability in the Australian university sector...universities have become businesses, they now serve customers, they are now entrepreneurial, and they are now more accountable.4

2.10.1.3 Canada:

Miller (1998) points to similar imperatives in Canada, generally summed up in the following quotations:

“we’re now in a competitive market. We have to maximize profits. If you’re going to compete globally you now have to have a product which is a competitive product.”
(a west coast university)14

“...the resource constraints coming from the Province affect the administrative practices, accountability, planning and competitive entrepreneurial activity on fees and student recruitment ‘aggressively.’” (an east coast university) 14

Comment on ‘managerial’ changes at the universities of other European countries has not been undertaken as these are non-English-speaking and their educational systems substantially different. However, in general, it can be appropriately posited that they too are being forced to make changes and adjustments in their managerial behaviour in order to accommodate global trends and other pressures in their higher education systems.

Lastly here, a footnote - Japan, too, has made its influence felt in this global metamorphosis of higher education management. Wholesale changes have been proposed and some already enacted to shift the entire managerial nature of Japan’s university operations and to make its universities more corporate (in an industrial sense) in their behaviour.23
2.10.2 ‘Local’ UK Factors:

As part of the ‘global-local metamorphic axis,’ over the period of the last 45 years, pressures for ‘managerial’ change in UK universities have come, domestically, from both within and without the sector. Outside it, the engines of reform have made themselves felt by example and reference.

2.10.2.1 The ‘White Heat of Technology’ Initiative:

For instance, in the 1960s, Prime Minister Harold Wilson’s initiative – “The White Heat of Technology” (an approach first coined by him at the October 1963 Labour Party Conference) – emphasized the importance and connection of technology and education (and by association, its management) for the development of a competitive UK economy.57

2.10.2.2 Civil Service Managerial Efficiencies:

Further, the 1980 Rayner Report on improving and making managerial efficiencies in the British civil service – with its 130 ‘scrutinies’ – which resulted each year - for some 10 years - in savings of some £170 million and the shedding of some 16,000 jobs from government – was again, a management-based brief. 58

2.10.2.3 Welfare and The National Health Service Reforms:

In the 1980s and 1990s there was a similar drive in the administration of welfare and the National Health Service (the NHS) to restructure for more efficient and cost-effective management. Departments were broken up into agencies (for example: Social Security and NHS trusts, etc.) to enable more effective performance assessment: managers became responsible for running these agencies in a business-like fashion and these government service providers were required to act more like quasi-markets in a competitive manner – with the separation of purchasing and the provision of services.21
2.10.2.4  Influences on and of UK Universities and Related Institutions:

2.10.2.4.1  Efficiency Gains:

In the universities arena – pressure for high volumes of activities - “efficiency gains” – have been spurred on by:

(1) Competitive ratings (RAE and QAA exercises);
(2) HEFCE and HESA requirements, regulations and reporting mandates;
(3) Survival needs in the face of diminishing resources (UK universities have been dysfunded by the UK government in ‘real’ terms by some 42% in cuts since 1989 – for example, the huge expansion in undergraduate and postgraduate student numbers during the late 1980s and early 1990s without a concomitant increase in academic and support staff); 
(4) Instant worldwide access for potential and actual students to UK universities websites through the internet (i.e. competition); and
(5) A government inspired ‘audit culture’ which has made the activities of higher education institutions much more publicly visible, much more scrutinized by independent commercial and nonprofit entities, and more likely to be criticized.

2.10.2.4.2  Open University and Distance Learning:

The success of Open University in the UK – with its distance learning delivery of university education - has also undoubtedly pushed forward the managerial ‘envelope’ of more business-oriented managerial change.

2.10.2.4.3  Private Universities:

The private University of Buckingham – which has survived and prospered for some 3 decades now - with its 2-year continuous 12 month in-term baccalaureate degree programmes is yet another example of UK universities being pressured by competition to refine their management and marketing techniques.

The private American University at Richmond is a further exemplar of this competitive management-efficiency pressuring phenomenon.
2.10.2.4.4 Specialty Degree-Granting Institutions:

Specialty degree-granting institutions, such as Ashridge and Henley Management College (now part of the University of Reading), have also lent force to the competitive need amongst UK universities to improve the management of their operations.

2.10.2.4.5 Bifurcation of Teaching and Research Funding:

The bifurcation of funding streams for teaching and research linked to performance metrics, have additionally lent their pressure to managerial improvement and reform in UK universities.60

2.10.2.4.6 Government Statistical Reporting Requirements:

Requirements to legitimately meet the reporting dictates of government instrumentalities such as HEFCE and HESA, have, too, begotten major developmental changes in accounting practices and information systems control mechanisms.

All the above ‘local’ pressures have promoted responses that have resulted in new approaches and ways of managing UK higher education institutions - the so-called ongoing march to and of ‘corporatisation.’

2.10.2.5 General Political Pressures:

Other significant pressures include:

(1) the desire of the Westminster politicians to be seen – through annual scrutiny - as ‘tough’ on higher education as a major consumer of public funds;
(2) Greater UK government regulation: regular audits and quality assessments covering research, teaching and administrative systems;3
(3) an historical perception that UK universities have catered primarily to relatively privileged students and staff;
(4) The changing higher-tech structure of industry, commerce and their associated labour markets - with associated pressures to ‘upskill’ the UK and other labour forces through education and training; and
(5) The greater facility of middle-class people to use their cultural capital to good effect in accessing higher education institutions.61

2.10.2.6 ‘Prodding’ From the Media:

Yet other pressures have come from respected entities of the public forum to spur on the evolution and implementation of ‘managerialism.’ Take, for instance, the following 1991 article in the Times Higher Education Supplement:

“...modern management is the only way to drag higher education out of the slough of elite collegiality (in the universities’ case) or semi syndicalist bureaucracy (in the polytechnic) to the high ground of mass enterprise.” 62

2.10.2.7 Summary of Local Factors:

En masse, all the above developments have become grouped under a collective umbrella known as the ‘New Managerialism.’

Ferlie, Ashburner, Fitzgerald and Pettigrew (1996) define this term as a concept used to refer to ideas about changes in the way that publicly funded institutions are managed, following the widespread restructuring of welfare services in Western societies.21 They and others define the phenomenon of ‘new managerialism’ as referring both to ideologies about the application of techniques, values and practices derived from the private sector of the economy to the management of organisations concerned with the provision of public services, and to the actual use of those techniques and practices in publicly funded organisations. (See also Clark, Cochrane and McLaughlin(1994),63 Clark and Newman (1997),22 Exworthy and Halford (1999),64 Reed (1999)65 and Whitehead and Moodley (1999)).66

Thus, the UK context here has been essentially one of isolating appropriate and necessitated reforms, setting up and managing the implementation of these, and measuring their success or failure.23
2.11 Why the *Internally-Driven* Necessity for These Managerial Changes?

Various internally-driven developments have occurred in UK universities to bring about transmutation from their traditional ‘academic collegial administration’ approach to the *new Managerialism* and aspects of a *strategic management* path.

However, primarily, these developmental changes at UK universities in organisational forms and technologies (reviewed in detail elsewhere) have ultimately resulted from and can be summarily sourced to *severe financial crises* - where shortages of resources have precipitated - at least uneven changes - in the direction of more industrial-style Managerialism. (For example, see Deem (1998) and the case of Lancaster University). Interestingly, The Dearing Report (1997) echoed these sentiments by declaring that “better management must replace … missing resources.”

2.12 The Undergirding Framework and Assumptions Driving the Research:

To carry out the necessary research to achieve the above-outlined purposes and objectives of this thesis, a basic research framework was established. Various “fit-for-purpose” practical and circumscribing input assumptions were made to drive the appropriate level of this Master’s Degree research. 8 UK universities - each with different cultures, each formed in and derived from different diverse eras of history - were chosen as the investigative survey base-line subject-matter. 8 was considered a large enough sample in view of the fact that the nature of the research had to be conducted with heavy manual input for reasons explained elsewhere.

It was predicated (assumed) that utilizing this variegated group of institutions would provide the needed time, size, balance, geographical diversity and richness of basically objective research detail to validate coherent, ethical and credible findings as to the issues under investigation here.

In other words it was believed that a universe of 8 UK universities (as different from 2 or 3)
somewhat randomly chosen initially, but ex post facto reviewed for appropriate diversification, would be a sufficient, preponderantly unbiased, and of a statistically fitting type and number of university entities to achieve the purposes of this inquiry.

Further it was posited that there would be in the examination of these entities a sufficient functioning cultural, age-matured and operational diversity as the chosen universities were representative of different geographic, founding and formational eras.

It is true that universities from England and Wales only were chosen. It was felt cogent and sensible to observe these limitations. Additional Scottish and Northern Irish ones would have caused overload and otherwise duplication beyond the necessary scope of a Master’s Degree thesis.

The chosen research subjects alone, it was and is believed could yield more than sufficing value-added quality shades of difference in their many different focuses of outlook.

These research subjects come from geographically representative and relatively prosperous areas of the country. Oxford and Cambridge Universities were chosen to represent the ancient and great universities located as they are in the middle south and more middle east respectively.

They ooze historical tradition and privilege and boast enviable historical academic excellence.

The next 2 universities were included to represent 19th century-founded institutions. Cardiff University, in the capital of Wales, exemplifies the traditional heart of the coal, iron and steel industries and their modern day successors. Royal Holloway University of London – just an hour’s ride from the centre of London - in contrast, showcases a gender-sensitive and well-to-do historical blend. Birmingham University, located in the middle of England, encompasses the center of UK heavy industry output as well as having fascinating arts and cultural overtones.
Lancaster University on the other hand profiles both the rural culture of the north as well as newer planned industrial growth. The University of Hertfordshire – northwest of London - in further contrast, exemplifies a former polytechnic institution grown into full and diverse university status catering to upwardly mobile families seeking to enjoy the promise of the “English Dream.” And lastly, Open University personifies the extraordinary ‘octopus’ reach of modern IT technology and E-communication in all its manifold forms – located as it is at the heart of where modern world-encompassing electronic computer science was borne.

All were and are full-service universities; all are fully established university institutions serving diverse population groups; they all have diversified historical, geographic and academic ‘footprints.’ Each has had and has the capacity to independently act out its own self-styled level of behaviour and performance – some more adaptive, flexible and forward-looking than others. All-in-all these selected UK university research subjects have strong varied cross-sectional research profiles fully able to yield significant analytical results. Also it is appropriate to point out that there tends to be a certain relative stability often found in ongoing operating results: they tend to repeat themselves to a greater or lesser extent or enjoy and harbor incremental plus or minus change. It is not statistically often that they have huge wild swings from ‘period to period.’

2.13 Thesis Hypotheses and Null-Hypotheses:

The scholastic literature and government-sponsored reports on this whole subject-area are basically in agreement about the critical need for ongoing managerial evolution at UK universities, though they differ in emphasis and degree. Almost all of it/them spell out the same fundamental elements of and for this ‘peaceful’ (non-violent) managerial revolution at UK
universities and further state the necessity of their continuing need for metamorphic corporate style management.

The hypotheses and null-hypotheses of this thesis have been set up to frame a series of tests. They test the degree of, the strategic and sociometric elements of and the nature of this perceived evolutionary process flowing from the original ‘fount’ – the Lord Robbins Report of 1963. They ascertain whether and in what form the process has (has not) taken place and in what periods of time - as evidenced in the public research domain. The testing here is both qualitative and quantitative - in terms of process, manner and results.

A set of eight (8) hypotheses and null-hypotheses have been developed which articulate what its author is endeavouring to portray and prove. They are:

2.13.1 Hypothesis I:
That UK universities reportedly moved - as evidenced in scholastic writings and other publications - from a pre-mid-1960s (stretching historically back through the centuries) – ‘non-Management’ form of ‘collegial academic administration’ (the Harold Macmillan/Alec Douglas-Home (Conservative party) era and before) - to a post-mid-1960s form of ‘incremental Governance/management,’ (spurred on by the Harold Wilson (Labour Party) “white heat of technology” mantra – later picked up by Edward Heath (Conservative Party) and the Callaghan (Labour) administration)).

2.13.2 Null-Hypothesis I:
That UK universities did not move - no evidence being available in scholastic writings or other publications - from a pre-mid-1960s (stretching historically back through the centuries) – ‘non-
management’ form of ‘collegial academic administration’ (the Harold Macmillan/Alec Douglas-Home (Conservative party) era and before) - to a post-mid-1960s form of ‘incremental governance/management,’ (spurred on by the Harold Wilson (Labour Party) “white heat of technology” mantra – later picked up by Edward Heath (Conservative Party) and the Callaghan (Labour) administration).

2.13.3 Hypothesis II:

That during the 1980s through the second half of the 1990s, there reportedly developed in UK universities - on a gradual basis - as evidenced in scholastic writings and other publications - a framework of public management - personified as ‘new managerialism’ in turn evidenced by the sub-concepts of soft management, hard management and performativity, endorsed and promoted by the Thatcher and Major (Conservative) administrations - as evidenced in behaviour, actions and language.

2.13.4 Null-Hypothesis II:

That during the 1980s through the second half of the 1990s, there did not gradually develop in UK universities - any evidence in scholastic writings or other publications – of a framework of public management - personified as ‘new managerialism’ in turn evidenced by the sub-concepts of soft management, hard management and performativity, endorsed and promoted by the Thatcher and Major (Conservative) administrations - as evidenced in behaviour, actions and language.

2.13.5 Hypothesis III:

That from 1997 – in the eras of Tony Blair, Gordon Brown and New Labour - there reportedly
developed in UK universities - on a gradual basis - as evidenced in scholastic writings and other publications - new strains of managerialism – namely, strategic management, academic capitalism and academic entrepreneurialism – as evidenced in behaviour, actions and language.

2.13.6 Nul-Hypothesis III:
That from 1997 – in the eras of Tony Blair, Gordon Brown and New Labour - there did not develop in UK universities - on a gradual basis - as evidenced in scholastic writings and other publications – any new strains of managerialism – namely, strategic management, academic capitalism and academic entrepreneurialism – as evidenced in behaviour, actions and language.

2.13.7 Hypothesis IV:
That in the early 21st century – in 2002 - in a first tranch survey of 8 time-era selected UK universities websites - there emerged (could be found) a ‘bank’ of stated elements - amounting to greater or lesser manifestations of ‘strategic management’ - corporate-wording language - in their articulated ideas as to what they stood for (their ‘values’), and to where they were aiming to progress (their ‘missions’).

2.13.8 Nul-Hypothesis IV:
That in the early 21st century – in 2002 – in a first tranch survey of 8 time-era selected UK universities websites - a ‘bank’ of stated elements, amounting to greater or lesser manifestations of ‘strategic management’ - corporate-wording language, could not be found in their articulated ideas - as to what they stood for (their ‘values’), and to where they were aiming to progress (their ‘missions’).
2.13.9 Hypothesis V:
That in the year 2012 – in a second tranch survey (10 years later) of 8 time-era selected UK universities websites - there appears to be an increasing use of ‘strategic management’ – corporate-wording language in their articulated statements – as to what they stand for (their ‘values’), and to where they are aiming to progress (their ‘missions’).

2.13.10 Null-Hypothesis V:
That in the year 2012 – in a second tranch survey (10 years later) of 8 time-era selected UK universities websites - there does not appear to be an increasing use of ‘strategic management’ – corporate-wording language in their articulated statements – as to what they stand for (their ‘values’), and to where they are aiming to progress (their ‘missions’).

2.13.11 Adjunct Subsidiary Hypothesis VI:
That in the early 21st century – in 2002 - in a first tranch survey of 8 time-era selected UK universities websites - there emerged (could be found) a ‘bank’ of stated elements - amounting to greater or lesser manifestations of ‘sociometric’ wording-language - in their articulated ideas as to what they stood for (their ‘values’), and to where they were aiming to progress (their ‘missions’).

2.13.12 Adjunct Subsidiary Null-Hypothesis VI:
That in the early 21st century – in 2002 – in a first tranch survey of 8 time-era selected UK universities websites - a ‘bank’ of stated elements, amounting to greater or lesser manifestations of ‘sociometric’ wording-language, could not be found in their articulated ideas - as to what they stood for (their ‘values’), and to where they were aiming to progress (their ‘missions’).
2.13.13 Adjunct Subsidiary Hypothesis VII:
That in the year 2012 – in a second tranch survey of 8 time-era selected UK universities websites - there appears to be an increasing use of ‘sociometric’ wording-language in their articulated statements – as to what they stand for (their ‘values’), and to where they are aiming to progress (their ‘missions’).

2.13.14 Adjunct Subsidiary Null-Hypothesis VII:
That in the year 2012 – in a second tranch survey of 8 time-era selected UK universities websites - there does not appear to be an increasing use of ‘sociometric’ wording-language in their articulated statements – as to what they stand for (their ‘values’), and to where they are aiming to progress (their ‘missions’).

2.13.15 Adjunct Subsidiary Hypothesis VIII:
That in the year 2012 – in a third tranch survey of 8 time-era selected UK universities websites - there appears to be a relationship between the combined increased use of ‘strategic management’ and ‘sociometric’ wording-language found in the second tranch survey of the 8 time-era selected UK universities websites articulated strategic plans – as to what they stand for (their ‘values’), and to where they are aiming to progress (their ‘missions’) - and their 2012 reported financial profit (surplus) as presented in the said third tranch.

2.13.16 Adjunct Subsidiary Null-Hypothesis VIII:
That in the year 2012 – in a third tranch survey of 8 time-era selected UK universities websites - there does not appear to be a relationship between the combined increased use of ‘strategic management’ and ‘sociometric’ wording-language found in the second tranch survey
of the 8 time-era selected UK universities websites articulated strategic plans – as to what they stand for (their ‘values’), and to where they are aiming to progress (their ‘missions’) - and their 2012 reported financial profit (surplus) as presented in the said third tranch.

2.14 Summary: Transmutation Process From ‘Academic Collegial Administration’ to ‘Strategic Management’ – 1960’s to Present:

General Conclusions: Why Has This Happened? - Where Has this Happened? – What have UK Universities Done in Response?

2.14.1 Why Has this Happened?

2.14.1.1 Globally:
On a global basis - universities worldwide – have undergone huge, widespread, sustained and transformative change over the last 3½ decades: why has this happened? Broadly, the whole process has been reflective of macro national and international political, social and economic trends.5

2.14.1.2 Domestically:
On a domestic basis - put simply - the UK government began to be concerned - as far back as 1961 - that all was not right with the country’s higher education system. This concern initially became crystalised with the Robbins Report in 1963.15 This, as stated earlier, investigated the then existing provision of higher education in the UK and the country’s need for further and different provision of higher education relative to the work of universities, teacher training colleges and systematic courses beyond ‘A’ levels, GCSE, etc. A by-product of this seminal work was criticism of the nature and ‘running’ of the whole UK higher education system. It was further reinforced by other later reports, investigations and studies – some done at the behest of the government, others voluntarily compiled by different independent bodies. By the mid-
1980s, many, but especially the government, were convinced that various root-cause problems existed in the system. These were lined up as follows:

(1) The university sector was deemed inefficient, wasteful and unresponsive managerially;
(2) It was not offering value for money;
(3) It was too distant from the wealth-creating sectors of industry and commerce; and
(4) It was too dependent on government funding.  

2.14.1.3 Locally:

On a more ‘home-front/home-territory’ basis, Prichard and Wilmott (1997)\textsuperscript{67} and Pritchard (1998)\textsuperscript{68} believe that the search for new sources of finance to replace declining government funding of higher education, may have been one of the strongest imperatives de-fibrillating UK universities to embrace and implement the real practicalities of ‘managerialism.’ (They also believe the same to be true relative to a number of other Western economies).

Slaughter and Leslie (1997) similarly conclude that changing patterns of resource dependency in universities have ushered in the necessity for searching out new sources of money - for instance undertaking commissioned ‘applied’ research for industry and ‘pure’ research for government-funded research councils - and that this in turn has engendered the development of new managerial techniques.\textsuperscript{31}

Deem (2001) additionally asserts that the move to a mass higher education system in the UK (and most Western countries) has also helped precipitate this change in ‘management’ style, because dealing with larger student numbers begets more complexity which in turn requires more sophisticated management to handle its consequences.\textsuperscript{32}
2.14.2 Where Has this Happened?

The authority of the state/government power, was and has been invoked on an ongoing basis to largely destroy the old self-governance and easy-going ‘collegiality’ of UK universities. The major elements that have been brought to bear are as follows:

1. Controlling state and intermediate agencies have been set up;
2. Economic constraints put in place;
3. Competition inaugurated – transition to more market-orientated governing forces – pushing UK universities to compete against each other for resources, survival, power and prestige; and
4. Pressure to change organisational structures and methods of working to promote and emphasise a more professional management approach.

2.14.3 What Have UK Universities Done in Response?

In short, UK universities have responded to the above by developing more sophisticated management systems and constructing an ideology of ‘Managerialism.’ They have sought to – in part – re-privatise themselves and in some measure to become more independent and compete in the market for students, research contracts and other services. They have adopted some of the practices and language of the private corporation and the market.

U.K. universities have – in greater or lesser measure – sought to reform themselves from highly autonomous, charitable organisations to institutions which would be more recognizable in the industrial world. They have sort, with greater or lesser measures of effort and success, to orientate towards a more managerial, industrial form of organisation. In the course of this process, they have experienced significant tensions between transitioning their historical cultures (with their ‘soft’ approaches to administration – see Trow ((1993)) and attempting to deliver ‘performance’ under the guise of ‘hard’ management practices and new Managerialism regimes.
CHAPTER 3

CHOOSING AMONGST ALTERNATIVES: A RESEARCH PHILOSOPHY AND RESEARCH DISCIPLINARY METHODOLOGY FOR THIS THESIS

3.1 The Choice of an Appropriate Research Philosophy and Research Disciplinary Methodology for this Thesis:

The choice of research methodology to utilise in a thesis such as this one, is essentially centered on quantitative methodology on the one hand and qualitative methodology on the other.

One’s eventual choice ultimately depends to a great extent upon one’s training, background, past experience and one’s belief system: the choice is also affected by how one answers a series of additional questions relating to the choice of research paradigm.

In this thesis, the research method to be used here lies somewhere between positivism and constructivism in order to account for the way in which managerialism has found its way into UK institutions of higher education, whilst not losing the complexity of a world that is socially constructed.

Employing a pure positivistic approach would require use of a methodology solely for testing ‘numbers’ and their relationships. This would eliminate the complexity of the research universe, however, because positivistic research frameworks are of necessity ‘reductionist.’

As far as ‘epistemology’ is concerned, the author does not claim to be an independent researcher, disconnected from the disciplinary method, because he has considerable experience of UK higher education, and to be fully independent as a researcher from the issue being researched, would require him to unlearn or at least not use his knowledge and insight.

The choice of methodology has also been influenced by the literature review here, which, as will be shown later, has revealed in the survey data forming the core of this thesis, a shift in
emphasis in the way in which UK universities have been operated - from ‘academic collegial administration’ to ‘managerialism.’ This shift, it will be argued, has been revealed by an analysis of the language employed by 8 time-era selected UK universities in their policy documents and key strategic planning statements as revealed on the Internet in 2 tranch surveys – the first conducted in 2002 and the second - 10 years later - in 2012. Thus, the research discipline used in this thesis will employ socially constructed numbers using a middle ground approach. According to Merton (1968) “Middle Range Theory is principally used in sociology to guide empirical inquiry. It is intermediate to general theories of social system which are too remote from particular classes of social behaviour, organisation and change to account for what is observed and to those detailed orderly descriptions of particulars that are not generalized at all.” So using a multi-method approach, such as this, will help triangulate findings - as suggested by Saunders et al. (Saunders et al., 2003) - bearing in mind how numbers are used and how they are socially constructed when interpretations are made.

3.2 What is ‘Research Disciplinary Methodology?’

According to Denzin et al. (Denzin et al, 1994) research methodology focuses on “how we gain knowledge about the world,” and as such, good research areas illuminate gaps in the fundamentals, the scope or the certainty of known knowledge. To answer research questions it is necessary to understand: (1) what it is that is desired to be known; and (2) how to apply ‘what’ investigative methods to illuminate new understandings (Ghauri et al., 1995). Guba et al. (Guba et al., 1994) further view the question of ‘what’ research methodology to use as “how can the inquirer (would-be knower) goes about finding out whatever he or she believes can be known?”
Saunders et al. (Saunders et al., 2003) define research as “something that people undertake in order to find out things in a systematic way, thereby increasing their knowledge.” This suggests that ‘research’ is based on logical relationships (not just beliefs) and that there may be a multiple of purposes involved relative to a particular piece of research. Ghauri et al. (Ghauri et al., 1995) further opine that research methods refer to the systematic collection of data for the purpose of obtaining information from the data to answer a research issue. By methods are meant data and information collection through the use of research strategies, which is different from the mere techniques of data collection. Techniques are the step-by-step procedures used to gather data, analyse it and make commentaries that illuminate and support the research issue(s). Thus, a ‘technique’ is about ‘how’ to do things; and a ‘method’ is about ‘what’ or ‘why’ to do it (ibid).

Management research is regarded as systematic research directed towards finding out things about business and management practice (Saunders et al., 2003). A ‘research disciplinary method,’ on the other hand, is “a systematic and orderly approach taken towards the collection and analysis of data so that information can be obtained from those data” (Jankowickz, 2000). A research method, and thus the development of some aspect of knowledge, is closely associated with an author’s social interpretation of reality (Saunders et al., 2003). It is therefore important when conducting a research study, to understand the nature and rationale for choosing and using a particular research strategy - compared to alternative approaches. As such, the ‘research method’ is the tool to retrieve knowledge and the choice of an appropriate the method depends how well it can help answer the research hypothesis.
3.3 The ‘Process’ of Choosing a Dissertation ‘Research Disciplinary Methodology’ for this Dissertation:

In structuring the ‘knowledge acquisition process,’ there are several alternative choices that can be made as to both ‘research philosophy’ and ‘research strategy.’ In the following sections of this Chapter 3, the “Research Onion” of Saunders (Saunders et al., 2003) has been utilised as the diagrammatic framework to illustrate the various ‘methodological’ possibilities available to enable the acquisition of research knowledge.

Research Onion

![Research Onion Diagram](image)

Figure 3.1
3.3.1 The Definitions of ‘Research Philosophy’ and ‘Research Discipline:’

Briefly, ‘research philosophy’ reflects the author’s basic belief system and this shapes his or her quest for knowledge; whereas ‘research approach’ is basically related to use of an ‘deductive’ or ‘inductive’ way of generating information.

3.3.2 The Nature of Research Discipline Paradigms - The ‘Basic Belief System:’

The ‘basic belief system’ of a human-being can be elicited by him or her answering three interconnected questions (Guba et al., 1994): (1) an ontological one; (2) an epistemological one; and (3) a research methodological one. Depending on how these questions are answered, different ‘belief systems,’ or ‘paradigms, can and will be revealed. Guba et al. (Guba et al., 1994) – Figure 2.2 - analyse four research discipline paradigms that can be used as research discipline ‘paradigms of choice’ – for informing and guiding ‘research’ in terms of these questions.
Basic Beliefs’ (Metaphysics): Alternative Inquiry Paradigms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>POSITIVISM</th>
<th>POST-POSITIVISM</th>
<th>CRITICAL THEORY ET AL.</th>
<th>CONSTRUCTIVISM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ontology</td>
<td><em>Naïve Realism</em>: “real” reality but apprehendable</td>
<td><em>Critical Realism</em>: “real” reality but only imperfectly and probabilistically apprehendable</td>
<td><em>Historical Realism</em>: virtual reality shaped by social, political, cultural economic, ethnic, and gender values; crystallized over time</td>
<td><em>Relativism</em>: local and specific constructed realities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epistemology</td>
<td><em>Dualist/Objectivist</em>: findings true</td>
<td><em>Modified Dualist/Objectivist</em>: critical tradition/community; findings probably true</td>
<td><em>Transactional/Subjectivist</em>: value-mediated findings</td>
<td><em>Transactional/Subjectivist</em>: created findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td><em>Experimental/Manipulative</em>: verification of hypothesis; chiefly quantitative methods</td>
<td><em>Modified Experimental/Manipulative</em>: critical multiplicity; falsification of hypothesis; may include qualitative methods</td>
<td><em>Dialogical/Dialectical</em>:</td>
<td><em>Hermeneutical/Dialectical</em>:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.2

As such, these authors state the responses that they believe proponents for each ‘research paradigm’ would make in response to the above three questions. This analysis is also in line
with (Denzin et al., 1994) who argue that a ‘research paradigm’ encompasses three elements: epistemology, ontology and methodology.

Relative to the above Figure 2.2, Guba et al. (Guba et al., 1994) also point out that the ontological position differentiates ‘constructivism’ from the other three ‘research paradigms’ and that the epistemological position differentiates ‘critical theory’ and ‘constructivism’ from the other two ‘research paradigms.’ As such, differences in ‘research paradigm’ choice have important consequences for the practical conduct and interpretation of research.

The nature of organisation as a social reality also affects the research process because research methods are:

(1) closely tied to different visions of how organisational realities should be studied. Methods are not neutral as they are linked to views on the nature of social reality and how it should be studied; and

(2) ‘organisation’ relates to how methods and practice are connected with the wider social scientific enterprise as research data is collected in relation to something - such as an ‘organisational’ problem. This means that social ontology positions cannot be isolated from issues concerning the conduct of research as ontological assumptions and commitments will affect the way in which research questions are formulated and research is carried out. (Bryman et al., 2003).

3.3.3 Qualitative and Quantitative Research Discipline Paradigms:

Creswell (Creswell, 1994) discusses the research process of understanding social or human phenomena in terms of two competing paradigms:
(1) the *qualitative* research discipline paradigm: this is based on “building a complex, holistic picture, formed with words, reporting detailed views of informants, and conducted in a natural setting;” and

(2) the *quantitative* research discipline paradigm: this is based on “testing a theory composed of variables, measured with numbers, and analysed with statistical procedures, in order to determine whether the predictive generalisation of the theory holds true.”

The *qualitative* research paradigm began as a countermovement to the empirical tradition by writers such as Dilthey,\(^{18}\) Weber,\(^{19}\) and Kant\(^{20}\) (Cresswell, 1994),\(^{21}\) whereas the *quantitative* research paradigm comes from an empirical tradition established by such authors as Comte,\(^{22}\) Mills,\(^{23}\) Drukheim,\(^{24}\) Newton,\(^{25}\) and Locke.\(^{26}\) The understanding of the assumptions of each research discipline paradigm provides direction for designing all phases of a research study (Cresswell, 1994).\(^{27}\)
### Qualitative and Quantitative Research Paradigm Assumptions

(Creswell, 1994)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSUMPTION</th>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>QUALITATIVE</th>
<th>QUANTITATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ontological</strong></td>
<td>What is the nature of reality?</td>
<td>Reality is subjective and multiple as seen by participants in a study</td>
<td>Reality is objective and singular apart from the researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Epistemological</strong></td>
<td>What is the relationship of the researcher to that researched?</td>
<td>Researcher interacts with that being researched</td>
<td>Researcher is independent from that being researched</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Axiological</strong></td>
<td>What is the role of values?</td>
<td>Value-laden and biased</td>
<td>Value-free and unbiased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rhetorical</strong></td>
<td>What is the language of the researcher?</td>
<td>Informal, evolving decisions, personal voice, accepted qualitative words</td>
<td>Formal, based on set of definitions, impersonal voice, use of accepted quantitative words</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Methodological** | What is the process of research? | - Inductive process  
- Mutual simultaneous shaping factors  
- Emerging design – categories identified during research process  
- Context-bound  
- Pattern, theories developed for understanding.  
- Accurate and reliable through verification | - Deduction process  
- Cause and effect  
- Static design – categorise isolated before study  
- Context free  
- Generalisation leading to prediction, explanation, and understanding.  
- Accurate and reliable through validity and reliability |

**Figure 2.3**

The above table is a matrix that describes the ontological, epistemological and methodological assumptions that condition ‘quantitative’ versus ‘qualitative’ research discipline methods.

According to Ghauri et al. (Ghauri et al., 1995) the main difference between ‘qualitative’ and ‘quantitative’ research is procedure, and thus is a reflection of different
perspective on knowledge and research objective. The difference in emphasis between the two research methods is illustrated in Figure 2.4 below.

The Difference in Emphasis Between Qualitative Versus Quantitative Research Discipline Methods

(Ghauri et al., 1995)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUALITATIVE METHODS:</th>
<th>QUANTITATIVE METHODS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Emphasis on understanding.</td>
<td>- Emphasis on testing and verification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Focus on understanding from</td>
<td>- Focus on facts and/or reasons of social events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>respondent's or information's point of</td>
<td>- Logical and critical approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>view.</td>
<td>- Controlled measurement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Interpretation and rational approach.</td>
<td>- Objective “Outsider view” distant from data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Observation and measurements in</td>
<td>- Hypothetical-deductive; focus on hypothesis testing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>natural settings.</td>
<td>- Result oriented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Subjective “insider view” and</td>
<td>- Particularistic and analytical.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>closeness to data.</td>
<td>- Generalization by population membership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Explorative orientation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Process oriented.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Holistic perspective.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Generalization by comparison of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>properties and contexts of individual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organism.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.4

Parry (Parry, 1998) also makes the point that “a consistent theme running through much recent research disciplinary methodology literature is that neither ‘qualitative’ research nor ‘quantitative’ research is clearly better than the other - rather, they are complementary.” As such the combination and triangulation of research disciplinary methodologies is recommended.
3.3.4 Choice of a ‘Qualitative’ Versus ‘Quantitative’ Research Discipline Paradigm:

In making a choice of research philosophy, it is important to review the alternatives available in terms of ‘qualitative’ research disciplinary methods versus ‘quantitative’ (positivistic framework) research disciplinary methods.

3.3.4.1 ‘Qualitative’ Research Disciplinary Frameworks of Analysis:

All ‘qualitative’ research is based on the philosophical assumption that ‘reality’ is socially constructed (“constructivism”) by individuals interacting within their social worlds and this implies that ‘qualitative’ research is carried on to find out how people make sense of their world and the experience they have in the world (see Merriam, 1998). Thus, ‘qualitative’ research disciplinary methods are appropriate when the researcher is interested in:

(1) understanding the meaning people have constructed where the researcher is the primary instrument for data collection; and
(2) analysis employing field work for inductive and descriptive analysis.
(Merriam, 1998).

‘Qualitative’ research is a mixture of the rational, explorative and intuitive, where the experience and skills of the researcher in the analysis of the data play an important role (Ghauri et al., 1995).

‘Qualitative’ research as a discipline focuses on the social process rather than on the social structure which would be the case in ‘quantitative research.’ ‘Qualitative’ research can also be seen an “umbrella concept covering several forms of inquiry that help us to understand and explain the meaning of social phenomena with as little disruption of the natural setting as possible” (Merriam, 1998 p 5).

The main reasons for utilising and performing ‘qualitative’ research are:

(1) the objective of the study; and
(2) the background of the researcher.
According to Ghauri et al. (Ghauri et al., 1995), several authors suggest that the major components of ‘qualitative’ research are that the data is collected through interviews and observation which are then subjected to an interpretative procedure resulting in a written or verbal report. ‘Qualitative’ researchers often argue that relying on ‘quantitative’ research disciplinary methods “neglect the social and cultural construction of the variables which quantitative researchers seek to correlate” (Silverman, 2000).

3.3.4.2 ‘Quantitative’ Research Disciplinary Frameworks of Analysis:

As developed by French philosopher and social scientist Auguste Comte (1778-1857), ‘positivism’ is a way of thinking based on the assumption that it is possible to observe social life and establish reliable, valid knowledge about how it works. Comte believed that social life is governed by underlying laws and principles that can be discovered through the use of methods most often associated with the physical sciences.

Various studies in sociology (Giddens, 1974; Keat and Urry, 1975; Benton, 1977) have stated that Comte's positivism has two dimensions:

1. The methodological dimension – this implies that the only true knowledge is scientific knowledge. This incorporates knowledge that describes and explains the coexistence and succession of observable physical and social phenomena; and
2. The social and political dimension - this is related to the fact that positive knowledge of social phenomena can facilitate new scientifically grounded intervention in politics and social affairs, which can, in turn, transform social life.

In choosing the term positivism, Comte conveyed his intention to repudiate all reliance on earlier religious or speculative metaphysical bases of knowledge. However, Comte regarded scientific knowledge as ‘relative’ knowledge, ‘not absolute’ knowledge. Absolute knowledge, he believed, was and always will be unavailable. Comte’s social and political programme envisaged a new consensus on social issues and a reorganisation of society on lines suggested by the new
science of sociology. A role would exist for sociological researcher in establishing a new

3.3.4.3 A 'Qualitative'/'Quantitative' Hybrid Disciplinary Framework of Analysis:

It is possible to employ a hybrid ‘positivist’ approach where numbers are used, to understand
the link between ‘factor’ inputs and ‘corporate’ outputs, where a series of hypotheses about
the relationship between inputs and outputs are assumed. Using sophisticated mathematical
techniques, a researcher is then trying to establish a relationship between variable X and Y
and also establish the degree of significance and correlation between these variables.
Gill & Johnson (Gill & Johnson, 1997)43 note that a ‘positivist’ researcher utilises a highly
structured methodology to facilitate replication and employs quantifiable observation(s) that lend
itself/themselves to statistical analysis. This leads to a more critical aspect of the approach to
research to be employed here, which also uses the finite sequence of ‘empirical’ observations to
make universal generalisation. However, the caution of Jary & Jary (Jary & Jary, 2000)44
should also be noted - that given the lack of any clear solution to the problem of ‘induction’ –
‘empiricism’ can lead to ‘scepticism’ or ‘relativism.’

3.4 The Ultimate Composite Choice of Research Methodologies – and Why:
The concept of mixing different research method/techniques (“Triangulation”) probably
originated in 1959, when Campbell and Fiske used multiple methods to study validity of
psychological traits. 59

A triangulation of research methodologies, namely both qualitative and quantitative, has been
employed in this thesis in order to increase the credibility and validity of the research results.
3.4.1 “Triangulation” of Research Defined:

Myers (Myers, 2009) opines that “triangulations” - “combining qualitative and quantitative [research methodologies] are useful and necessary in researching...organizations.” He indicates that both types can be regarded as rigorous. ‘Triangulation’ means that 2 or more research methodologies are being applied and combined in a research study of the same phenomenon – here – strategic and sociometric administration/managerialism of 8 time-era selected UK universities.

Cohen and Mannion (2000) further define ‘triangulation’ as an “attempt to map out, or explain more fully, the richness and complexity of [subject-matter] by studying it from more than one standpoint.” And, O’Donoghue and Punch (2003) alternatively define it as a “method of cross-checking data from multiple sources to search for regularities in the research data.”

Campbell and Fiske (1959) describe it as ‘convergent methodology,’ ‘multimethod’ and ‘multitrait.’ Webb et al. (1966) call it ‘convergent validation.’

3.4.1.1 The Different Forms of Triangulation:

There are 4 basic types of recognized ‘triangulation” in business research methodology today. They are:

(1) Data triangulation: this approach involves looking at data in dimensions of time and space and persons;
(2) Investigator triangulation: this methodology involves the utilization of multiple researchers in a particular investigation;
(3) Theory triangulation: this involves the harnessing of more than one theoretical scheme in the interpretation of a phenomenon;
(4) Methodological triangulation: this type of research procedure entails using more than one research disciplinary method to gather data – for example – interviews, observations, questionnaires and documents.

3.4.1.2 Form of Triangulation Adopted in this Thesis:

The form of ‘triangulation’ adopted for this thesis is that of ‘theory triangulation” – in that it is
the only one of the 4 types of triangulation that is relevant here.

3.4.1.3 The Advantages of Triangulation:

The advantages of ‘triangulation’ (a mixed research method matrix) are as follows:

1. It enables the checking and validation of results;
2. One can be more confident with research results where different ‘triangulated’ research methods are utilized which all lead to the same conclusion;
3. It is a powerful technique that facilitates the validation of data through cross-verification from 2+ sources;
4. It can be employed in both quantitative (validation) and qualitative (inquiry) research;
5. It is a method-appropriate strategy for framing the credibility of qualitative analyses;
6. It is an alternative to traditional criteria like ‘reliability’ and ‘validity’;
7. It is a preferred approach in the social sciences;
8. By combining multiple research methodologies it enables the overcoming of weaknesses and intrinsic biases and the problems that come from single-method, single-observer, and single-theory studies.
9. It gives a more detailed and balanced picture of the research situation;
10. Triangulation crosschecks information to produce accurate results in data collection.
11. This mixed approach enables the researcher to get at the “how much,” often turn out to enrich the explanation(s).
12. When there is convergence of results using a mixed method matrix, there can be increased confidence in the results.
13. Equally when divergent results, using the mixed method matrix are used, often more complex explanations can be and are generated;
14. It can enable the researcher to meld together many pieces of a complex puzzle into a coherent whole and first-hand knowledge drawn together from qualitative methodology may be critical in the context;
15. The utilization of mixed matrix methodology can allow the researcher to be more confident of his/her results, that there is greater overall strength in the multi-method used and that the multiple system used has created a better balance than solely using (a) conventional data-collection method(s);
16. Mixed matrix methodology can uncover deviant and off-quadrant dimensions of a phenomenon and enrich the explanation and results of the research;
17. Mixed matrix methodology can act as a ‘linking thread’ or ‘glue’ cementing the interpretation of multimethod results thus enriching and brightening the ‘portrait’ – making it more holistic;
18. The mixed method matrix of utilizing qualitative and quantitative disciplines in a single research study can each compliment each other; behavioural and objective data can be successfully combined.
3.4.1.4 The Disadvantages of Triangulation (Mixed Method Matrix Approach):

Specifically the disadvantages of utilizing triangulation (mixed matrix method) are:

1. There are few guidelines for systematically ordering eclectic data in order to determine congruence or validity;
2. There are no formal tests to discriminate between the different methods in the mixture to judge applicability;
3. Significant differences found when utilizing qualitative research methods may not readily compare with quantitative research statistical tests also used, which may in turn demonstrate significant differences;
4. The researcher may be left to search for a logical pattern when utilizing mixed matrix methodology: any claim to validity will then rest on subjective judgement to find a plausible framework;
5. The researcher may have to rely on subjective “feel” to interpret a particular issue or situation;
6. It can, too, be argued that utilizing a mixed method matrix detracts because it can be falsely gilded by errant perceptions drawn from personal experiences and be colored by firsthand observations;
7. Qualitative data can be superior to quantitative data in density of information, vividness and clarity of meaning;
8. ‘Replication’ – a necessary step in scientific research - may be impossible when using a qualitative research method, in part, in a study;
9. Either a quantitative sub-method(s) or a qualitative sub-method(s) used in a mixed method matrix research project can become mere window dressing for the other(s) causing the design of the whole research project to become inadequate and/or biased; and
10. Not all sub-methods in the mixed method matrix may be considered as being equally sensitive to the phenomenon being studied – thus to a greater or less extent possibly subverting the rationale of the mixed method matrix usage.

3.4.2 Qualitative Research Defined:

Interviews, focus groups, reviews and observations are the basic ‘tools’ of Qualitative Research. Qualitative research has been described by Myers (Myers, 2009) as “perhaps the best way for research in business and management to become both rigorous and relevant at the same time.”
3.4.2.1 The Advantages of Qualitative Research:

The advantages of the qualitative research methodology are as follows: 

1. It “brings scholarship and practice together at the same time… as it studies real situations;”
2. It works for in-depth study and for dealing with the complexity of organizations; and
3. It can bring relevance to the practice of research in completely unquantifiable issues that are often the reality of business.

3.4.2.2 The Disadvantages of Qualitative Research:

On the other hand, the disadvantages of Qualitative research are: 

1. Because of its subjectivity its use can lead to procedural problems;
2. Replicability when using it can be very problematic;
3. Researcher bias – conscious or unconscious – is ‘built in’ and unavoidable when using it;
4. The in-depth, comprehensive approach to data gathering involved in Qualitative research limits its scope;
5. It is labor intensive and can be expensive to carry out;
6. It is not understood well by “classical” researchers

3.4.3 Quantitative Research Defined:

Survey methods, laboratory experiments, formal methods (e.g. econometric) and numerical methods e.g. mathematical modeling) are the ‘stuff’ of quantitative research. They emphasise numbers – values, levels of theoretical constructs and concepts. The interpretation of numbers is viewed as strong scientific evidence of how a phenomenon works. And, quantitative research methodology employs statistical tools and packages to analyse data.

3.4.3.1 The Advantages of Quantitative Research:

Quantitative research as a methodological tool, used solely, is advantageous if the researcher: 

1. has a large sample – i.e. it is a large-scale survey;
2. wants to generalise a “large population;”
3. wants to study a topic over many people or organizations;
4. wants to find trends and patterns applying in many different situations – initially not knowing what to expect – but with the expectation the compiled statistics will reveal what the data means.
3.4.3.2 The Disadvantages of Quantitative Research:

The disadvantages of Quantitative research are that:

1. one loses in the process, cultural and social aspects of organizations;
2. cultural and social aspects of organizations are treated in a superficial way;
3. “context” tends to be treated as unimportant “noise;”
4. it is generally more costly and the numbers change often.

3.4.4 Why a ‘Triangulation’ Research Mode was Chosen:

As described earlier, ‘Triangulation’ in a business research context means that the researcher is trying to accomplish more than just one element of research in his or her study. It involves the use of more than one method of research, namely, 2 or more research techniques are utilized to gather data – in this case combining qualitative and quantitative research methods in the one research project. In the process of looking at the same topic from different angles, it gives the researcher a fuller picture of what is happening. It essentially uses survey information from different sources.

The research conclusions in this thesis are from triangulated data sources to achieve the purposes outlined above:

1. qualitative data has been sifted from what scholars/academics have written about the subject;
2. the 8 time-era selected UK universities strategic business plan type language which has been extracted also is qualitative data in nature; and
3. the social science (sociometric) type language information which has been culled is, too, qualitative data in nature; and
4. the profit(surplus)/loss financial data is of course, quantitative information.

3.4.5 Final Choice as to Composite Research Discipline Employed in this Thesis:

Thus, the framework of the triangulation research disciplinary approach here can be stated as employing 3 qualitative data surveys, 2 of which are summarized through quantitative methodology (the strategic business language and the social science (sociometric) language and 1 wholly quantitative data method (the collation of the financial information).
3.4.6 Why Statistical Packages were not Used in this Thesis:

Only 8 subjects were selected for research here - the 8 time-era UK universities mentioned earlier. To successfully merit and use statistical packages in aid of analysis such as we have here, it would be necessary to have some 25 different research subjects: this would create an appropriate statistical mass to evaluate using statistical methodology. Since there are only 8 research subjects utilized here, use of a statistical package in this case would be ‘blinding’ rather than ‘illuminating.’

All 8 research subjects in this thesis have different, multi-faceted characteristics, so nothing would be accomplished by using a statistical technique: essentially, in this situation, the human element is required.

3.4.7 Why the NViVo Language-Stripping Package has not been Used:

The NViVo language Stripping Programme would work in this context if there was a commonality of language used between the 8 different research subjects being employed here. However, certainly not in 2002, and even to-day, both the research subjects selected here and all the other UK universities are using their own variant improvisations of strategic and sociometric language so that there is no essential sameness of verbiage in which a language-stripping programme like NViVo could be successfully applied. The author purchased the NViVo package and tried to used it, but unfortunately its methodology was and is not suited to the present analysis. The research in this thesis has often required qualitative interpretation as to what it is believed a university is trying to say in its own way, to classify statements under a particular heading for later quantum analysis.

3.5 Summary:

In relation to the research hypotheses of this dissertation, the specifically chosen research
disciplines employed here clearly imply, indeed indicate, that the author believes that a prerequisite of only statistical correlation between variables is not the best approach in relation to the research objectives of this thesis. Employing only a ‘positivist’ research framework would, of necessity, require the need to make various assumptions and formulate a structurally focused methodology for numerical testing that would lose the richness of the universe being investigated here. Such an approach would not account for the rich operating context and complexity of the universe and subject matter of the investigation in this thesis.

And so, in this dissertation, the research methods which are utilised here incorporate, as stated earlier, positivism and constructivism in order to account for the way in which managerialism has found its way into UK institutions of higher education, whilst not losing the complexity of a world that is socially constructed.

The research subject-matter involved in this thesis has mandated straightforward and not hugely sophisticated analytical techniques, but at the same time it has involved a great deal of detail requiring intense concentration and tenacity to combat and successfully distil its sheer volume. It is not complicated in format but has required extensive value-judgements. It has utilized simple mathematics to ultimately convey its results simply and clearly. Because of this, it has not been germane to apply sophisticated IT software to obtain the necessary incisive and trenchant results.

In its wake, however, it has employed quantum and qualitative research approaches – with balance-weighing, choosing amongst alternatives and value-judgements to harvest ‘clean cut’ and ‘clear’ results.

In light of the above, it is appropriate at this juncture to review the specific ‘manually harnessed’ research disciplinary methods that have been chosen to be utilised in this thesis - namely Media
Analysis and Language Stripping/Language Analysis – along with quantum summary methodology. These are, of course, ‘middle’ ground approaches. They can be found in the following Chapters 4 and 5.
CHAPTER 4

RESEARCH DISCIPLINE I – ‘MEDIA ANALYSIS:’ REVIEW OF IT AND ITS USE RELATIVE TO THE 2002 AND 2012 INTERNET SURVEYS OF THE 8 TIME-ERA SELECTED UK UNIVERSITIES

4.1 Introduction:
The principal academic disciplinary methodology (Research Discipline I) - the qualitative part – utilized in this dissertation for analyzing the so-called vision statements, mission statements, values statements, other associated nomenclature and strategic plans of the 8 time-era selected UK universities – as stated on their internet websites - as of the years 2002 and 2012 - will be explained and reviewed in this Chapter 4.
This prime umbrella research discipline – the conceptual framework used here for analytical dissection and review - is known as ‘Media Analysis.’ A full explanation of its nature and properties (strengths, weaknesses and value-added) follows later in this Chapter. A subsidiary quantitative disciplinary methodology – The Language Stripping/Language Analysis Module - has additionally been employed for data collation and presentation purposes.
This latter will be reviewed hereafter in Chapter 5.
The 8 time-era selected UK universities sought in 2002 and in 2012 - on their individual internet websites - to call their ‘values’ ‘planning’ and ‘management’ efforts by many different names, and therefore, from a nomenclature perspective, the whole scenario in this area is somewhat confused. Whether these institutions chose their terminology for seeming ‘originality’ and ‘individuality’ purposes, or whether this has been done out of ‘ignorance,’ is not clear. There is some acknowledged historical terminological ambiguity in the area, but the 8 time-era selected UK universities have taken this minor confusion to create extensive and
troubling re-definitions in this area. See also an abstract of the terminology in this area adopted by UK universities in general – culled in 2002 (see Table 4.1 in Appendix 4)

Relative to the 2002 tranch survey previously referred to, the author broke down and laid out in simple form, the above-referred-to statements proffered by 8 time-era selected UK universities – from often complex and confusing multiple concepts in a single sentence, to single ‘value’ or ‘concept’ sentences. From these fundamentals the Specific Media Analysis Structural Variant Model used in this Dissertation – a combination of Research Discipline I and Research Discipline II – to gain qualitative and quantitative results - was developed, which is more particularly explained in Section 4.3 below.

As to the 2012 tranch survey – again previously referred to - the greater sophistication acquired over time by these universities and consolidated into HEFCE-mandated Strategic Plans enabled the author to use the Specific Media Analysis Structural Variant Model – a combination of Research Discipline I and Research Discipline II to carry out the qualitative and quantitative parts of the second core survey of this dissertation.

4.2 Media Analysis - Statement of the Basic Disciplinary Methodology:

Five monographs (by Thomas(1996)1, Agar (1997)2, House (1997)3, House, Wright and Aditya (1997)4 and Leslie-Hughes(2000)s) set out the background, nature and contextual validation relative to ‘what is’ Media Analysis, as utilised by the author in this Dissertation. The first four publications constituted the theoretical foundation for a massive global study conducted at the Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania - were completed and
published at the turn of the century - on the cultural aspects of leadership styles in sovereign countries. In the fifth, a ‘new generation’ version of Media Analysis was outlined: this was incorporated as the foundational disciplinary methodology for a PhD dissertation by the author, completed in the year 2000.

The main components of Media Analysis, synthesized from the above, are as follows:

4.2.1 Sources of Literature:

General identification of the chosen source(s) - namely internet websites here - of published information covering the topic was made.

4.2.2 Specific Websites Utilised:

The so-called ‘media’ for the purposes of this thesis is what these ‘8 time-era selected UK universities’ stated on their websites in 2002 and 2012 about that which, in essence, was and is their strategic ‘vision,’ ‘mission,’ ‘values’ and ‘plans’ in whatever personalized nomenclature they may have individually chosen to express such.

4.2.3 Defining ‘Value Statements:’

The extraction out of a huge mass of often complex statements by these selected UK universities, of single-concept ‘statements.’ These were separated out from sentences in which there may have been one or a multiple of different enunciated ‘concepts’ bundled together in one sentence.

4.2.4 Key Typifiers (Idiomatic Words, Terms, Phrases):

Key ‘typifiers’ (idiomatic words, terms, phrases) reflecting the essence of ‘found’ ‘statements’
were then identified and selected.

4.2.5 *Categorisation and Counting of ‘Typifiers:’*

Categorisation and counting (methodologically set out and explained in Chapter 5) of ‘Typifiers’ led to finding out the general preponderance of how the 8 time-era selected UK universities ‘expressed’ and ‘viewed’ the areas of strategic™ management and strategic™ sociometry as part of their activities. They enabled the finding out of – how important, individually and in the aggregate, any definitive strategic and sociometric ‘concepts’ embedded within their statements were and are - and to what extent different terms were and are deemed, in the aggregate, more important than others. This gives a reliable view of the ‘world’ of the ‘typifier.

4.2.6 *Validation:*

‘Validation’ of the methodology is logically done by an independent third-party: having such person – in a sense ‘blindfold’ – evaluate the relevant ‘sifted-out’ ‘concepts’ from the internet website-published documents of each selected UK university. The purpose of this exercise is to identify the degree to which the evaluator comes up with:

(a) the same distilled ‘concepts’: and
(b) the same key word(s)/phrase(s) as ‘typifiers.’

If the evaluator comes up with the same ‘diagnoses,’ as outlined by the researcher, then the latter’s view is seen as valid: if not, then the research is not validated.

In summary, the above can be characterized as the distinctive features of *Media Analysis.*

4.3 *The Specific Media Analysis Structural Variant Model Used in this Dissertation:*

The specific structural variant - as utilised in this dissertation - of the *Media Analysis* research
disciplinary methodology model is set out in ‘quick reference’ tabular form in Figure 4.1.

The Model has the following properties:

4.3.1 Separating Out The 8 Time-Era Selected UK Universities ‘Concept’ Statements:

A different ‘concept’ may exist as a result of just one word in a sentence, or, in other cases many different words may exist in a sentence that stand for many separate ‘concepts.’

The writer has attempted to list what is believed to be - in ‘substance,’ if not always actually stated in appropriate ‘form’ - each and every ‘management’ and ‘sociometric’ concept set out by the selected UK universities on their websites – in two separate tranches – as of 2002 and 2012.

This two-track approach was designed to indicate whether there has been some sense of strategic evolutionary ‘change,’ movement or ‘motion’ in the language of their several approaches relative to the subject, during the intervening ten-year period. This has been a long-winded process: but it is believed to have yielded a rich value-added ‘working product’ result: nevertheless, it is conceded that it may well not be regarded as totally satisfactory in the eyes of the over-fastidious.

However, the methodology has enabled detailed analysis of what the author believes to be a relatively accurate expression of the ‘institutional will’ of each selected UK university in this area. From this ‘media analysis-based’ disciplinary excerpting, the foundation for the ‘word-stripping’ methodological analysis (as enunciated in Chapter 5) has been made possible.

4.3.2 Development of a Two-Part ‘Language Stripping’/‘Language Analysis’ ‘Typifier’ ‘Lexicon’:

The author has developed (see Table 1.1 and Table 1.2 in Appendix 1 of this thesis) so-called
THE SPECIFIC MEDIA ANALYSIS STRUCTURAL VARIANT MODEL
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specialty ‘dictionary’ listings of language terms broadly and vernacularly lumped together as ‘Strategic™ Management’ and ‘Strategic™ Sociometric’ ‘concept’ ‘typifiers.’

These are, in fact, a compendium of all the ‘concept’ ‘typifiers’ found on the 8 time-era selected UK universities internet websites in 2002 and 2012.

The above thus compose the Two-Part ‘Language Stripping’ ‘Typifier’ ‘Lexicon’ part of the said Specific Media Analysis Structural Variant Model.

The subsidiary quantitative Language Stripping disciplinary methodology ‘part’ of the Specific Media Analysis Structural Variant Model - employed for summarized data collation and presentation purposes - is explained and reviewed in Chapter 5 of this thesis.

4.4 Media Analysis – Evaluative Summary:

The following evaluative summary of Media Analysis is largely drawn from the author’s outline and review of this disciplinary methodology in his PhD thesis, completed in the year 2000.5 Figure 4.2 sets this out in ‘quick reference’ tabular form.

4.4.1 The STRENGTHS of Media Analysis:

4.4.1.1 Hones in on ‘Slippery’ Concepts:

Media Analysis enables the researcher to bring reasonable definition and evaluation to the ‘slippery nature’ of ‘concept statements’ – hidden as they may be in a plethora of complicated, multi-dimensioned phrases, in overall stated sentence construction. The methodology provides ‘levers’ to fashion abstract concepts into a more useable quantitative and qualitative framework and thus bring sharper focus to the instant analysis.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRENGTHS</th>
<th>WEAKNESSES</th>
<th>VALUE-ADDED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Hones in on ‘slippery’ concepts</td>
<td>• Selection of appropriate media</td>
<td>• Provides sharper definition, focus and clarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Permits distillation of huge databases</td>
<td>• Judgemental selectivity (bias)</td>
<td>• Revelation of replicated and non-replicated patterns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Uses wide spectrum of media</td>
<td>• Contradictions</td>
<td>• Greater general and specific understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Accordion-like concept</td>
<td>• Unequal projection (frequency, breadth and width)</td>
<td>• Promotes understanding of historical use problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Deeper understanding</td>
<td>• ‘Snapshot’ period of time problem</td>
<td>• Vernacular comprehensibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pragmatic results</td>
<td>• Categorisation problem</td>
<td>• Commonly-accepted word meanings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Positive/negative ‘typifier’ framework</td>
<td>• Problem of ‘meaning’</td>
<td>• Simplification and distillation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Permits longitudinal measurement</td>
<td>• ‘Typifiers’ often open to positive or negative interpretation</td>
<td>• More logical ordering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Uses original material</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Analytically comprehensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Uses authors ‘key’ words, terms and phrases</td>
<td></td>
<td>• An Occam’s Razor-like tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reduction of researcher bias</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Facilitates opportunities for further development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Permits ‘typifier’ categorization and clarification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Can identify ‘typifier’ convergence/variance/divergence classification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Permits mapping of confused/conflicting areas of thought</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Embodies validation techniques</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4.1.2 Permits Distillation of Huge Databases:

Media Analysis enables the distillation of enormous amounts of data and provides a methodological process for choosing, ordering and interpretation of subject-matter.

4.4.1.3 Extensive Spectrum of Media Utilised:

Two tranches – the years 2002 and 2012 – of the 8 time-era selected UK universities published strategic website ‘statements’ have been used for analysis. This use of this methodological technique has enabled the avoidance of narrow, limiting and possibly biased reportage.

4.4.1.4 ‘Accordion-Like’ Concept:

Media Analysis provides a disciplinary methodology for assessment of the importance of vast amounts of data and its distillation into succinct categorization, definition and explanation.

4.4.1.5 Deeper Understanding:

Media Analysis gives ‘extra purchase’ to the inquiry in question: it permits review and distillation of huge amounts of data from multiple sources: it facilitates new, greater, deeper and more valid understanding of the subject-matter under investigation.

4.4.1.6 Pragmatic Results:

The development in this thesis of a robust, innovative, insightful, ‘pragmatic,’ and ‘stipulative’ assessment model of the progress of the selected UK universities from ‘academic administration’ to some semblance of ‘strategic management’ is in itself a validation of the Media Analysis disciplinary approach here – affirmation of its strengths as a comprehensive full-scale academic disciplinary methodology.
4.4.1.7 Positive/Negative ‘Typifier’ Framework:

A Media Analysis ‘typifier’ (defined here as an idiomatic word, term or phrase) may provide for or be seen in a positive or negative framework flowing from the environment in which it appears. Depending on the context, it may be important to identify that difference of possible interpretation.

4.4.1.8 Longitudinal Measurement:

From the tabular and comparative information set forth in the various tables generated as part of this dissertation, one can trace the nature of developmental change as enumerated in Tranch 2 comparative to that stated in Tranch 1, relative to the selected UK universities and their metamorphosis in the ‘Strategetic™ Managerial’ and ‘Strategetic™ Sociometric’ approaches.

4.4.1.9 Uses Original Material:

The Media Analysis methodology utilizes for its analytical purposes, the original language uttered by the selected UK universities, rather than ‘reported’ writings (i.e. that to be found in newspapers, professional journals, etc.). All tabulation is based upon original ‘quotes’ rather than second-hand reported information. In this way, the Media Analysis methodology tends to avoid ‘interpretative’ errors, writer/reporter bias and space limitations.

4.4.1.10 Uses the 8 Time-Era Selected UK Universities own ‘key’ Words, Terms and Phrases:

In the selection of idiomatic words, terms and phrases, etc., the language of the selected UK universities, solely, is employed, rather than the researcher’s interpretative verbiage. Thus, the Media Analysis disciplinary approach here limits diagnostics errors and possible bias.
4.4.1.11 Reduction of Researcher Bias:

In this second generation use of *Media Analysis*, developed by the author in his PhD dissertation (2000), the possibility of bias is reduced by the utilization, for analysis purposes, of uncensored unrestricted idiomatic words, terms and phrases put out by each selected UK university, rather than reducing different words, phrases or terms’ (quotes) to one-word ‘typifiers’ for quantification purposes.

4.4.1.12 Permits ‘Typifier’ Categorisation and Clarification:

Everything contained in the multiple tables presented in this dissertation can be checked ‘forwards’ and ‘backwards’ over the time-period of the two tranches set out here. The provenance of the *Media Analysis* ‘typifiers’ is shown and the uses and/or variances in the use of words, terms or phrases over time can also be plotted.

4.4.1.13 Can Identify ‘Typifier’ Convergence/Variance/ Divergence Classification:

Through graphic representation of the variety of uses of ‘typifiers,’ *Media Analysis* allows deduction of their clear convergence, variance and divergence over the period of the two tranches. It highlights *homogeneity* in the use of words/terms/phrases and also *wide variance/divergence* in their use, as well.

4.4.1.14 Permits Mapping of Confused/Conflicting Areas of Thought:

The use of *Media Analysis* methodology permits the tracing and mapping out of areas of
standard conventional thought with conflicting and/or confused thought, and thus enables the reader to separate out the ‘wheat from the chaff.’

4.4.1.15 Embodies Validation Techniques:
The distilled data is laid out in various figures and tables in this dissertation so that anyone can individually validate the documentation.

4.4.2 The VALUE-ADDED Dimensions of Media Analysis:

4.4.2.1 Provides Sharper Definition, Focus and Clarity:
*M*edia *Analysis* gives value-added clarity, enrichment and understanding – even if not water-tight definitions – of ‘typifiers.’

4.4.2.2 Revelation of Replicated and Non-Replicated Patterns:
*M*edia *Analysis* reveals replicated and non-replicated patterns which are to be found in the website utterances of the selected UK universities in the areas of vision statements, mission statements, value statements, other associated nomenclature and strategic plans used in aid of this investigation.

4.4.2.3 Greater General and Specific Understanding:
*M*edia *Analysis* as used in the context of this dissertation, facilitates greater general and specific understanding of an important area – Management Science – relative to evolving ‘governance’ pronouncements by UK universities. It provides a methodology for ‘filtering’/’winnowing’ down large amounts of material into quintessential definition. Through this investigative methodology, the author has been able to derive findings and understandings which could not
have been derived through the more narrow dimensions or confines of many other disciplinary methods.

4.4.2.4 Promotes Understanding of Historical ‘Governance Impedimenta’ From Which UK Universities are Emerging:

Usage of the Media Analysis discipline enables the development of a clearer understanding of why ‘management’ in UK universities has historically - over time - been a resisted concept, a concept in restricted use, and an oft confused concept.

4.4.2.5 Vernacular Comprehensibility:

The Media Analysis disciplinary methodology approach relates more closely with vernacular understanding: it is comprehensible in terms of everyday vocabulary and experience. Indeed, it speaks to both the academic community and to the world of business alike.

4.4.2.6 Commonly-Accepted Word Meanings:

Media Analysis makes use of commonly-accepted interpretation of words and is relatively free of semiotics. It utilizes original words and phrases, not re-interpreting them in the form of other descriptive words and phrases. In this way, this disciplinary methodology reduces the ever-present problem of biased interpretation.

4.4.2.7 Simplification and Distillation:

Media Analysis provides a generalized process for greater simplification and distillation to analyse the often seemingly-divergent labyrinths down which the selected and UK universities in general, appear - on the face of things - to be headed. It provides the ‘tools’ for cutting through the complexity characterizing this area of inquiry: it facilitates ‘making sense’ of all the various
‘utterances’ where other traditional methodological techniques might be less successful.

4.4.2.8 More Logical Ordering:

*Media Analysis* enables, through its use of ‘typifiers’ and ‘categorisations,’ etc, more logical ordering and conceptual explanations of the extensive amount of information to be found in this subject-area on the various websites of the 8 time-era selected UK universities.

4.4.2.9 Analytically Comprehensive:

*Media Analysis*, as a disciplinary methodology, provides a very analytically comprehensive approach for coping with and bringing order to huge amounts of diverse informational pronouncements.

4.4.2.10 An Occam’s Razor-Like Tool:

*Media Analysis* provides – through its mechanism of ‘typifiers’ – an Occam’s Razor-like method with which to cut through the largely variant, often conflicting, sometimes confused, at other times obscure, approaches found in the huge amount of ‘governance’ information now put out by UK universities on their websites, and by the 8 time-era selected universities in particular.

4.4.2.11 Facilitates Opportunities for Further Development:

*Media Analysis* provides insight and opportunities for additional use and adaptation of the type of analysis which is the subject-matter of this dissertation, instead of freezing it as terminology at one point in the ‘march’ of time.

4.4.3 The WEAKNESSES of Media Analysis:

4.4.3.1 Selection of Appropriate Media:

With *Media Analysis* there is always the perennial question as to what is the most appropriate
‘medium’ or mix of ‘media’ to employ, to select, in order to review and evaluate any particular type of subject-matter. Different views will always surface as to what constitutes an ‘appropriate medium’ or ‘appropriate media’ for whatever the analytical project. Such views can be affected, inter alia, by content control, regionalism and provincialism. In utilising a research discipline technique such as Media Analysis, no author can be safe from the criticism of others as to selection of what information to single out and which to ignore. In every case, the medium or media used is a ‘judgement call’ – subject to potential criticism.

4.4.3.2 Judgemental Selectivity (Bias):

Not everyone will necessarily ‘devine’ the same conclusions from reading a particular publication or hearing a vocalization of words. The reason for this phenomenon in Media Analysis is that individuals read texts, hear words or view illustrations from the prisms of their own personalized universe – their own unique knowledge and understanding of the world around them. Each person applies his or her own individualized interpretative code and sub-codes to every message received, based on his or her own patrimony of knowledge, ideological, ethical and religious standpoints, psychological attitudes, tastes and value systems. Because of this, it is virtually impossible, and therefore no attempt has been made by the author, to weed out all evidence of biases associated possibly or actually with the current analysis.

In fact, some researcher/author bias in interpretative writings and findings will always be absolutely inevitable in that each is trained to think of his or her work at all times in terms of some theoretical academic disciplinary system.
4.4.3.3  Contradictions:

It is reasonable in an abstract and elusive investigation - such as measurement of the ongoing emergence of a certain blend of focus-defined language - to expect many contradictions in the course of Media Analysis.

Indeed, in the general area of strategic planning, management and operations, there is a foundational and environmental specialty language of perhaps upwards of 7000 words and phrases. Equally, it is reasonable to expect some instances of ‘coherence’ across certain generalized types of published communications. In fact, instances of both contradictions and coherence can be found along the continuum of this phenomenon. Thus, as the internet expressions of the 8 time-era selected UK universities are studied across the 2002 and 2012 tranches, key multiply-endorsed concepts can be found in this survey field.

4.4.3.4  Unequal Projection (Frequency, Breadth and Width):

Individual UK universities websites are not equal in the frequency, breadth and width of their projection to online viewers. Some UK universities’ internet websites are changed – at least in some part – on a daily basis, others weekly, still others quarterly and yet others less frequently or even sporadically. Some have a huge number of ongoing audience ‘response hits:’ others have a much smaller ‘target’ audience projection, and thus tally of responses. Some embrace the publication of an extended volume of disclosed information, whilst others limit themselves to giving out only very basic - even trivial - morsels as to their vision, mission statement areas, values, intentions and conceptual approaches. Thus, there is here a weakness in Media Analysis.
as this relates to projection of information by whatever means.

4.4.3.5 ‘Snapshot’ Period of Time Problem:

Media Analysis, as originally conceived and presently applied, does not pick up dynamic changes over a longitudinal period of time. Each Media Analysis study thus reflects a picture at a particular point in time.

4.4.3.6 Categorisation Problem:

To have total managerial science ‘pedigree,’ respectability and fully-accepted meaning, succinct and distinctive classifications, categorizations and definitions are required. To ensure such total, complete and authenticated validation, all words, terms and phrases analysed must be recognizably and identifiably unique in definition, in order to obtain fully defendable ‘air-tight’ research conclusions. At this stage, however, no extant Media Analysis or other ‘bible’ exists that authoritatively and intrinsically has defined the words, phrases and terms used herein.

4.4.3.7 Problem of ‘Meaning:’

The problem of unique ‘meaning’ of individual words, phrases and terms is one that universally pervades the singular understanding of language. Indeed, one can find single words, terms and phrases in the Oxford English Dictionary that have 12 or more different definitions, each geared to their being found in different environmental settings. And so, it may be necessary to interpret sub-text to ascertain the ‘real meaning’ (i.e. the ‘typifier’) in a particular case – which, of course is a ‘subjective’ exercise in itself, and thus can be said to be a weakness of the disciplinary methodology of Media Analysis.
4.4.3.8 ‘Typifiers’ Often Open to Positive or Negative Interpretation:

An original word, phrase or term may not be totally clear as to whether it is being stated positively or negatively in a particular contest. Depending on which way it is construed, this can lead to very different interpretations and outcomes which inevitably amount to a weakness of *Media Analysis*.

4.5 Summary and Conclusions:

It is believed that the results achieved through the utilization of the disciplinary methodology of *Media Analysis* and later set out in Chapter 6 of this dissertation, have added critical value to this study. Through the use of this methodology it will be shown in Chapter 6, where the 8 time-era selected UK universities (individually and in aggregate) currently appear to be or would like to be, in their development of strategic and social science planning management and operations concepts, as active behaviours in the day-to-day running of their institutions.

As a data reduction technique *Media Analysis* adds important value in that it can be reversed for additional validation purposes, as the ‘concepts’ can be repeatedly checked and rechecked against the original internet broadcast statements from whence they came, in order to (a) review their context; and (b) retest their validity.

Some hidebound, conservative academics may look down their noses at this flexible analytic technique. Some may even see it as a ‘loose cannon’ – erratic, unstructured, non-cohesive and even artificial as an intelligence-organising and rationalising framework. However, few would
argue that this approach is not a disciplined and systematic procedure and that it does not facilitate the derivation of new knowledge.

Historically, *Media Analysis* can boast of its credibility for centuries as a research disciplinary methodology: indeed, it can trace its provenance back further than most such disciplines. Its genesis actually stretches all the way to the eighteenth century - to the disciplinary research technique employed by the redoubtable Dr Johnson in compiling his famous Dictionary of the English Language. To-day, as then, it enables the ‘reining’ in of vast and complex study material and thus is believed to be the appropriate disciplinary methodology for investigating the instant subject-matter.

*Media Analysis*, in general, fosters thoroughness in bibliographic research, generates quality results, conceptualizes collated information, facilitates depth of analysis, classifies the various boundaries of a study and enables the assembly of a ‘mine’ of data from which conclusions can be drawn, and further, facilitates statistical validation of ‘typifier’ concepts, information and data. Finally, it highlights new knowledge by the absence of such ‘typifiers’ and distils material into theoretical as well as general practical formulations.
CHAPTER 5


5.1 Introduction:

A subsidiary quantitative research disciplinary methodology (Research Discipline II) – The Language Stripping or Language Analysis Module – an additional yet separate ‘part’ of the Specific Media Analysis Structural Variant Model (see Appendix 5 - also previously reviewed in Chapter 4) has also been employed in this dissertation for collation and presentation purposes and is reviewed in this Chapter 5. This ‘handmaiden’ of Research Discipline I is a ‘word/term/phrase search’ engine whose assignment has been and is to ascertain what, if any, ‘core’ strategic planning management and operations’ and ‘sociometric’ language was being utilized by the 8 time-era selected UK universities in the base year of 2002, and comparing this with that used in 2012, and to collate this data and present the summarized results.

The purpose of all the above has been and is to analyze further shifts during the period from ‘public management’ rhetoric to strategic planning, management and operations’ and sociometric parlance at these institutions.
5.2 Strengths, Weaknesses and Value-Added of this Subsidiary Methodology:

The strengths, weakness and value-added constituents of the Specific Media Analysis Structural Variant Model – the umbrella research disciplinary methodology used in this dissertation - of which the subsidiary quantitative research Language Stripping/Language Analysis Discipline is a part – have already been addressed in Chapter 4 of this thesis. Therefore, the ‘pros and cons’ of use of this Subsidiary Quantitative Module will not be addressed again in this Chapter.

5.3 The Module Explained:

To carry out this word/term/phrase search requirement, for reasons already explained, an exhaustive manual and computer-aided approach was employed. Language stripping programmes, such as N-Vivo, do exist but are inapplicable in this context, for the reasons already explained and examined.

Instead, the 2-part word and phrase ‘typifier’ dictionary of Strategetic™ Management and Strategetic™ Sociometrics (as elucidated in Appendix 1) was developed and the 2002 and 2012 selected UK universities tranches ‘run past’ these two batches of ‘typifiers’ for the purposes of discerning specific statistical information – the results of which will be reported and analysed in the following Chapter 6.

5.3.1 Desired ‘Strategetic™ Management’ ‘Typifier’ Information:

The following general categories of ‘strategic’ planning management and operations ‘typifier’ ‘values’ information can be provided through the ‘search’ operations of the Subsidiary Quantitative Module:
(1) How many different ‘strategic’ planning management and operations ‘typifier’ ‘values’ were used by UK universities on their internet websites during 2002 in connection with their statements as to their so-called ‘values’?

(2) Whether there was any increase in the number of different ‘strategic’ planning management and operations ‘typifier’ ‘values’ used by UK universities on their internet websites during 2004 in connection with their statements as to their so-called ‘values’?

(3) What were the aggregated numbers in the case of (1) and (2) above?

(4) What percentage of the ‘strategic’ planning management and operations ‘typifier’ ‘values’ listed in the Appendix 6 ‘Language Stripping/Language Analysis’ ‘Lexicon’ were used by UK universities on their internet websites during 2002 in connection with their statements as to their so-called ‘values’?

(5) What percentage of the ‘strategic’ planning management and operations ‘typifier’ ‘values’ listed in the Appendix 6 ‘Language Stripping/Language Analysis’ ‘Lexicon’ were used by UK universities on their internet websites during 2012 in connection with their statements as to their so-called ‘values’?

(It should be noted once again that all ‘strategic’ planning management and operations ‘typifier’ ‘values’ to be used are listed in Appendix 6 pursuant to the explanation on these set out in Chapter 4 under section 4.4.2).

5.3.2 Desired ‘Strategic™ Management and Strategic™ Sociometry’ ‘Typifier’ Information:

The following general categories of ‘management’ planning management and operations and ‘sociometric’ ‘typifier’ ‘values’ statistical information is required through the ‘search’ operations of the Subsidiary Quantitative Module:

(1) How many different ‘management’ planning management and operations and ‘sociometric’ ‘typifier’ ‘values concepts’ were used by the 8 time-era selected UK universities on their internet websites during 2002 in connection with their statements as to their so-called ‘values concepts’?

(2) Any increase in the number of different ‘management’ planning management and operations and ‘sociometric’ ‘typifier’ ‘values concepts’ used by the selected UK universities on their internet websites during 2012 in connection with their statements as to their so-called ‘values concepts’?

(3) What were the aggregated numbers in the cases of (1) and (2) above?

(4) What percentage of the ‘management’ planning management and operations and ‘sociometric’ ‘typifier’ ‘values concepts’ listed in the Appendix 1 ‘Language Stripping/Language Analysis’ ‘Lexicon’ were used by the selected UK universities on their internet websites during 2002 and 2012 in connection with their statements
as to their so-called ‘values concepts?’
(5) What was the increase in usage of ‘management’ planning management and operations and ‘sociometric’ ‘typifier’ ‘values concepts’ listed in the Appendix 1 ‘Language Stripping/Language Analysis’ ‘Lexicon’ between 2002 and 2012?
(7) Is there any connection between the statistical aggregate number of ‘management’ planning management and operations and ‘sociometric’ ‘typifier’ ‘values concepts’ words used in the 2012 survey tranche and profitability(surplus) of the 8 time-era selected UK universities?

5.4 Summary and Conclusions:
Since the overarching framework of the disciplinary methodology of Media Analysis – its nature, concepts, strengths, weaknesses and value-added properties – was reviewed both in detail and in summary form in Chapter 4, a further repetition concentrating on the contents of this Chapter has not been attempted here. However, it is appropriate to point out again that Research Discipline II is the quantitative part of the overarching framework of Media Analysis, the qualitative part of which was reviewed extensively in Chapter 4. Thus, it is apposite to offer here some concluding observations about Research Discipline II only.

The manual ‘word search engine’ approach of ‘eyeball’ counting words/phrases/terms utilized here has been effective and efficient in this context. The difficulties – indeed, impossibilities – of using here a language stripping program such as N-Vivo or like-software has been reviewed elsewhere. This manual methodological technology, nevertheless, has permitted categorization, classification and statistical summation. Through utilization of this research discipline, it has been possible to bring under control and review an enormous amount of detailed data to analyse for the ‘presence’ or ‘absence’ of minute repetitive pieces of information and to specifically excerpt same statistically.
Using this methodological technology has enabled collated data, cross-cuts, cross-comparisons, and close comparisons, as well as repetition counts. It has enabled the gathering of ‘rich’ and accurate detail and the ‘mining’ through of huge amounts of detail. It has facilitated the ‘winnowing down’ of raw data into clear concise accurate simple or detailed results. It has metaphorically enabled the finding of ‘needles in a haystack.’ It has enabled succinct summaries to be made of a library-size data collection. It has enabled careful and meaningful ‘comparison’ analysis.

Further, this research methodology is a ‘monitoring mechanism’ that has enabled the ‘taking of “temperature” of a particular situation at any one or more points in time. It also allows the longitudinal ‘soundings’ of ‘the pulse of progress’ – be it positive or negative. In the case of this dissertation, the methodology used here has made it possible to show what ‘progress’ and what ‘deterioration’ occurred between 2002 and 2012. It has shown this relative to what the 8 time-era selected UK universities asserted – on their individual internet websites – ‘were’ and now ‘are’ their ‘Strategetic™ management’ planning management and operations and ‘Strategetic™ sociometric’ ‘planning’ and ‘management’ ‘values’ and how meaningful these are in terms of their annual profitability (surplus).

Lastly, it should be noted that the methodology permits simple transcription of findings into ‘easy-to-understand’ ‘user-friendly’ summary charts, graphs and other visual presentations.
CHAPTER 6


6.1 Introduction:

How does the current and recent ‘language’ employed by UK universities in their website-published ‘Strategic Plans’ and other related documents, match the well-settled language of strategic ‘planning’ ‘management’ and ‘operations?’

The purpose of this Chapter is to show to what extent - in the form of published statements on strategic ‘planning’ ‘management’ and ‘operations’ by UK universities - the language of “Managerialism” as opposed to “academic administration”— has been adopted and become embedded in the language of UK universities planning, organisation, management and distribution of resources.

This thesis does not attempt any evaluation of whether such universities statements are just ‘cosmeticspeak’ or whether, in fact, they are ‘realspeak action-follow-through.’ It deals only with the ‘presence’ or ‘absence’ of words and phrases - as published on individual UK universities’ websites and in scholarly articles - which cumulatively do or do not add up to the language of strategic ‘planning’ ‘management’ and ‘operations.’

The impact that the growing aggregate use of such terminology has had on the ‘realtime’ development of managerial governance systems of the UK universities sector is outside the purview of this dissertation and will only be commented upon in the most general
way here. Such comments have essentially been derived from quoted statements by other writers in the published media.

The research does, however - as a by-product - show how the ideology of ‘management’ language is being installed in the sector.

6.2. Findings As To Hypothesis I and Null-Hypothesis I:

Clearly from the literature and scholastic writings reviewed in Chapter 2, Hypothesis I has been proven.

UK universities did, in fact, move - as evidenced in scholastic writings and other publications set out in Chapter 2 - from a pre-mid-1960s (stretching historically back through the centuries) – ‘non-Management’ form of ‘collegial academic administration’ (the Harold Macmillan/Alec Douglas-Home (Conservative party) era and before) - to a post-mid-1960s form of ‘incremental Governance/management,’ (spurred on by the Harold Wilson (Labour Party) “white heat of technology” mantra – later picked up by Edward Heath (Conservative Party) and the Callaghan (Labour) administration).

6.3. Findings As To Hypothesis II and Null-Hypothesis II:

Patently from the literature and scholastic writings reviewed in Chapter 2, Hypothesis II has also been proven.

During the 1980s through the second half of the 1990s, there clearly developed in UK universities - on a gradual basis - as evidenced in scholastic writings and other publications - a framework of public management - personified as ‘new managerialism’ in turn evidenced by the
sub-concepts of soft management, hard management and performativity, endorsed and promoted by the Thatcher and Major (Conservative) administrations - as evidenced in their behaviour, actions and language.

6.4. Findings As To Hypothesis III and Null-Hypothesis III:
Again from the literature and scholastic writings reviewed in Chapter 2, Hypothesis III has additionally been proven.
From 1997 – in the eras of Tony Blair, Gordon Brown and New Labour - there developed in UK universities - on a gradual basis - as evidenced in scholastic writings and other publications - new strains of managerialism – namely, strategic management, academic capitalism and academic entrepreneurialism – as evidenced in behaviour, actions and language.

6.5. Findings As To Hypothesis IV and Null-Hypothesis IV:
There is evidence in the survey findings of the first tranch survey of 2002 as evidenced in Table 6.1 (in Appendix 6) (the underlying original survey being reported in Table 6.3 in Appendix 6 also) to support both Hypothesis IV and Null-Hypothesis IV.
In the case of 4 of the time-era selected universities (Oxford, Royal Holloway, Birmingham and Hertfordshire) there is little to no evidence that in the early 21st century – in 2002 - in the first tranch survey the of 8 time-era selected UK universities websites – that there was (could be found) a ‘bank’ of stated elements - amounting to greater or lesser manifestations of ‘strategic management’ – corporate-wording language - in their articulated ideas as to what they stood for (their ‘values’), and to where they were aiming to progress (their ‘missions’).
However, in the case of the other 4 time-era selected universities (Cambridge, Cardiff, Lancaster and Open) there is some evidence that in the early 21st century – in 2002 - in the first tranch survey of the 8 time-era selected UK universities websites – that there was (could be found) a small number of stated elements - amounting some early manifestations of ‘strategic management’ – corporate-wording language - in their articulated ideas as to what they stood for (their ‘values’), and to where they were aiming to progress (their ‘missions’).

6.6. Findings As To Hypothesis V and Nul-Hypothesis V:

The survey data of the second tranch in 2012 clearly proves out Hypothesis V – see Table 6.2 (in Appendix 6) (the underlying original survey being reported in Table 6.4 in Appendix 6)

In the year 2012 – in a second tranch survey (10 years later) of the 8 time-era selected UK universities websites - there appears to be a major increase in the case of all the universities in the use of ‘strategic management’ – corporate-wording language in their articulated statements – as to what they stand for (their ‘values’), and to where they are aiming to progress (their ‘missions’).

The strategic plans - with their more comprehensive strategic™ management wording - of Oxford University and the University of Hertfordshire, stand out above the rest. They are both particularly thoughtful documents.

6.7 Summary and Conclusions:

The findings in this Chapter 6 - enabled through this use of the disciplinary methodology of Media Analysis - are, it is believed, extremely valuable. They highlight the presence and
absence of ‘core strategic and social science planning, management and operations language’ in
the internet ‘showcase’ presentations of the 8 time-era selected universities.

The results provide a method by which each such university can evaluate its other UK
counterparts and measure their competitiveness in the ongoing competitive world of UK
universities provision.

The findings will also enable the UK government to evaluate what appears to be happening in
this area of UK universities management:

Are these universities – at least conceptually - meeting the criteria set out by the government for their continuing development and
metamorphosis - in terms of time-frames and ‘management’
actuation - as exemplified by the language these institutions are employing?

Further, the results point to where these institutions believe they have come, are, and wish to be,
in the development of sophisticated day-to-day and strategic and social science management
techniques.

(However, it should be cautioned that such statements may in fact be only ‘posited’ or
‘promoted’ intentions - not ‘present reality’ - in the ‘actual’ world of UK universities ongoing
governance).

Nevertheless, the research results indicate, in some measure, how the top management of those
institutions funded as universities by the UK government, intend to govern their institutions to
meet the highly competitive future global demands they face in order to become, be and remain
leaders in the world environment of major university institutions.
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CHAPTER 7


7.1 Introduction:

How does the current and recent ‘language’ employed by the 8 time-era selected UK universities in their website-published ‘Strategic Plans’ and related documents, match the well-settled language of sociometric ‘planning’ ‘management’ and ‘operations’?

The purpose of this Chapter is to show to what extent - in the form of published statements on strategic sociometric ‘planning’ ‘management’ and ‘operations’ by the 8 time-era selected UK universities - the language of “sociometry” as opposed to “academic administration”— has been adopted and become embedded in the language of the selected UK universities planning, organisation, management and distribution of resources.

This thesis does not attempt any evaluation of whether such universities statements are just ‘cosmeticspeak’ or whether, in fact, they are ‘realspeak action-follow-through.’ It deals only with the ‘presence’ or ‘absence’ of words and phrases - as published on the selected individual UK universities’ websites - which cumulatively do or do not add up to the language of Strategetic™ sociometry ‘planning’ ‘management’ and ‘operations.’

The impact that the growing aggregate use of such terminology has had on the
‘realtime’ development of managerial governance systems of the UK universities sector is outside the purview of this dissertation and will only be commented upon in the most general way here. Such comments have essentially been derived from quoted statements by other writers in the published media.

The research does, however - as a by-product - show how the ideology of ‘management’ and ‘sociometric’ language is being installed in the sector.

7.2. Findings As To Adjunct Subsidiary Hypothesis VI and Adjunct Subsidiary Null-Hypothesis VI:

The findings from the first tranch survey in 2002 indicate Adjunct Subsidiary Hypothesis VI is basically proven. (See Table 6.1 in Appendix 6 for the statistical data and Table 7.1, in Appendix 7 for the original underlying survey data).

However, the amount of strategic sociometric language used by 3 of the time-era selected universities (Birmingham, Hertfordshire and none by Oxford) is without significance.

Otherwise, in the early 21st century – in 2002 - in a first tranch survey of 8 time-era selected UK universities websites - there emerged (could be found) a ‘bank’ of stated elements - amounting to greater or lesser manifestations of ‘sociometric’ wording-language - in their articulated ideas as to what they stood for (their ‘values’), and to where they were aiming to progress (their ‘missions’).

7.3. Findings As To Adjunct Subsidiary Hypothesis VII and Adjunct Subsidiary Null-Hypothesis VII:

Positive proof as to Adjunct Subsidiary Hypothesis VII is to be found throughout all of the 8
time-era selected UK universities. See Table 6.2 in Appendix 6 for the statistical data and Table 7.2. in Appendix 7 for the original underlying survey data).

In the year 2012 – in a second tranche survey of the 8 time-era selected UK universities websites - there appears to be a dramatic increasing use of ‘sociometric’ wording-language in most of their articulated statements – as to what they stand for (their ‘values’), and to where they are aiming to progress (their ‘missions’).

7.4. Findings As To Adjunct Subsidiary Hypothesis VIII and Adjunct Subsidiary Nul-Hypothesis VIII:

With all of the above data on ‘words’ usage elucidated in Chapters 6 and 7, a natural question to be posed is – does all this increased usage of strategetic™ management wording and strategetic™ sociometric wording by these 8 time-era selected UK universities, translate into or have any relationship to their profitability (surplus). Does all the survey data gleaned from the second and third tranches prove or disprove Hypothesis VIII or otherwise prove Nul-Hypothesis VIII?

The actual results appear to be a ‘mixed bag!’ In weighing everything, it can be argued that there is a ‘slight drift’ in favour of upholding Hypothesis VIII over Nul-Hypothesis VIII. The pros and cons of this view are discussed below.

Table 7.3 (the basic data for which is presented in Table 8 in Appendix 8) on its face, seems to indicate that there is little relationship between the amounts of such verbiage used and profitability (surplus).

Open University which had the poorest showing relative to quantity of such managerial and sociometric language used in 2012, came in first with the highest amount of annualized profit
The University of Oxford which scored by far the highest usage of ‘management’ and ‘sociometric’ language in the 2012 survey tranch, however, came in 4th in the table of financial ratings - with 4.37% of annualized profitability (surplus) in 2012. Of course, the administrative and fiscal complexities to be found at Oxford are enormous and their financial results are quite creditable as they seek to continuously tighten up their massively diversified and difficult-to-manage operations.

The University of Hertfordshire, on the other hand, which came in 2nd in the table of managerial and sociometric language usage quantity ratings in the 2012 survey tranch, did in fact, achieve the 2nd highest level of profitability (surplus) of the 8 time-era selected UK universities – with an annualized 2012 profit (surplus) of 7.53%.

The Universities of Birmingham and Cardiff, however, which only made somewhat ‘lip-service’ efforts in composing their Strategic Plans from a Strategetic™ management words and Strategetic™ sociometric wording language point of view, did not achieve remarkable fiscal results in 2012 – Birmingham’s annualized profitability was only 1.27% in 2012 and Cardiff’s was only 2.19%

Royal Holloway’s amount of ‘managerial’ and ‘sociometric’ “wordsmithing” - which was in the middle of the group - nevertheless, came in 3rd in the financial ratings, with an annualized 2012 profit (surplus) of 5.55%.

This compared with the University of Cambridge, which whilst it came in 3rd place with its
limited edition 2012 strategic ‘teaching and learning’ planning efforts, was placed ‘bottom’ in the 2012 financial ratings, with only a minimal annualized 0.38% profit (surplus). One has to assume that ‘politics’ and the difficulty of sector ‘accounting’ issues caused the disappointing result at this most complicated ancient academic institution.

Lancaster University, on the other hand, put forth great effort and produced a very fine color-printed Strategic Plan, but when this was compared against its annualized profitability (surplus) in 2012 of 1.88%, its exertions in drafting the plan and the university’s financial results amounted to a ‘non sequitor.’ Of course, Lancaster is a comparatively young university dealing with many growing pains, yet, in general it produces commendable results in the process. So its limited profit (surplus) showing in 2012 is not really or necessarily indicative of its overall performance as an institution.

So, in the end, it cannot be concluded that the selected UK universities thoughtful and extensive strategic planning is a useless exercise relative to profitability (surplus). However, effort in this area equally cannot be considered as co-equal with the level of their profitability (surplus). On balance it can be concluded the ‘drift’ is that more effort bears some relationship with positive results. In general – with the significant exception of Open University (with its lower real estate costs), and somewhat of Lancaster University – less effort in the area of strategic planning by UK universities seems to be from the survey sample - a harbinger of poorer results. Thus one can ultimately come down in favour - somewhat – even if very loosely- of the tenets of Hypothesis VIII.
7.5 Summary and Conclusions:

The findings in this Chapter 7 - enabled through this use of the disciplinary methodology of Media Analysis and the Language Stripping or Language Analysis Module – all part of the Specific Media Analysis Structural Variant Model - are, it is believed, extremely valuable. They highlight the presence and absence of ‘core strategic management and social science planning, management and operations language’ in the internet ‘showcase’ presentations of the 8 time-era selected UK universities and relate this to the selected UK universities annualized profitability (surplus).

The results provide a method by which each such university can evaluate its other UK counterparts and measure their competitiveness in the ongoing competitive world of UK universities provision.

The findings will also enable the UK government to evaluate what appears to be happening in this area of UK universities management:

Are these universities – at least conceptually - meeting the criteria set out by the government for their continuing development and metamorphosis - in terms of time-frames and ‘management’ actuation - as exemplified by the language these institutions are employing?

Further, the results point to where these institutions believe they have come, are, and wish to be, in the development of sophisticated day-to-day and strategic and social science management techniques.

(However, it should be cautioned that such statements may in fact be only ‘posited’ or ‘promoted’ intentions - not ‘present reality’ - in the ‘actual’ world of UK universities ongoing governance).
Nevertheless, the research results *indicate, in some measure, how* the top management of those selected institutions funded as universities by the UK government, *intend to govern their institutions* to meet the highly competitive future global demands they face in order to become, be and remain leaders in the world environment of major university institutions.
CHAPTER 8
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS & FURTHER RELATED RESEARCH IMPLICATIONS

I. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

8.1 Introduction:

Certainly the 1963 Robbins Report on Higher Education initiated a shattering ‘break’ with the past. The governance and manifest nature of UK higher education had, by then, become a recognized cause for concern. Lord Robbins set the seal on the demise of easy collegiality - to some, the collegial ‘golden age’ - whereby academics could routinely block changes that might lead UK universities to better address the needs of society. In its place, the Report ushered in the rise of new and ‘harder’ Managerialism, robbing conservative UK university collegiality of its veto power.

Ever since, this master manifesto has continued to propel a high-powered ongoing engine of reform and growth in the way UK universities go about their daily business. The evolution of Post-Robbins incremental governance/management has in turn given way to the introduction and development of a variant of the Thatcherite process of public management, which in turn, has been further pushed forward by the strategic management ‘drive’ of New Labour (who likewise have insinuated this into various other government ministries and departments – notably, the National Health System(NHS) – with varying levels of results).

The ‘fiscal responsibility’ thrust of the David Cameron Conservatives has further driven this phenomenon – through the adoption of the Lord Browne and other reports mentioned earlier in this thesis (Chapter 2) and more formally documented in the appendices at the end of this
dissertation. (See Appendices 10, 11, 12 and 13).

However, the nostrums of ‘funding’ and so-called ‘reform’ do not necessarily correlate with or deliver:

(1) positive changes in the utilisation of resources;
(2) efficiency and effectiveness; or
(3) financial stability.

Published language and rhetoric can be changed fairly quickly, but, this may remain ‘lip-service’ – and not result in ‘real-time ongoing practical change.’

Equally, however, substantial strategic change in the UK university system – self-evident at this point - has not meant that there is now a total dichotomy between Collegiality and Managerialism within the structural confines of these universities. To a great or lesser extent – and this empirically varies from institution to institution – academics and administrative managers have learned to work together with a level of shared vision that has made some of these institutions quite successful, rather than the sum of disparate departments co-existing in some muted state of war!

Equally, it can be properly argued that so-called ‘strategic management’ of a UK university does not necessarily correlate with ‘value’ or ‘value-added’ or that the concept is an automatic passport to future institutional success. However, where strategic management is pragmatically carried out at such an institution, common sense indicates that the thoroughness and systematic managerial activity associated with its framework application, will tend to move the odds in favour of achievement of consistent positive future results.
However, it must be emphasized once again that the author has not tried to suggest or prove by means of this thesis that contemporary use by UK universities of some or much of the ‘language trappings’ of strategic planning management and operations, is making any such institution, successful per se, based on their degree of their utilisation of the concept.

8.2 Findings and Assessment - Proof/Disproof: The 8 Hypotheses/Null-Hypotheses – as Tested by Research Evidence:

8.2.1 Hypothesis I /Null-Hypothesis I:

Hypothesis I has been proven by the research evidence: scholastic writings and literature have evidenced the movement in UK universities from pre-mid 1960s non-management academic ‘collegial’ administration to post-mid 1960s incremental government/management (public management). See Chapter 2 of this dissertation.

8.2.2 Hypothesis II /Null-Hypothesis II:

Hypothesis II has been proven by the research evidence: scholastic writings and literature have evidenced the movement in UK universities from 1980s public management/new managerialism to 2nd half of the 1990s concepts of soft management, hard management and performativity. See Chapter 2 of this dissertation.

8.2.3 Hypothesis III /Null-Hypothesis III:

Hypothesis III has been proven by the research evidence: scholastic writings and literature have evidenced the movement in UK universities from 1997 new managerialism to ‘turn-of-the-century strategic management, academic capitalism and academic entrepreneurialism. See
Chapter 2 of this dissertation.

8.2.4 Hypothesis IV / Nul-Hypothesis IV:

Hypothesis IV / Nul-Hypothesis IV can be interpreted either way: i.e. Hypothesis IV proven/disproven or Nul-Hypothesis IV proven/disproven – based on how a ‘reasonable person’ might view the ‘pyric’ results (can be interpreted either way) of the 1st tranch survey of 2002. See Chapter 6 of this dissertation.

8.2.5 Hypothesis V / Nul-Hypothesis V:

Hypothesis V has been proven by the research evidence: there was, in fact, a major increase – borne out by the 2nd survey tranch of 2012 of strategetic™ management (planning, management and operations) – corporate wording language, used by the 8 time-era selected UK universities. See Chapter 6 of this dissertation.

8.2.6 Adjunct Hypothesis VI / Adjunct Nul-Hypothesis VI:

Adjunct Hypothesis VI is basically proven by research evidence: there was, in fact, a measurable increase in the use of strategetic™ sociometric wording – language in the 1st survey tranch of 2002 by the 8 time-era selected UK universities. See Chapter 7 of this dissertation.

8.2.7 Adjunct Hypothesis VII / Adjunct Nul-Hypothesis VII:

Adjunct Hypothesis VII is dramatically proven by research evidence: there was, in fact, a substantial increase in the use of strategetic™ sociometric wording – language in the 2nd survey tranch of 2012 by the 8 time-era selected UK universities. See Chapter 7 of this dissertation.
8.2.8 Adjunct Hypothesis VIII /Adjunct Nul-Hypothesis VIII:

The survey results from the 2012 2nd tranche of the 8 time-era selected UK universities show a slight ‘drift’ - ‘preponderance’ - in favour of upholding Adjunct Hypothesis VIII as proven: some slender evidence does support better financial results emanate where more strategic planning effort is put out by a UK university – here seen through the lenses of the 8 time-era selected UK universities. See Chapter 7 of this dissertation

8.3 Summary - Key Manifestations of the Epic Change in UK Universities Governance as Delineated in this Thesis:

This thesis has shown that current funding regimes, government policies and quasi-market conditions have all played their crucial part in bringing about the epic change in the governance of UK universities. This is so, both in the older universities and the newer (former polytechnic) universities, as they are almost all now located within common government funding frameworks (see McNay (1995)).

The managerial result is that staff (academic, administrative, research, support and operational) in UK higher education organisations have, particularly since the early 1990’s, found themselves required to do far more work, in a much more directed efficient fiscally-sound manner, and with fewer resources. On top of all this, UK universities have to operate within the non-optional world of profitability/surplus. Ultimately just about everything they do is measured and justified - either directly or somewhere in the background - in terms of the ‘yardstick’ of finance, and thus affordability/profitability. Profit is the ultimate benchmark required of UK universities.
and this is why the element of profitability was introduced into the research undergirding of this thesis. Our universities function in an ever increasing competitive, costly and cost-conscious environment - under tighter and tighter financial conditions. Less and less government funds are becoming available in aggregate and they must be spent on the purposes for which supplied. Government fines and penalties apply for violating “the rules,” or not reaching pre-set targets. Tighter and tighter rules also exist for obtaining research grants. Non-profit donors are increasingly requiring more current and historical fiscal information before they give money, to ensure that the donee university has the resources and capacity to carry out the terms of any donations/grants. Further, UK universities are not allowed by law to operate ‘in the red’ for more than 2 years.

Also, of course, profits/surpluses are needed by the universities to fund new capital projects, absorb cost of living increases and the inflationary costs of doing business.

Other key manifestations, covered either in this thesis, are summarised below:

8.2.1 Sociological:

Various sociological changes have been swept up in this general ‘river of change’ in UK university governance. The following key elements stand out:5 & 6

(1) Access - The widening of access to UK universities of a greater range of socio-economic groups – non-traditional enrollees (many of whom take extended time to complete their scholastic experiences) – what Anderson (2005) calls: “the massification of higher education;”7 and 8

(2) Internationalisation - Greater internationalization of universities – particularly in the emphasis of their desire to undertake and deliver ‘world-class research;’

(3) Exchange Schemes - Student and faculty exchange schemes;

(4) Student Recruitment - International student recruitment;
(5) **Intellectual Diversity** - The range of student intellect is far more diverse, requiring a broader repertoire of instructional techniques; 9,10 and 8

(6) **Virtual Boundaries** - Expansion of universities boundaries (e.g. through distance learning – export of educational services by way of hi-tech - and multiple campuses);8

(7) **Partnerships** - University to university partnerships – especially academic (joint use of facilities, e.g. Royal Holloway University of London and Silwood Park (Imperial College – University of London) in Sunningdale, Berkshire, etc.);

(8) **Franchising** - Franchising agreements between universities; and

(9) ‘Marketisation’ - Transformation of such universities ‘culture’ to the discourse of the market.

8.2.2 **Academic:**

From an academic perspective there have also been many innovative managerial changes – some mandatory, others elective - that have been adopted to a greater or lesser extent by the 145-odd UK universities existing today. The following represents a summary of these:

(1) **The RAE (Research Academic Exercise)** – known familiarly as the ‘Research Exercise’ – has been an every 7-year phenomenon since its introduction by the UK government. Managerially, through its resource allocation and quality rankings, it has forced many UK universities (particularly the older ones) into developing a well-organized pattern of operations that emphasize R & D (research and development). Indeed some have argued that certain UK higher education institutions have put their ‘principal focus on research and research training’11 - with considerable carefully thought-through and directed budgetary force – in terms of manpower, equipment, buildings and finance – behind such endeavours. This indeed has spawned, in some cases, university-sponsored industrial parks and business enterprise incubation nurturing (e.g. The University of Cambridge on Trinity College’s estate land));

(2) **The QAA (The Quality Assurance Agency)** – a periodic 5-year UK government-sponsored inquiry into the teaching standards of UK universities has been and continues to be mandated. This prescribed exercise gauges the timely, efficient and meaningful organisation and technical delivery of the teaching didactic. This initiative, through its resource allocation and quality rankings, has forced a much greater professionalisation, workforce organisation and tailoring, investment in hi-tech, and the development of new systems to teach and learn;

(3) **‘Boutique’ Degrees** – these are degrees that not only teach general or core-course academic subject-matter, but also contain specialty or ‘major’ course elements of a more practical applied nature, applicable to, as appropriate, industrial, political, social or cultural fields. This initiative, too, has forced a much greater professionalisation, workforce organisation and tailoring.
investment in hi-tech, and the development of new systems to teach and learn;

(4) Modular Course Teaching – this unit method of teaching is geared to and is a concession to the workplace, to students who are employed whilst learning and working towards a university degree. Instead of having to attend a course taught throughout a term or a whole year, a modular course may be disposed of in concentrated teaching in the course of a ‘long’ day, a weekend, week or two weeks, etc. This approach has forced universities to adopt far more student ‘customer’ and ‘market’ driven, flexible and convenient – industry-inspired ‘batching’ approaches - to the educational process and, indeed, its teaching employment patterns;

(5) Co-op/Sandwich Degrees – this method of degree-acquisition is another concession by the UK university establishment to the pressures and organisation needs of the business-place. Essentially, students reading for such degrees, work at their jobs for periods of time and then go to ‘school’ for other periods of time and then go back to work again – hence the term sandwich! These approaches have required universities to develop their operations in a much more managerial, careful budgetary and businesslike fashion;

(6) Distance learning – the emergence of distance learning degrees – pioneered in the UK by Open University – has also led to the need to plan, organize, execute in a hi-tech context and carefully budget (set-up, operations and surplus), in a much more fine-tuned ‘corporatised’ manner;

(7) Professional University-Validated Continuing Education – this professionally geared workshop, course-unit, certificate or diploma teaching and learning methodology is exclusively fashioned to meet industry and other external demands. It is a far-cry and departure from the traditional delivery of higher education by UK universities. This bespoke pragmatic educational delivery, however, recognizes the practical corporate and professional body ‘generated-revenue-value’ to UK universities and their need to respond to the ‘customer’ pressures of the free-market.

8.2.3 Managerial:

‘Management’ or ‘Managerialism’ is – according to Anderson (2005) – the incorporation of approaches and techniques commonly found in the private sector, to the management of the public sector (i.e. in this case, UK universities), with *a particular emphasis on an enhanced role for managers.*

Key manifestations of the so-called ‘managerial’ revolution in UK universities governance can be found in the following ‘free market-efficiency’ perspectives: 12 and 13
8.2.3.1 Internal Changes: 14, 15, 16, 17 and 18

(1) **Cost Centres** - Use of internal cost centres;
(2) **Reduction of Costs** - Emphasis on the reduction of costs;\(^{6}\) and \(^{7}\)
(3) **Appraisals** - Use of appraisals – overt measurement of academic employees performance and outcomes (e.g. exam results);\(^{19}\)
(4) **Quality Assurance** - Articulation of quality assurance;\(^{7}\)
(5) **Competition** - Fostering of competition between employees;
(6) **Marketisation** - The marketisation of universities services;
(7) **Efficiency & Effectiveness** - The monitoring of efficiency and effectiveness through measurement of outcomes and individual staff performances;
(8) **Managerialism** - Regimes change in universities (moving from administration-governance styles to Managerialism);\(^{2}\) see also \(^{7}\)
(9) **Organisation Culture changes** - in universities – gradual forced shedding by faculty of common traditional beliefs and norms about the professoriate – particularly concerning ubiquitous ‘committeeism,’ self-governing bodies and taskforces - and further, the diminution of the power of external university self-governing academic associations;\(^{20}\)
(10) **‘Industry’ Values** - Altering the values of UK universities employees to more closely resemble those found in the private ‘for profit’ sector (for example: some instances of performance-related pay for heads and senior members of academic departments and explicitly worded job descriptions for academic staff);\(^{21}\)
(11) **Work Intensification** - Academic staff ‘work intensification’ and increased workloads that can include teaching, research and ‘administrivia’ (routine administrative non-core duties);\(^{7}\)
(12) **Re-Organising, Controlling & Regulating** - Academic managers and administrators (metamorphosing into ‘agents of capital’ \(^{22}\) and \(^{23}\)) re-organising, controlling and regulating the work of academic, research, support and operational staff and the conditions and regulations under which they work - transformation of the academic workforce into middle managers or skilled craftsmen;\(^{25}\)
(13) **Governance** - Less openness in governance (particularly as regards the former polytechnics/now universities), as these are all corporations with governors appointed principally from the private sector; and\(^{26}\)
(14) **Strategic Planning** - Adoption of business planning techniques.\(^{21}\)

8.2.3.2 External Influences:

Emergence in recent years, from industry-based organisations, of commercial expertise to compete with:
(1) the traditional university educational approach; and
(2) distance learning (which utilises a combination of internet,
periodic plenary sessions and hardcopy mail communications).27

The impact of these industry-based organisations in the UK has, so far, been very limited – the
joint venture of Laureate with the University of Liverpool, in distance learning, is the only one
known to the author.

However, their influence in the US is growing. The most well-known of these
‘entrepreneurial’ university corporations are: Capella, De Salles, Streyer, Phoenix and Laureate
(which controls multiple institutions in different countries).

8.2.4 Finance and Information Systems:

More recently, major changes and developments in accounting sophistication and the technology
of information systems, and their delivery, have brought about management structures and
control mechanisms in UK universities which tend to identify UK universities in a
recognizable mode more akin to industrial organisations.5

8.2.5 Accountability and Entrepreneurship:

The ‘New Managerialism’ in UK universities is essentially woven around the principle of
‘required ongoing and continuous improvement’ demanded of them - personified, in the areas of
accountability and entrepreneurship, by the following:

(1) Controls;
(2) Audits;
(3) Plans;
(4) Procedures;
(5) Research for industry;
(6) Incubation of small business from transition ideas into active
commerce;
(7) Trading company models;
(8) Service agreements;
(9) SWOT analyses; and
(10) Quality brand-image building.9

Out of all the above, some clear results are appearing at this point, relative to UK universities' management, which can be summarized as follows:

(1) **Better Fiscal Management** - There is an increasing visibility of more effective and efficient management from an accounting standpoint;5

(2) **Performance Management** - There is an increasing visibility of so-called ‘performance’ management;28

(3) **Hybridisation** - There has been an hybrid retention of some long-established administrative and management conduct alongside the new ‘strategic management’ approach - both internally within UK universities and externally between these institutions. And indeed, this hybridization process has itself been fraught with contradictions and inconsistencies. (For instance, middle level academic staff are often able - to a degree – to insulate themselves from the most stark effects of greater ‘managerialism,’ and to some extent enjoy flexible working hours. However, this tends to be made up for on the basis of ‘goodwill,’ by giving unpaid working hours in the name of student responsiveness);26 and22

(4) **Control & Regulation** - Control and regulation of academic labour seem to have replaced ‘collegiality,’ trust and professional discretion;26

(5) **Strategic Planning & Management** - There is more forward planning and swifter decision-making;6

(6) **Customer Service** - Customer-orientation (‘consumers’ to be recruited and serviced)29 can be seen in the many instances of UK universities. Some, at least, now tailor their courses and research to the expressed needs of industry, commerce and professional groups.6 These sentiments have been echoed by one of the greatest of all time intellectual ‘godfathers’ of ‘Management science – Peter Drucker (2004): ‘business educators should be out as practitioners where the problems and results are.’30

(7) **Research** - There has been an almost universal driving force throughout the UK higher education scene - not just confined to the old privileged universities segment - to burnish UK universities research profiles under the mantra of “research excellence.”6
8.4 Ongoing Process of Change:

The research set out in this thesis has shown that the change process within UK universities is an ongoing, gestating, alive and progressive one, but, however, that these so-called “new management techniques” fall far short of the industrial model. Some universities have found it easier than others to adopt a more ‘strategic management Mantle,’ (for instance, the universities of Bristol and Leeds amongst the older universities, and Bournemouth as regards the newer ones). Their ability to make these changes have been influenced in particular by the capacity of each organisation’s culture to nurture change. Others have struggled just to develop some semblance of budgeting, controlling, accountability, auditing and responding to legal challenges.

It should also be reaffirmed that this general emergence of public management does not amount to or neatly mirror so-called UK ‘public sector managerialism’ (for example: in the National Health Service (NHS) and other government departments). The separate higher education institutional ‘strain’ of this phenomenon – from essentially the 1980’s to the present (from Thatcherite origin and through New Labour and fiscally-responsible Conservatism) – is distinct and up until this point, somewhat different.
‘Public Sector Managerialism’ is heavily concerned with scoring, ranking and performance measurements – connecting rewards to patient/customer satisfaction rendered by employees’ performance. The ‘Public Management’ of UK universities, on the other hand, is somewhat more muted, less advanced, less strident and emphasized, and somewhat less pressed by the UK government.

UK universities in the areas of ‘science’ and ‘technology’ are increasingly being required to be seen as ‘performing’ – on a research basis, on a grants-received basis, and on a sound financial basis – generating some kind of fiscal surplus, in order to gain additional government funding rewards.

Funding and government requirements as regards UK universities are more and more being directed towards:

1. improved management along ‘corporate model’ lines; and
2. ongoing transformation of what UK universities are required to be doing to support the present and future British economy.

The UK government – variously – seems to be using a ‘carrot and stick’ approach: ‘orders’ setting new targets and performance requirements regularly issue from Westminster. Interestingly, incentives, too, are increasingly being offered by the government and tied to performance and rankings whether this be, inter alia, relative to teaching issues (TQA), examination and results, or research matters (RAE).

Not surprisingly, there is an ongoing chaffing between the government and UK universities, because of the former’s ever-increasing variety of requirements.
As shown by the research results from Chapters 6 and 7 of this thesis, there is, at this point, some percolating ‘seepage’ of ‘management,’ ‘strategy’ and ‘sociometric’ language into UK universities published ‘statements of intention.’ However, as the findings indicate, it is still limited, and more ‘sociological’ than ‘strategic.’

According to Lapsley (2004), “the reform of accounting practices within universities has not connected in a managerial sense with individuals in these institutions.” Further, in the area of student instruction – the core activity of UK universities - as Nemetz and Cameron (2006) have pointed out: whilst many faculty have developed creative and interesting methods of instruction, few have undertaken formal programmes of pedagogical research and assessment. Further, Knight and Trowler (2000) have argued that “work intensification – as this relates to academics – has meant that the time, energy and mental space available for improving teaching practice has been reduced.” Indeed, it has been additionally opined that ‘the bottom level rungs of academe are expected to do twice as much as their predecessors were expected to do.” – See Anderson (2005)

The ongoing ‘management’ discourse shift (accountability, reform, efficiency, market structures and financial realities) is inexorably - though not with lightening speed - colonizing the culture of UK universities, though faculty morale – both in the UK, USA and elsewhere - is a mixed picture at this point.
Further, as Prichard and Willmott (1995) indicate:

“Universities are being constituted as knowledge factories organized by managers whose aim is to intensify and commodify the production and distribution of knowledge and skills to whomsoever has the wherever to purchase them.”

8.5 Conclusions:

The fundamental purpose of this thesis has been to selectively trace the general development of the notion of ‘management’ in and of UK universities. The evolutionary process here has been an essentially English one – akin to the gradual development of our Common Law – an ongoing build-up of principles generated out of pragmatic situations.

From the above discussions - and fortified by the views of Reed and Anthony (1993), Clark, Cochrane and McLaughlin (1994), Clark and Newman (1994), Itzin & Newman (1995), Clark and Newman (1997b) and Nemetz and Cameron (2006) - it can be appropriately posited that the so-called ‘new managerialism’ of UK universities more personifies managerial techniques and organisation controls more usually associated with medium and large ‘for profit’ businesses, that have been grafted onto these public sector organisations.

For many practical reasons, stated or implied above, our universities continue to be at an important crossroads. Indeed, turbulence in the global university system is pronounced.

The process of transformation to ‘corporatisation’ has not been and will not be a straight-forward linear change from complex-not-for-profit organisations to business-oriented entities. Indeed, there is still to be found in UK universities to-day, manifestations of the retention of the ‘symbolic power’ of ‘collegiality’ - i.e. heavy-duty ‘committeeism.”

See 41
Nonetheless, twenty-first century universities have found that they must be more vigilant like businesses in responding to changes in the environment; they are inevitably under continual pressure to respond to a myriad of daily ongoing operational challenges. Their faculty and professional staff need to constantly adapt their ‘values’ to the ongoing and unstoppable evolutionary phenomenon of ‘strategic management.’ They need to be ever more nimble in adapting to the constant stream of government directives invading their traditional preserves. There are and will be - not surprisingly - winners, failures and a majority of such institutions ending up somewhere in between.

“‘New managerialism’ and ‘hard’ management are undoubtedly appealing to managers of universities looking to deal with severe resource problems, which are affecting the whole of the higher education sector in the United Kingdom to a greater or lesser degree.” In fact, ‘hard’ managerial regimes – in whatever UK university they may be – have probably – at this time – not yet been able to completely change most of the elements of each such relevant organisation’s culture. Nevertheless, they are likely to have changed some organisational forms and technologies.

Major growth of higher education in the United Kingdom has brought with it - almost in tandem - the requirement to appropriately justify the expenditure of increased public funds and to demonstrate ‘value for public money’ doled out and allocated in this area. Because of ongoing increasing interference, pressure and control from the UK government, an evolutionary ‘sea-change’ in the governance of UK universities has been generally occurring, resulting in a
more pragmatic businesslike approach, observable alongside increased ‘managerial’ market orientation.6

However, a warning bell should be sounded: published language and rhetoric can be changed fairly quickly, but, this can and may remain ‘lip-service’ – and not result in ‘real-time ongoing practical change.’

Venieris and Cohen (2004) believe, for a variety of reasons, that despite all the pressures and influences historically and currently being put on universities globally - and that includes UK universities - these may not translate into efficient and accountable entities any time soon.42

As McClenaghan (1998) indicates, there are very different cultural mentalities between universities and the corporate world.43

In summary, this metamorphic UK universities operating ‘world’ is to-day characterised by an environment of competition, forward-thrusting ‘corporatism,’ globalization, market niches, some semblance of entrepreneurship, external fundraising and financialisation – all highly business-world-focused activities.43 and 7

However, in the end, as Alfred Chandler (1964) has essentially said - you have to have the ‘structure’ in place before you can successfully develop the ‘strategy.’44 And on this, UK universities still have a considerable way to go.
II. FURTHER RELATED RESEARCH IMPLICATIONS BEYOND THAT COVERED IN THIS THESIS FOR ACADEMIA, INDUSTRY AND POLICYMAKERS

8.6 Overview:

The discussions and findings which are the core of this thesis are inevitably circumscribed by the so-called “Popperian” phenomenon. (You can never cover everything!) However, it is asserted that the findings expounded in this research credibly represent ‘reality’ in the multifarious area of UK universities operations. But, it is recognised that with the contemporary explosion of knowledge and endless database resources, it is impossible to be 100% definitive on anything and particularly in the realm of information covered in this dissertation.

8.7 Other Potential Areas of Research:

The following sets out other additional areas of related research which could be usefully carried out, above and beyond that covered in this thesis. Such research would reveal valuable implications and opportunities for managers in academia, government policymakers and for various sections of industry.

8.7.1 Similar studies for all UK Universities and University Colleges:

The survey research project which is the centerpiece of this dissertation covered only 8 time-era selected UK universities. The same framework utilized to study all UK universities would provide an interesting, more complete and definitive reservoir of research which would complement the findings enunciated here – to a greater or lesser extent.
8.7.2  A Financial Study of All UK Universities and University Colleges:

A comprehensive research study of all UK universities and university colleges annual financial reports would yield very interesting and valuable information relative to developing a framework model for profitable operation of a UK university or university college. 49 English universities are currently at high financial risk (see Appendix 11 – Universities at Risk and the Lord Browne Report 2010).

8.7.3  Revenue Studies and Module Development in a Number of UK universities and University Colleges Operational Areas:

Revenue studies to develop operational module (sub-model) profiles could be usefully developed in a number of UK universities and university colleges areas. For instance, research on the following could be very informative and helpful in devising stable financially viable operations at these institutions:

(1) Financial profiles of teaching departments and the revenue generation from various degrees/ diplomas offered, along with domestic, EU and international student profiling for fees generation;
(2) Financial profiles of research centres/areas and the revenue generation from various types of research programs, along with domestic, EU and international student profiling for fees generation;

8.7.4  Revenue Studies and Module Development Relative to Outside Trading Businesses that could be Developed by UK Universities and University Colleges:

Some UK universities and university colleges already have profitable “outside” trading businesses (e.g. the University of Hertfordshire’s bus company operations and Royal Holloway’s “outside” trading income operations). Other such universities and university colleges could profitably develop their own such businesses. A national research study to analyse current such ventures could yield information which could help build a module profile for what other UK
universities and university colleges could/might usefully do in this area to stabilize their own financial operations.

8.7.5 Revenue Studies and Module Development relative to Collaborative Projects That Could Be Developed by UK Universities and University Colleges and Industry (domestic and international):

There are many successful examples of university/industry collaboration partnerships which are funded by relevant industrial companies. A national research study to analyse current such ventures could yield information which could help build a module profile for what other UK universities and university colleges could/might usefully do in this area to stabilize their own financial operations.

8.7.6 Revenue Studies and Module Development relative to UK University/University College-Owned Industrial Parks That Could Be Developed by UK Universities and University Colleges and Industry (domestic and international):

There is more than one successful example of university/industry collaboration relative to UK university/university college-owned industrial parks. (The Trinity College, Cambridge example (as mentioned earlier) springs to immediate mind. Others also exist). A national research study to analyse current such ventures could yield information which could help build a module profile for what other UK universities and university colleges could/might usefully do in this area to stabilize their own financial operations.

8.7.7 Revenue Studies and Module Development relative to UK Universities/University Colleges Obtaining Patent Royalties Could Be Developed/Increased by UK Universities and University Colleges:

Research patents registered on “inventions” by UK university/university college employees (academic staff and others) have become more and more common over the last 50 years. Since
these employees work (for the most part) on university/university college property and get paid by the university/university college, and work with university/university college-owned equipment, it is reasonable for a university/university college to require royalty payments to be paid over to the institution on any such patent that starts/continues to generate money in return for its use by third-party firms/entities. A national research study to analyse current such patenting protocols could yield information which would help build a module profile for what other UK universities and university colleges could/might usefully do in this area to stabilize their own financial operations.

8.7.8 Revenue Studies and Module Development relative to UK Universities/University Colleges Building up Fundraising/Development Income Operations:

Putting together a sustainable ongoing fundraising/development department to raise capital for buildings, equipment and ground purchase etc., endowment and annual operational funding for UK universities/university colleges is a science which has been highly and successfully developed by US universities and colleges – Penn State University in Pennsylvania being probably the most well-known example. (In the non-profit world this is the equivalent of for-profit industrial ‘public offerings’).

A national research study to analyse current such current UK university/university college operations as exist, could yield important information which would help build a module profile for what other UK universities and university colleges could/might usefully do in this area to stabilize their own financial operations.
8.8 Summary:

Doubtless, others could come up with a myriad of additional ideas for research in the general area dealt with by this thesis. But here at least are 8 such ideas and approaches. They can all be reasonably considered as relevant, useful and productive future opportunities for investigation in this whole field – fascinating and complex as it is. There is no reason why UK universities and university colleges should not be able to generate 3-5% annual operating profit (surplus) on their teaching operations – if they are properly profiled financially. Equally, there is no reason why such UK universities/university colleges cannot gradually build up a framework of overall operations which generate an 8% annualized profit (surplus) per university/university college. In this way they would be generating the necessary revenue to adequately fund their future development needs.
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APPENDIX 1 (CHAPTER 1)


14. ‘Strategy-related’ and ‘Sociometrically-related’ words definitions:

   ‘Strategy-related:’

   (1) Collegial Administration: This is personified in the form of weak management with extreme deference to the views and wishes of academic colleagues, endless committees,
no rocking-of-the-boat, snail-pace decision-making and often with time-limited rotating
tours of duty between colleagues.

(2) *Strategetic*™ management: ‘Strategetic™’ combines the concepts of ‘strategy’ and
‘metrics.’ ‘Strategic’ has to do with planning to achieve short-term, intermediate term,
long-term and generational aims, objectives and goals. The term ‘management,’ of
course, is self-explanatory. ‘Metrics’ stands for monitoring and measuring the results of
operations.

(3) *Strategetic™ Sociometry:* Strategetic™ combines the concepts of ‘strategy’ and
‘metrics.’ ‘Strategic’ has to do with planning to achieve short-term, intermediate term,
long-term and generational aims, objectives and goals. ‘Metrics’ stands for monitoring
and measuring the results of operations. The term ‘sociometry,’ as used here,
combines the concepts of ‘sociology-type’ language terms and ‘metrics.’ ‘Metrics’ in
this context stands for the monitoring and measuring of the use of sociological-type
terminology.

(4) Planning: ‘Planning’ here means to devise the realization for the achievement of a
particular objective.

(5) Benchmarking/Monitoring: the term ‘benchmarking’ is defined in this thesis to mean
a point of reference from which measurements of any sort may be made. ‘Monitoring’
here speaks to keeping track of, regulating or controlling benchmarks.

(6) Performance: ‘Performance’ here is used to mean the execution of an action.

**Sociometrically-related:**

(1) Development/Improvement: ‘Development,’ in the context here, is to make
something happen. ‘Improvement’ is to do/make something better – enhance value.

(2) Teaching/Learning: ‘Teaching’ in its simplest most generic form here is ‘to impart
knowledge.’ ‘Learning’ in this context is used primarily to mean the gaining of
knowledge or understanding or skill by study, instruction or experience.

(3) Research and Development (R&D): for the purposes of this thesis ‘R&D’ is defined
here as investigation and/or experimentation to discover/develop/amend/improve
theories, concepts, facts, products, processes or services.

(4) Excellence: ‘Excellence’ here is used to mean –very good of its kind, eminently good.

(5) Internationalism: ‘Internationalism’ is used to mean foreign or global in scope,
coverage, character, principles, interests or outlook.

(6) Community/Environment: ‘Community’ deals with local/regional interactions of
various kinds. ‘Environment’ references the nature/condition of surroundings.

15. Ultimately, economies of scale, higher education for economic productivity and better
training systems for economic performance, have been the fundamental underlying rationale for
the Higher Education initiatives of every UK government administration since the time of Harold
Macmillan, all effectively grounded in the crucible of “the white heat of technology” (scientific
and managerial).

Thanks to the Robbins Committee, UK universities to-day still have, by convention, ‘some’
minimum level of immunity from direct government ministerial intervention and
inappropriate influences. The Report tried to balance off “the necessity of freedom for
academic institutions and the necessity that they should serve the nation’s
needs.”

However, the many recommendations made by the Robbins Committee implied – in reality spoke directly to - a much greater degree of ‘survey’ and ‘co-ordination’ of higher education to be exercised by the central UK government than had been the case in the past – and, indeed, this is precisely what has happened up to and including the present.

The Robbins Report – although delivered and published in 1963 – some 50 years ago - is critically important as a crucial part of what has become ‘to-day’s order of things,’ and indeed, ‘tomorrow’s ongoing development of things.’ It may have gotten many financial and forecasting numbers wrong – but these are only matters of degree, not debilitating substance. The Report itself was well-researched, voluminous, fully developed and well specified. It was and is thus a very valuable contribution to the understanding and development of UK universities – creating the foundations for what has since become a crucial break with the past. In this sense, it can be compared in importance to the 1942 Beveridge Report on Social Insurance and Allied Services. The Robbins Report was truly forward thinking: it laid out scenarios, vividly painted consequences and proposed pragmatic solutions, many of which have stood the test of time.
TABLE 1.1

STRATEGETRIC™ MANAGEMENT WORDING

Accounting – Accountable, Accountability:
Advertising:
Aid – Student Aid, Scholarships, Bursaries, Financial Support:
Allocation – Re-allocation, Apportion:
Appraisal:
Approved – Endorsed, Authorized:
Asset(s):
Audit:
Balance Sheet – Off Balance Sheet:
Brand – Well-Known, Trusted:
Beliefs:
Benchmarking – Key Performance Indicators, League-tables, Ratings: Builds - Building Capacity, Capability:
Benefits of Scale:
Budgets –Adequate, Balanced:
Bureaucracy:
Business – Links, Private Sector, Enterprises, Companies, Potential, Business-facing:
Cash – Cash Flow:
Capitalising - Capital Expenditure:
Challenges - Fiscal:
Change(s), amendments, updates:
Chairman - Chair:
Compensation – Benefits, Pensions, Appraisals:
Competition – Competitive, Competitive Advantage/Disadvantage, Position of Strength:
Commercial:
Communication:
Computer Applications:
Consolidation:
Consultancy – to Business, to Government, With Employees:
Contracts –Standard Terms & Conditions:
Control:
Core Activities, Critical Mass:
Corporate (Corporation) – Relationships, Enterprise, Organisations, Institutional, SME’s:
Corporate Social Responsibility:
Costs – Costs Control, Cost Accounting, Cost Efficiency:
Credit – Credit Strength:
Critical Mass:
Culture – Cultural Change, cultural Assets, Cultural Understanding, Continuous improvement, Multi-Culturalism, Culture Climate:
Customers:
Discrimination:
Disinvest:
Decision - Decision-Making Structure:
Deficits:
Deliver – Delivering, Delivery:
Demand & Supply:
Dependency – Reduced Dependency:
Depreciation:
Distribution - Redistribution:
Diversification:
Divisions:
Dividends:
Economy – Economic, Impact, regional:
Economic Climate:
Economic Development:
Economic Recession:
Efficiency – Business-Like, Efficiency Gains, Effective:
Employees – Highly-Skilled:
Employers - Regard:
Employment – Careers, Accredited Student Placements:
Endowment(s):
Enterprise – Enterprising:
Entrepreneurship:
Equipment –Replacement, Safe, User-Friendly:
Equity:
Estate – Developments, Maintenance:
Excel:
Executive Team:
Expansion:
Expenses:
Facilities - Expansion, Repairs, Purpose -Built, Disposal:
Feedback:
Forecast:
Financial – Contribution, Fees, Finance, Financing, Funding, Performance, Strength, Sustainability:
Financial Assistance/Support – Scholarships, Funding:
Financial Barriers:
Fundraising – Philanthropy, Development Campaign:
Future – Equipping Students for the Future, direction:
Goals – Financial, Non-Financial:
Grants – Applications, Funding, Funding Capacity, Revenue Contracts:
Group:
Grow - Growth, Revenue, Fees, Turnover:
Harassment:
Human Resources:
Implementation:
Incentivise - Incentives:
Income – Discretionary Funds, Income Sources, Income Streams, Income Generation, Real Income:
Increase – Numbers:
Industry – Links:
Inflation:
Innovate – Innovation:
Intellectual Property:
Inventor:
Investment – Sound, Capital Investment:
Investors, Financiers, Business Angels:
IT – Use Authorizations, Data Storage Centre:
Job Description:
Knowledge Transfer – Technology Transfer, Transmission:
Launch:
Legal – Ordinances:
Legislation:
Licences:
Lobby – Campaign:
Long-Term – Short-term Trends:
Loss – Shortfall:
Management – Executives, Managers:
Market – Marketing, Market Share, Marketplace, Market Needs, Marketing Differentiation, Market Focus, Market Tool, Offered:
Market Mix – Product Mix:
Maximise:
Mission:
Model - Modes:
Monitoring – Assessment, Accountability, Evaluation, Feedback, Measuring, Review, Statistics, scrutiny :
Motivated:
Needs:
Negotiations:
Nominating Committee:
Objectives - Targets:
Offer – Offered:
Operations – Operating, Operating Statement:
Overhead Costs:
Ownership:
Patents:
Partnerships – Alliances, Partners:
Pay-Roll Costs:
Performance:
Pipeline:
Plan – Planning, Planning Period:
Policies & Procedures:
Politics:
Price – Pricing Strategies:
Priorities – Business, National:
Processes – efficient, procedures:
Productivity - Productivity Gains, Productive, Production:
Product(s):
Projects – Targeted Projects:

Professions – Professional Societies, Professional Bodies, Professional Services, Professional Development, Professionalism:
Profit – Surplus:
Public Sector – Government Links:
Public Funds:
Public Interest:
Purchase - Purchasing:
Ratios – Key Ratios:
Recruitment – Intake, Applications:
Reduce Government Funding Dependency:
Re-engineering:
Regulation – Government Regulation, Regulators:
Reports – Internal, External, To Government:
Research Commercialisation:
Reserves:
Resources:
Responsibility(ies):
Results – Action, Solutions, Solution-oriented, Outcomes, Problem-solving:
ROI - Return on (Public) Investment:
Retention:
Revenue:
Rewards:
Risk(s):
Safe:
Sale:
Security:
Sickness Absence – Employees:
Skills – Development, Lifelong, Transferable, Useful:
Solutions:
Specifications:
Spin-offs:
Sponsors:
Stakeholders:
Start-ups:
Strategic Map:
Strategy – Strategic, Strategic Plan, Strategic Framework, Strategic Priorities:
Subsidiaries:
Surplus(es) – profitability:
Sustainable – Economic Impact, Sustainable Growth, Sustainable Development,
Sustainability,
Sustainable Relationships, Underpin:
Survey:
Systems:
Targets:
Tariff:
Teamwork - Teams:
Technology(ies) – Technological, Techniques:
Testing – Tested:
Training:
Trends:
Turnover – Reduction:
Values – Core:
Value – for Money, Value-Added:
Ventures – Joint Ventures:
Waste – Waste Management:
Wealth Creation:
Welfare – Student Welfare:
Work – Conduct, World of Work, workforce, working conditions, Workload, Work
Options, Workplace, Undertaken:
Working Capital:
Working with Businesses:
### TABLE 1.2

**STRATEGETRIC™ SOCIOMETRIC WORDING**

| Academic – Academic Staff, Focused, Goals, Challenge: |
| Academic Portfolio – Contents: Arts, Creative Arts, Humanities, Education, Sciences, Engineering, Finance, Technology, Mathematics, Law, Business, Health - Standards: |
| Academic - Freedom, Responsibilities, Environment: |
| Academic Support – Academic Apprentices: |
| Access: |
| Achievement – Delivery, enhanced academic performance: |
| Acquisition – Acquire: |
| Administration - Administrative: |
| Admissions: |
| Advice: |
| Agreement – Agree, Approve: |
| Aims- Aspiration(s): |
| Alignment: |
| Analysis – Critical Reflection: |
| Appropriateness: |
| Archives: |
| Areas – Approaches, Active, Activities, Fields, Catchment, Directions: |
| Autonomous: |
| Balance: |
| Barriers: |
| Benefit – Beneficiaries, Students, Student Needs, Student-centred, locally, the World: |
| Best Practice(s): |
| Best-known: |
| Board – Council, Congregation: |
| Broadening: |
| Carbon Emissions – Reduction: |
| Catalysts – Drivers: |
| Capabilities – Unique University Capabilities, Capacity: |
| Central: |
| Challenges – Challenging, Demanding, Domestic and Global: |
| Characteristics – Attributes, Characterises: |
| Charities: |
| Charter: |
| Citizenship: |
| Climate: |
| Coaching: |
| Collegiality – Colleges, Collegiate, Collegial University: |
| Colleagues: |
| Collaborate - Collaboration, Collaborative, Participation: |
| Commitment: |
| Committee(s), Task Force, groups: |
Communication – Targeted, Communication Value:
Community – Alumni, Awareness, Benefit, Civic Roots, Engagement, Local, People, Region, Society – needs, Support, university, Volunteering:
Comparison:
Complaints:
Completion - Complete:
Comprehensive:
Conferences –Workshops, Exchanges, Lectures:
Confidence:
Contemporary:
Consolidation:
Consumption – Energy usage, water usage:
Context:
Contribution – to community:
Continue – Continuing, ongoing, Lifelong:
Conventional Thinking:
Coordination:
Counselling:
Country-of-Origin:
Courtesy:
Creative – Creativity, Create, Creation:
Curiosity – Intellectual:
Curriculum – Content:
Cycle:
Debate:
Defining:
Delegation – Delegated:
Demands – Future Demands:
Democracy:
Demonstrable - Demonstrate:
Depth – In-Depth:
Destination of Choice:
Development – Career, Cultural, Forwarding-Thinking, General, Organisational, Social:
Difficult - Complexity:
Dignity:
Disabilities:
Disaster Recovery:
Discipline(s) – academic, Inter-Disciplinary, Multi-Disciplinary, Schools, Institutions, Faculties, departments, Collegiate:
Discovery (ies):
Distance Learning – Remote Learning:
Distinction – academic:
Distinctive:
Diversity – Diverse, Under-Represented Groups, Minorities:
Duplication:
Dynamism:
Education – Breadth, continuing education, Depth, Enriching, Experience, Inspiring, Professional, tutorials, Unique Model:
Efforts – Implementation:
Élite – University:
Element:
Embedding - Embedded:
Embracing:
Emphasis – Care:
Empowerment:
Enabling – Enabler, Ensure, Implement:
Encourage – Encouragement:
Engagement – Action, Activities, Maximising Potential:
Enhancement – Enrichment, Social:
Enjoyment:
Environment (Cohesive, Dynamic, Excellent, Healthy, Intellectual, Positive, Rewarding, Safe, Working, Learning, Recreational, Supportive, Pastoral):
Equality – of Opportunity, Disadvantaged Groups:
Esteem – Eminence, National, international:
Ethical:
Evidence - Evidenced-Based Approaches:
Examinations:
Exemplar – Example, Exemplary:
Excellence – Academic, Expertise, Centres of Excellence, Outstanding:
Exceptional:
Expansion:
Expectations – Of Students, Of Staff, Of Stakeholders:
Experience – Student Experience, Outcomes, Positive, Supportive:
Expertise - Experts:
Expression:
Extra-Curricular:
Family:
Features:
Fieldwork:
Flexibility - Flexible:
Framework - Framing:
Focus:
Foster:
Foundation:
Freedom – Freedom of Thought, Freedom of Speech – Without Penalty:
Full potential:
Full-time – Part-time, non-matriculated:
Fundamental:
Gender:
Generation – Next Generation:
Guide – Guiding, Guidelines:
Governance – Good Governance:
Hallmark:
Heritage:
Higher Education:
Hub:
Ideas- Issues:
Impact – social, cultural, Global:
Improvement – Improved, Upgrades:
Independent:
Influential - influence:
Information – Information-Sharing, Informed:
Infrastructure – Development, Framework, Maintenance, Structure:
Initiatives - Enquiry:
Inquiry:
Insufficiency:
Integration – Interaction, Integrated:
Integrity:
Intellectual:
Intensive:
International – Ambitions, Global Networks, Global Footprint, Global University, Recognition, Relationships, Staff, Student Body, World, World-Class:
Investigate – Investigation:
Involvement – Pro-active Involvement:
Justification – Justify:
Key:
Knowledge – New, Advancement, Knowledge-Related:
Leading- leadership, Thought Leadership, Agenda-Setting:
Learning – Lifelong Learning, flexible learning:
Legacy:
Library – Provision:
Limitations:
Links - Linkages:
Long-term Role:
Low-use:
Maintain - maintenance:
Material:
Mentoring:
Methods – Mechanisms, Modus Operandi, Protocols:
Mind-Set:
Minimise - Minimal:
Momentum:
Museum(s) – Botanic Garden, Choirs, Collections, Galleries, Theatres, Orchestras:
Negotiation – Influence:
Network:
Norms:
Nurture(s):
Obligation – Mutual Obligation:
Occur – Happen:
Open – Openness, Open Access:
Opportunities – Exchange Opportunities:
Organisation – behavior:
Originality:
Outputs:
Outreach:
Oversight:
Overloading:
Paramount:
Parity:
Participation:
Patterns:
People-Based:
Portfolio:
Positioning - Position:
Positive:
Potential:
Premise:
Preparation:
Preservation – Preserve:
Prevention – Inhibit:
Primacy – Importance:
Principle:
Proactive:
Problems:
Process(es):
Professionalism:
Profile:
Programmes – Flexible, modular, Regular:
Progress - Progression:
Promote – Promotion:
Propose – Proposal;
Protection:
Provision - Provide:
Publishing:
Public – Engagement, Policy, Services, Sector, Understanding:
Purpose:
Qualification – Courses, Degree, Entry, Certificate, Diploma, Joint Honors, Summer Schools: Quality – Quality Outputs, Calibre:
Recognition – Academic, Renowned:
Recommendations:
Recreation:
Reduction:
Regard by Professional Bodies:
Registry:
Reinforce:
Relationships – lifelong:
Relevance – Relevant, In Touch, update:
Representation - Representative:
Reputation:
Requirements:
Responsive – Responsiveness, Respond, Responsibility:
Respect – Mutual:
Restructuring:
R & D – Blue Sky, cutting edge, intensive, Enquiry, Investigation, Fundamental, Applied, Practice-based, Researchers, Research-Active, New and Better Ways:
Revision:
Robust - Rigour:
Role – Central Role:
Sabbatical Leave:
Satisfaction:
Scheduling - Scheduled:
Scholars:
Scholarship:
Sectors – Emerging:
Selective - Selected:
Self-Governance:
Self-awareness:
Services:
Shared:
Significance – Academic:
Social Justice:
Stages – Phases:
Standard(s) – Highest, Criteria, Outstanding:
Standard – low-grade:
Stimulation – Stimulating:
Strength – Areas of, strengthen:
Student Charter:
Studies – Completion, Further, Overseas:
Subsidiarity:
Subvention:
Success – Future Success, Key Successes:
Suffered:
Suitable – Suitable Channels:
Supervision:
Support – Supported, Supportive:
Synergy:
Talent:
Teaching – Teachers, Educators, Pedagogic:
Theme(s):
Thinking – Conventional Thinking, Critical Thinking:
Timely – Timescales:
Track Record:
Traditional - Traditions:
Transcripts:
Transformational:
Transparency:
Unaffected:
Uncertainty:
Understanding:
Units:
Unsatisfactory:
Usage:
Variety - Variance:
Valuing People:
Virtual Circle:
Vision(s) - Expectations:
Well-Being – work-Life Balance:
### TABLE 1.3
THE 8 SURVEY-SELECTED TIME-ERA UK UNIVERSITIES RELATIVE TO THIS DISSERTATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ancient universities:</strong></td>
<td>The University of Oxford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The University of Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>19th Century Universities:</strong></td>
<td>Royal Holloway University of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cardiff University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Red-Brick Universities:</strong></td>
<td>University of Birmingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plate-Glass Universities:</strong></td>
<td>Lancaster University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distance-Learning Universities:</strong></td>
<td>Open University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post-Polytechnic Universities:</strong></td>
<td>University of Hertfordshire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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30. Ghauri et al. 1995. Supra, p.84.


34. Ghauri et al. 1995. Supra, p.84.


38. Comte. 1868. Supra.


47. en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Triangulation_(social_science). P.1


51. Audrey, E. 2013. (No additional reference information available)


54. www.okstate.edu/ag/agedcm4h/academic/aged5980a/5980/qualrsch/QUALRSCH/sld010.htm


APPENDIX 4 (CHAPTER 4)


As of 2002 there was no HFCE requirement that English universities generate a public Strategic Plan. Accordingly, only a couple had such! For the purposes of this thesis, their driving ‘managerial’ and ‘sociometric’ language framework was alternatively sought through their public statements as to their Vision, Mission, Values, Aims etc. Some such statements had become an emerging vogue by 2002, following worldwide general acceptance of ‘corporate culture’ concepts originating from seminal articles published in prestigious academic journals starting in earnest in the 1970s.

As far as is known, only Keele University and Leeds University had Strategic Plans in 2002.

The principal 2002 website-derived managerial and sociometric concepts of UK universities, as a whole, are listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>About us [Durham]</th>
<th>Academic Structure [Brunel]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aims [Aberdeen] [Bradford] [Coventry] [Exeter] [Leeds] [Manchester], (Academic Aims [Warwick] [Brunel] [King’s] [Oxford Brookes] [Queen Mary] [Royal Academy of Music] [Royal College of Music] [Royal Veterinary College] [Salford] [London – School of Pharmacy] [Teeside], Principal Aim [Bath], FundamentalAims [Glasgow]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspirations [West of England], (Aspirations – Strategic Aims [Coventry])</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics [Bristol]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct [John Moores]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinctive Strengths</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals [Aston] (Key Strategic Goals)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internationalism [North London], International Purpose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifelong Learning [Middlesex]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission [Wales - Medicine] [Aberdeen] [Anglia Polytechnic] [Aston] [Bath] [Bournemouth] [Bradford] [Brighton] [Cambridge] [City] [Derby] [Dundee] [East Anglia] [East London] [Essex] [St Gere’s] [Glamorgan] [Goldsmith’s] [Heriot-Watt] [Hertfordshire] [Huddersfield] [Hull] [Imperial College] [Institute of Education] [Keele] [King’s] [Liecester] [Leeds] [Leeds Metropolitan] [UMist] [North London] [John Moores] [Manchester Metropolitan] [Middlesex] [Newcastle] [Northumbria] [Nottingham] [Oxford Brookes] [Sheffield] [Staffordshire] [South Bank] [Stirling] [Strathclyde] [Sunderland] [Sussex] [Teeside] [Warwick] [University College] [West of England], (Mission Statement(s) [Brunel] [University College] [Central Lancashire] [Glasgow Caledonia] [Gloucestershire] [Keele] [Kent] [Kingston] [Lancaster] [Manchester] [Loughborough] [London – Hygiene &amp; Tropical Medicine] [Open] [Porthsmouth] [Queen Mary] [University College], University Mission Statement [Coventry], Clear Mission[Thames Valley], Distinctive Mission [Keele], Stated Mission [Leeds], Our Mission [Middlesex]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Oxford University and the London School of Economics were the lone exceptions at this time: they did not have any announced ‘managerial’ or ‘sociometric’ statements relative to Vision, Mission, Values, etc. on the internet. To-day, of course, not surprisingly, they have all of these, and, in the case of Oxford, along with a 34 page Strategic Plan! The Oxford Strategic Plan (2009-2013) is by far the longest and most comprehensive of all the universities included as investigative examples in this dissertation!
APPENDIX 5 (CHAPTER 5)

NONE
### APPENDIX 6 (Chapter 6)

#### Table 6.1

INTERNET SURVEY RESULTS

ANALYSIS OF THE STRATEGETRIC™ MANAGEMENT WORDING AND STRATEGETRIC™ SOCIOMETRIC WORDING UTILISED BY THE 8 TIME-ERA SELECTED UK UNIVERSITIES IN 2002

**Listed by Seniority**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Strategetic™ Management Wording</th>
<th>Strategetic™ Sociometric Wording</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ancient universities:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Oxford</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Cambridge</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>19th Century Universities:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Holloway</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of London</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiff University</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Red-Brick Universities:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Birmingham</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plate-Glass Universities:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster University</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distance-Learning Universities:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open University</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post-Polytechnic Universities:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Hertfordshire</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Listed in Order of Utilisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Strategetic™ Management Wording</th>
<th>Strategetic™ Sociometric Wording</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Distance-Learning Universities:</td>
<td>Open University</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 19th Century Universities:</td>
<td>Cardiff University</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ancient universities:</td>
<td>The University of Cambridge</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Plate-Glass Universities:</td>
<td>Lancaster University</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 19th Century Universities:</td>
<td>Royal Holloway University of London</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Post-Polytechnic Universities:</td>
<td>University of Hertfordshire</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Red-Brick Universities:</td>
<td>University of Birmingham</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Ancient universities:</td>
<td>The University of Oxford</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.2

INTERNET SURVEY RESULTS

ANALYSIS OF THE STRATEGETRIC™ MANAGEMENT WORDING AND STRATEGETRIC™ SOCIOMETRIC WORDING UTILISED BY THE 8 TIME-ERA SELECTED UK UNIVERSITIES IN 2012

Listed in Order of Seniority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strategetic™ Management Wording</th>
<th>Strategetic™ Sociometric Wording</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ancient universities:</td>
<td>The University of Oxford</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The University of Cambridge</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19th Century Universities:</td>
<td>Royal Holloway</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cardiff University</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red-Brick Universities:</td>
<td>University of Birmingham</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lancaster University</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Polytechnic Universities:</td>
<td>University of Hertfordshire</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance-Learning Universities:</td>
<td>Open University</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Listed in Order of Utilisation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Strategic™ Management Wording</th>
<th>Strategic™ Sociometric Wording</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>Ancient universities</strong>:</td>
<td>The University of Oxford</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>Post-Polytechnic Universities</strong>:</td>
<td>University of Hertfordshire</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <strong>Ancient universities</strong>:</td>
<td>The University of Cambridge</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <strong>19th Century Universities</strong>:</td>
<td>Royal Holloway University of London</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. <strong>Plate-Glass Universities</strong>:</td>
<td>Lancaster University</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. <strong>19th Century Universities</strong>:</td>
<td>Cardiff University</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. <strong>Red-Brick Universities</strong>:</td>
<td>University of Birmingham</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. <strong>Distance-Learning Universities</strong>:</td>
<td>Open University</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 6.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OXFORD UNIVERSITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2002)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STRATEGIC™ MANAGEMENT WORDING**

**NONE**
STRALETEGIC™ MANAGEMENT WORDING

Accounting – Accountable, Accountability:
Advertising:
Aid – Student Aid, Scholarships, Bursaries, Financial Support:
Allocation – Re-allocation, Apportion:
Appraisal:
Approved – Endorsed, Authorized:
Asset(s): 11
Audit:
Balance Sheet – Off Balance Sheet:
Brand – Well-Known, Trusted:
Beliefs:
Benchmarking – Key Performance Indicators, League-tables, Ratings: Builds - Building
Capacity, Capability:
Benefits of Scale:
Budgets – Adequate, Balanced:
Bureaucracy:
Business – Links, Private Sector, Enterprises, Companies, Potential, Business-facing: 1
Cash – Cash Flow:
Capitalising - Capital Expenditure:
Challenges - Fiscal:
Change(s), amendments, updates:
Chairman - Chair:
Compensation – Benefits, Pensions, Appraisals:
Competition – Competitive, Competitive Advantage/Disadvantage, Position of Strength:
Commercial:
Communication:
Computer Applications:
Consolidation:
Consultancy – to Business, to Government, With Employees:
Contracts – Standard Terms & Conditions:
Control:
Core Activities, Critical Mass:
Corporate (Corporation) – Relationships, Enterprise, Organisations, Institutional, SME’s:
Corporate Social Responsibility:
Costs – Costs Control, Cost Accounting, Cost Efficiency:
Credit – Credit Strength:
Critical Mass:
Culture – Cultural Change, cultural Assets, Cultural Understanding, Continuous improvement, Multi-Culturalism, Culture Climate: 11
Customers:
Discrimination:
Disinvest:

Decision - Decision-Making Structure:

Deficits:

Deliver – Delivering, Delivery: 1

Demand & Supply:

Dependency – Reduced Dependency:

Depreciation:

Distribution - Redistribution:

Diversification:

Divisions:

Dividends:

Economy – Economic, Impact, regional:

Economic Climate:

Economic Development:

Economic Recession:

Efficiency – Business-Like, Efficiency Gains, Effective:

Employees – Highly-Skilled:

Employers - Regard:

Employment – Careers, Accredited Student Placements: 1

Endowment(s):

Enterprise – Enterprising:

Entrepreneurship:

Equipment – Replacement, Safe, User-Friendly:

Equity:

Estate – Developments, Maintenance:

Excel:

Executive Team:

Expansion:

Expenses:

Facilities - Expansion, Repairs, Purpose –Built, Disposal:

Feedback:

Forecast:

Financial – Contribution, Fees, Finance, Financing, Funding, Performance, Strength, Sustainability:

Financial Assistance/Support – Scholarships, Funding:

Financial Barriers:

Fundraising – Philanthropy, Development Campaign:

Future – Equipping Students for the Future, direction:

Goals – Financial, Non-Financial:

Grants – Applications, Funding, Funding Capacity, Revenue Contracts:

Group: 1

Grow - Growth, Revenue, Fees, Turnover:

Harassment:
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Incentivise - Incentives:
Income – Discretionary Funds, Income Sources, Income Streams, Income Generation, Real Income:
Increase – Numbers:
Industry – Links:
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Innovate – Innovation: 11111
Intellectual Property:
Inventor:
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Investors, Financiers, Business Angels:
IT – Use Authorizations, Data Storage Centre:
Job Description:
Knowledge Transfer – Technology Transfer, Transmission: 1
Launch:
Legal – Ordinances:
Legislation:
Licences:
Lobby – Campaign:
Long-Term – Short-term Trends:
Loss – Shortfall:
Management – Executives, Managers:
Market – Marketing, Market Share, Marketplace, Market Needs, Marketing Differentiation, Market Focus, Market Tool, Offered:
Market Mix – Product Mix:
Maximise:
Mission: 11
Model - Modes:
Monitoring – Assessment, Accountability, Evaluation, Feedback, Measuring, Review, Statistics, scrutiny:
Motivated:
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Nominating Committee:
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Operations – Operating, Operating Statement:
Overhead Costs:
Ownership:
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Price – Pricing Strategies:
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Processes – efficient, procedures:
Productivity - Productivity Gains, Productive, Production:
Product(s):
Projects – Targeted Projects:
Professions – Professional Societies, Professional Bodies, Professional Services, Professional Development, Professionalism:
Profit – Surplus:
Public Sector – Government Links:
Public Funds:
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Purchase - Purchasing:
Ratios – Key Ratios:
Recruitment – Intake, Applications:
Reduce Government Funding Dependency:
Re-engineering:
Regulation – Government Regulation, Regulators:
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Reserves:
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Results – Action, Solutions, Solution-oriented, Outcomes, Problem-solving:
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Retention:
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Safe:
Sale:
Security:
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Skills – Development, Lifelong, Transferable, Useful:
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Specifications:
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Sponsors:
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Strategy – Strategic, Strategic Plan, Strategic Framework, Strategic Priorities:
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Surplus(es) – profitability:
Sustainable – Economic Impact, Sustainable Growth, Sustainable Development, Sustainability,
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Technology(ies) – Technological, Techniques:
Testing – Tested:
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Value – for Money, Value-Added:
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Welfare – Student Welfare:
Work – Conduct, World of Work, workforce, working conditions, Workload, Work Options, Workplace, Undertaken: Working Capital:
Working with Businesses:
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Audit:
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Beliefs:
Benchmarking – Key Performance Indicators, League-tables, Ratings: Builds - Building Capacity, Capability:
Benefits of Scale:
Budgets – Adequate, Balanced:
Bureaucracy:
Business – Links, Private Sector, Enterprises, Companies, Potential, Business-facing:
Cash – Cash Flow:
Capitalising - Capital Expenditure:
Challenges - Fiscal:
Change(s), amendments, updates:
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Compensation – Benefits, Pensions, Appraisals:
Competition – Competitive, Competitive Advantage/Disadvantage, Position of Strength:
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Deliver – Delivering, Delivery:
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Depreciation:
Distribution - Redistribution:
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Divisions:
Dividends:
Economy – Economic, Impact, regional:
Economic Climate:
Economic Development:
Economic Recession:
Efficiency – Business-Like, Efficiency Gains, Effective:
Employees – Highly-Skilled:
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Legal – Ordinances:
Legislation:
Licences:
Lobby – Campaign:
Long-Term – Short-term Trends:
Loss – Shortfall:
Management – Executives, Managers:
Market – Marketing, Market Share, Marketplace, Market Needs, Marketing Differentiation, Market Focus, Market Tool, Offered:
Market Mix – Product Mix:
Maximise:
Mission:
Model - Modes:
Monitoring – Assessment, Accountability, Evaluation, Feedback, Measuring, Review, Statistics, scrutiny:
Motivated:
Needs: 1111111111
Negotiations:
Nominating Committee:
Objectives - Targets:
Offer – Offered:
Operations – Operating, Operating Statement:
Overhead Costs:
Ownership:
Patents:
Partnerships – Alliances, Partners:
Pay-Roll Costs:
Performance:
Pipeline:
Plan – Planning, Planning Period:
Policies & Procedures:
Politics:
Price – Pricing Strategies:
Priorities – Business, National:
Processes – efficient, procedures:
Productivity - Productivity Gains, Productive, Production:
Product(s):
Projects – Targeted Projects:
Professions – Professional Societies, Professional Bodies, Professional Services, Professional Development, Professionalism:
Profit – Surplus:
Public Sector – Government Links:
Public Funds:
Public Interest:
Purchase - Purchasing:
Ratios – Key Ratios:
Recruitment – Intake, Applications:
Reduce Government Funding Dependency:
Re-engineering:
Regulation – Government Regulation, Regulators:
Reports – Internal, External, To Government:
Research Commercialisation:
Reserves:
Resources:
Responsibility/ies:
Results – Action, Solutions, Solution-oriented, Outcomes, Problem-solving:
ROI - Return on (Public) Investment:
Retention:
Revenue:
Rewards:
Risk(s):
Safe:
Sale:
Security:
Sickness Absence – Employees:
Skills – Development, Lifelong, Transferable, Useful:
Solutions:
Specifications:
Spin-offs:
Sponsors:
Stakeholders:
Start-ups:
Strategic Map:
Strategy – Strategic, Strategic Plan, Strategic Framework, Strategic Priorities:
Subsidiaries:
Surplus(es) – profitability:
Sustainable – Economic Impact, Sustainable Growth, Sustainable Development, Sustainability, Sustainable Relationships, Underpin:
Survey:
Systems:
Targets:
Tariff:
Teamwork - Teams:
Technology(ies) – Technological, Techniques:
Testing – Tested:
Training:
Trends:
Turnover – Reduction:
Values – Core:
Value – for Money, Value-Added:
Ventures – Joint Ventures:
Waste – Waste Management:
Wealth Creation:
Welfare – Student Welfare:
Work – Conduct, World of Work, workforce, working conditions, Workload, Work Options, Workplace, Undertaken: Working Capital:
Working with Businesses:
Table 6.4

OXFORD UNIVERSITY – 5 YEAR STRATEGIC PLAN
(2009 - 2013)

STRATEGETRIC™ MANAGEMENT WORDING

Accounting – Accountable, Accountability: 1111
Advertising:
Aid – Student Aid, Scholarships, Bursaries, Financial Support:
Allocation – Re-allocation, Apportion: 11111111
Appraisal: 1
Approved – Endorsed, Authorized: 111
Asset(s): 1111
Audit: 111
Balance Sheet – Off Balance Sheet: 1
Brand – Well-Known, Trusted:
Beliefs:
Benchmarking – Key Performance Indicators, League-tables, Ratings: Builds - Building
Capacity, Capability:
1111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111
Benefits of Scale: 11
Budgets – Adequate, Balanced: 1111111111
Bureaucracy: 1
Business – Links, Private Sector, Enterprises, Companies, Potential, Business-facing:
1111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111
Cash – Cash Flow: 111
Capitalising - Capital Expenditure: 1111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111
Challenges - Fiscal:
Change(s), amendments, updates: 1111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111
Chairman - Chair: 11
Compensation – Benefits, Pensions, Appraisals: 1111111
Competition – Competitive, Competitive Advantage/Disadvantage, Position of Strength:
1111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111
Commercial: 11
Communication: 1
Computer Applications: 1
Consolidation: 11
Consultancy – to Business, to Government, With Employees: 1111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111
Contracts – Standard Terms & Conditions: 1111111111
Control: 1111
Core Activities, Critical Mass: 111
Corporate (Corporation) – Relationships, Enterprise, Organisations, Institutional, SME’s:
1111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111
Corporate Social Responsibility:
Financial – Contribution, Fees, Finance, Financing, Funding, Performance, Strength, Sustainability: 111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111
Financial Assistance/Support – Scholarships, Funding:
111111
Financial Barriers: 111
Fundraising – Philanthropy, Development Campaign:
111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111
Future – Equipping Students for the Future, direction: 11111
Goals – Financial, Non-Financial: 11
Grants – Applications, Funding, Funding Capacity, Revenue Contracts:
111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111
Group: 111111111111111
Grow - Growth, Revenue, Fees, Turnover: 111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111
Harassment:
Human Resources: 1111
Implementation: 111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111
Incentivise - Incentives: 111
Income – Discretionary Funds, Income Sources, Income Streams, Income Generation, Real Income:
111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111
Increase – Numbers: 111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111
Industry – Links: 1111111
Inflation:
Innovate – Innovation: 111111111111111
Intellectual Property: 111
Inventor: 11
Investment – Sound, Capital Investment: 111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111
Investors, Financiers, Business Angels: 1
IT – Use Authorizations, Data Storage Centre:
111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111
Job Description: 111
Knowledge Transfer – Technology Transfer, Transmission: 111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111
Launch: 1
Legal – Ordinances: 1111
Legislation: 111111
Licences: 1
Lobby – Campaign: 11
Long-Term – Short-term Trends: 11111111
Loss – Shortfall: 11
Management – Executives, Managers: 111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111
Market – Marketing, Market Share, Marketplace, Market Needs, Marketing Differentiation, Market Focus, Market Tool, Offered: 11111111111
Market Mix – Product Mix:
Maximise: 11
Mission: 11111
Model - Modes: 1
Monitoring – Assessment, Accountability, Evaluation, Feedback, Measuring, Review, Statistics, scrutiny :

Motivated:
Needs: 1
Negotiations: 1
Nominating Committee: 1
Objectives - Targets: 1
Offer – Offered: 1
Operations – Operating, Operating Statement: 1
Overhead Costs:
Ownership:
Patents: 1
Partnerships – Alliances, Partners: 1
Pay-Roll Costs:
Performance:
Pipeline: 1
Plan – Planning, Planning Period:

Policies & Procedures: 1
Politics: 11
Price – Pricing Strategies: 1
Priorities – Business, National: 1
Processes – efficient, procedures: 1
Productivity- Productivity Gains, Productive, Production: 1
Product(s): 1
Projects – Targeted Projects: 1
Professions – Professional Societies, Professional Bodies, Professional Services, Professional Development, Professionalism: 1
Profit – Surplus: 11
Public Sector – Government Links: 1
Public Funds: 1
Public Interest: 1
Purchase - Purchasing: 11
Ratios – Key Ratios: 1
Recruitment – Intake, Applications:

Reduce Government Funding Dependency:
Re-engineering: 1
Regulation – Government Regulation, Regulators: 1
Reports – Internal, External, To Government: 1
Research Commercialisation:
Reserves: 1
Resources: 1
Responsibilit(y)(ies): 11
Results – Action, Solutions, Solution-oriented, Outcomes, Problem-solving: 1111111
ROI - Return on (Public) Investment: 11
Retention: 11
Revenue: 11
Rewards: 11111
Risk(s): 1111
Safe:
Sale: 1
Security: 11
Sickness Absence – Employees:
Skills – Development, Lifelong, Transferable, Useful: 111111111111
Solutions: 11
Specifications: 1
Spin-offs:
Sponsors: 11
Stakeholders: 1
Start-ups: 11
Strategic Map:
Strategy – Strategic, Strategic Plan, Strategic Framework, Strategic Priorities:
11111111111111111111
Subsidiaries:
Surplus(es) – profitability:
Sustainable – Economic Impact, Sustainable Growth, Sustainable Development,
Sustainability,
  Sustainable Relationships, Underpin: 111111111111111111111111111111111
Survey: 111111
Systems: 11111111111111111111
Targets: 1111111
Tariff:
Teamwork - Teams: 111
Technology(ies) – Technological, Techniques: 11111111
Testing – Tested:
Training: 11111111111111111111
Trends:
Turnover – Reduction: 1
Values – Core: 111111111111111111111111111111111
Value – for Money, Value-Added: 1111111
Ventures – Joint Ventures:
Waste – Waste Management: 1
Wealth Creation:
Welfare – Student Welfare:
Work – Conduct, World of Work, workforce, working conditions, Workload, Work Options, Workplace,
Undertaken:

Working Capital:
Working with Businesses:
ROYAL HOLLOWAY UNIVERSITY OF LONDON – 5 YEAR CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN (2009 - 2013)

STRATEGERIC™ MANAGEMENT WORDING

Accounting – Accountable, Accountability:
Advertising:
Aid – Student Aid, Scholarships, Bursaries, Financial Support:
Allocation – Re-allocation, Apportion:
Appraisal:
Approved – Endorsed, Authorized:
Asset(s): 11
Audit:
Balance Sheet – Off Balance Sheet:
Brand – Well-Known, Trusted: 1
Beliefs:
Benchmarking – Key Performance Indicators, League-tables, Ratings: Builds - Building Capacity, Capability: 11111111111111111111111
Benefits of Scale:
Budgets – Adequate, Balanced:
Bureaucracy:
Business – Links, Private Sector, Enterprises, Companies, Potential, Business-facing: 1
Cash – Cash Flow: 1
Capitalising - Capital Expenditure:
Challenges - Fiscal:
Change(s), amendments, updates: 11
Chairman - Chair:
Compensation – Benefits, Pensions, Appraisals: 111
Competition – Competitive, Competitive Advantage/Disadvantage, Position of Strength: 1
Commercial:
Communication:
Computer Applications:
Consolidation:
Consultancy – to Business, to Government, With Employees: 111
Contracts – Standard Terms & Conditions:
Control:
Core Activities, Critical Mass:
Corporate (Corporation) – Relationships, Enterprise, Organisations, Institutional, SME's: 11111111111111111111111
Corporate Social Responsibility:
Costs – Costs Control, Cost Accounting, Cost Efficiency: 1
Credit – Credit Strength:
Critical Mass:
Culture – Cultural Change, cultural Assets, Cultural Understanding, Continuous improvement, Multi-Culturalism, Culture Climate: 11111111
Customers:
Discrimination:
Disinvest:
Decision - Decision-Making Structure: 11
Deficits:
Deliver – Delivering, Delivery:
Demand & Supply: 1
Dependency – Reduced Dependency:
Depreciation:
Distribution - Redistribution:
Diversification: 11
Divisions:
Dividends:
Economy – Economic, Impact, regional: 111
Economic Climate:
Economic Development:
Economic Recession:
Efficiency – Business-Like, Efficiency Gains, Effective: 1111111111111111
Employees – Highly-Skilled: 11111
Employers - Regard: 11111
Employment – Careers, Accredited Student Placements: 111111111
Endowment(s):
Enterprise – Enterprising: 1
Entrepreneurship: 1
Equipment – Replacement, Safe, User-Friendly: 1111111111111111
Equity:
Estate – Developments, Maintenance:
Excel:
Executive Team:
Expansion:
Expenses:
Facilities - Expansion, Repairs, Purpose –Built, Disposal:
Feedback:
Forecast:
Financial – Contribution, Fees, Finance, Financing, Funding, Performance, Strength, Sustainability: 1
Financial Assistance/Support – Scholarships, Funding: 1111
Financial Barriers:
Fundraising – Philanthropy, Development Campaign: 11111
Future – Equipping Students for the Future, direction:
Goals – Financial, Non-Financial: 1
Grants – Applications, Funding, Funding Capacity, Revenue Contracts: 1111
Group:
Grow - Growth, Revenue, Fees, Turnover: 111
Harassment:
Human Resources:
Implementation:
Incentivise - Incentives: 11
Income – Discretionary Funds, Income Sources, Income Streams, Income Generation, Real
Income:

Increase – Numbers:
Industry – Links:
Inflation:
Innovate – Innovation: 1
Intellectual Property: 11
Inventor:
Investment – Sound, Capital Investment: 11111
Investors, Financiers, Business Angels:
IT – Use Authorizations, Data Storage Centre: 11111
Job Description:
Knowledge Transfer – Technology Transfer, Transmission:
Launch:
Legal – Ordinances: 1
Legislation:
Licences:
Lobby – Campaign:
Long-Term – Short-term Trends: 1
Loss – Shortfall:
Management – Executives, Managers: 111
Market – Marketing, Market Share, Marketplace, Market Needs, Marketing Differentiation, Market Focus, Market Tool, Offered: 1111
Market Mix – Product Mix: 1111
Maximise:
Mission: 11
Model - Modes:
Motivated:
Needs: 11111
Negotiations:
Nominating Committee:
Objectives - Targets: 11111111
Offer – Offered:
Operations – Operating, Operating Statement:
Overhead Costs: 1
Ownership:
Patents:
Partnerships – Alliances, Partners: 11
Pay-Roll Costs:
Performance: 1111111111
Pipeline:
Plan – Planning, Planning Period: 1111111111
Policies & Procedures: 1
Politics:
Price – Pricing Strategies: 1
Priorities – Business, National: 111
Processes – efficient, procedures: 11
Productivity - Productivity Gains, Productive, Production:
Product(s): 1
Projects – Targeted Projects:
Professions – Professional Societies, Professional Bodies, Professional Services, Professional Development, Professionalism: 1
Profit – Surplus:
Public Sector – Government Links: 111
Public Funds:
Public Interest:
Purchase - Purchasing:
Ratios – Key Ratios:
Recruitment – Intake, Applications: 111
Reduce Government Funding Dependency:
Re-engineering:
Regulation – Government Regulation, Regulators:
Reports – Internal, External, To Government: 1
Research Commercialisation:
Reserves:
Resources: 1
Responsibility(ies):
Results – Action, Solutions, Solution-oriented, Outcomes, Problem-solving: 111
ROI - Return on (Public) Investment:
Retention: 11
Revenue:
Rewards: 111
Risk(s): 111
Safe:
Sale:
Security:
Sickness Absence – Employees: 11
Skills – Development, Lifelong, Transferable, Useful: 11111111
Solutions:
Specifications:
Spin-offs:
Sponsors:
Stakeholders: 1111111
Start-ups:
Strategic Map:
Strategy – Strategic, Strategic Plan, Strategic Framework, Strategic Priorities: 11
Subsidiaries:
Surplus(es) – profitability: 11
Sustainable – Economic Impact, Sustainable Growth, Sustainable Development, Sustainability,
Sustainable Relationships, Underpin: 1
Survey:
Systems:
Targets: 1
Tariff:
Teamwork - Teams: 1
Technology(ies) – Technological, Techniques: 1
Testing – Tested:
Training:
Trends:
Turnover – Reduction: 1
Values – Core: 11
Value – for Money, Value-Added: 111
Ventures – Joint Ventures:
Waste – Waste Management:
Wealth Creation: 1
Welfare – Student Welfare:
Work – Conduct, World of Work, workforce, working conditions, Workload, Work Options, Workplace, Undertaken: 11111
Working Capital: 1
Working with Businesses:
STRATEGTRIC™ MANAGEMENT WORDING

Accounting – Accountable, Accountability:
Advertising:
Aid – Student Aid, Scholarships, Bursaries, Financial Support: 111
Allocation – Re-allocation, Apportion:
Appraisal:
Approved – Endorsed, Authorized:
Asset(s):
Audit:
Balance Sheet – Off Balance Sheet:
Brand – Well-Known, Trusted:
Beliefs:
Benchmarking – Key Performance Indicators, League-tables, Ratings: Builds - Building Capacity, Capability:
Benefits of Scale:
Budgets – Adequate, Balanced: 1
Bureaucracy:
Business – Links, Private Sector, Enterprises, Companies, Potential, Business-facing: 1
Cash – Cash Flow:
Capitalising - Capital Expenditure:
Challenges - Fiscal:
Change(s), amendments, updates:
Chairman - Chair:
Compensation – Benefits, Pensions, Appraisals:
Competition – Competitive, Competitive Advantage/Disadvantage, Position of Strength: 1111
Commercial:
Communication:
Computer Applications:
Consolidation:
Consultancy – to Business, to Government, With Employees:
Contracts – Standard Terms & Conditions: 1
Control: 1
Core Activities, Critical Mass:
Corporate (Corporation) – Relationships, Enterprise, Organisations, Institutional, SME’s: 1
Corporate Social Responsibility: 11
Costs – Costs Control, Cost Accounting, Cost Efficiency: 11
Credit – Credit Strength:
Critical Mass:
Culture – Cultural Change, cultural Assets, Cultural Understanding, Continuous improvement, Multi-Culturalism, Culture Climate: 11111
Customers:
Discrimination:
Disinvest:
Decision - Decision-Making Structure: 1
Deficits:
Deliver – Delivering, Delivery:
Demand & Supply:
Dependency – Reduced Dependency:
Depreciation:
Distribution - Redistribution:
Diversification:
Divisions:
Dividends:
Economy – Economic, Impact, regional:
Economic Climate: 1
Economic Development: 1111
Economic Recession: 1
Efficiency – Business-Like, Efficiency Gains, Effective: 11
Employees – Highly-Skilled: 1
Employers - Regard: 1111
Employment – Careers, Accredited Student Placements: 1
Endowment(s):
Enterprise – Enterprising:
Entrepreneurship:
Equipment –Replacement, Safe, User-Friendly:
Equity:
Estate – Developments, Maintenance: 1
Excel:
Executive Team:
Expansion:
Expenses:
Facilities - Expansion, Repairs, Purpose –Built, Disposal: 1
Feedback:
Forecast:
Financial – Contribution, Fees, Finance, Financing, Funding, Performance, Strength, Sustainability: 1
Financial Assistance/Support – Scholarships, Funding:
Financial Barriers:
Fundraising – Philanthropy, Development Campaign: 11
Future – Equipping Students for the Future, direction: 1
Goals – Financial, Non-Financial:
Grants – Applications, Funding, Funding Capacity, Revenue Contracts: 1
Group:
Grow - Growth, Revenue, Fees, Turnover:
Harassment:
Human Resources:
Implementation:
Incentivise - Incentives:
Income - Discretionary Funds, Income Sources, Income Streams, Income Generation, Real Income: 1111
Increase - Numbers:
Industry - Links: 1
Inflation:
Innovate - Innovation: 111
Intellectual Property: 1
Inventor:
Investment - Sound, Capital Investment: 11111111
Investors, Financiers, Business Angels:
IT - Use Authorizations, Data Storage Centre: 11
Job Description:
Knowledge Transfer - Technology Transfer, Transmission: 11111
Launch:
Legal - Ordinances:
Legislation:
Licences:
Lobby - Campaign:
Long-Term - Short-term Trends:
Loss - Shortfall:
Management - Executives, Managers: 11
Market - Marketing, Market Share, Marketplace, Market Needs, Marketing Differentiation, Market Focus, Market Tool, Offered: 1
Market Mix - Product Mix:
Maximise:
Mission:
Model - Modes:
Motivated: 1
Needs:
Negotiations:
Nominating Committee:
Objectives - Targets: 1111111
Offer - Offered:
Operations - Operating, Operating Statement:
Overhead Costs:
Ownership:
Patents:
Partnerships - Alliances, Partners: 11111111111
Pay-Roll Costs:
Performance: 1
Pipeline:
Plan - Planning, Planning Period: 11111
Policies & Procedures:
Politics:
Price – Pricing Strategies:
Priorities – Business, National: 111
Processes – efficient, procedures: 11
Productivity - Productivity Gains, Productive, Production:
Product(s):
Projects – Targeted Projects:
Professions – Professional Societies, Professional Bodies, Professional Services, Professional Development, Professionalism: 11111111
Profit – Surplus:
Public Sector – Government Links:
Public Funds: 1
Public Interest:
Purchase - Purchasing:
Ratios – Key Ratios:
Recruitment – Intake, Applications: 111
Reduce Government Funding Dependency: 1
Re-engineering:
Regulation – Government Regulation, Regulators:
Reports – Internal, External, To Government:
Research Commercialisation: 1
Reserves:
Resources: 11111
Responsibility(ies):
Results – Action, Solutions, Solution-oriented, Outcomes, Problem-solving:
ROI - Return on (Public) Investment:
Retention: 1
Revenue:
Rewards:
Risk(s):
Safe:
Sale:
Security:
Sickness Absence – Employees:
Skills – Development, Lifelong, Transferable, Useful: 1
Solutions:
Specifications:
Spin-offs:
Sponsors:
Stakeholders: 1
Start-ups:
Strategic Map: 1
Strategy – Strategic, Strategic Plan, Strategic Framework, Strategic Priorities: 11111111
Subsidiaries:
Surplus(es) – profitability:
Sustainable – Economic Impact, Sustainable Growth, Sustainable Development, Sustainability, Sustainable Relationships, Underpin: 1111111111111

Survey:
Systems:
Targets:
Tariff:
Teamwork - Teams:
Technology(ies) – Technological, Techniques: 1
Testing – Tested:
Training:
Trends:
Turnover – Reduction:
Values – Core:
Value – for Money, Value-Added: 1
Ventures – Joint Ventures:
Waste – Waste Management: 1
Wealth Creation:
Welfare – Student Welfare:
Work – Conduct, World of Work, workforce, working conditions, Workload, Work Options, Workplace, Undertaken:
Working Capital:
Working with Businesses: 1
STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT WORDING

Accounting – Accountable, Accountability:
Advertising:
Aid – Student Aid, Scholarships, Bursaries, Financial Support:
Allocation – Re-allocation, Apportion:
Appraisal:
Approved – Endorsed, Authorized:
Asset(s):
Audit:
Balance Sheet – Off Balance Sheet: 1
Brand – Well-Known, Trusted:
Beliefs:
Benchmarking – Key Performance Indicators, League-tables, Ratings: Builds - Building Capacity, Capability: 1
Benefits of Scale:
Budgets – Adequate, Balanced:
Bureaucracy:
Business – Links, Private Sector, Enterprises, Companies, Potential, Business-facing:
111111
Cash – Cash Flow:
Capitalising - Capital Expenditure:
Challenges - Fiscal: 11
Change(s), amendments, updates: 11111
Chairman - Chair:
Compensation – Benefits, Pensions, Appraisals:
Competition – Competitive, Competitive Advantage/Disadvantage, Position of Strength: 1111
Commercial: 1
Communication:
Computer Applications:
Consolidation:
Consultancy – to Business, to Government, With Employees:
Contracts – Standard Terms & Conditions:
Control:
Core Activities, Critical Mass:
Corporate (Corporation) – Relationships, Enterprise, Organisations, Institutional, SME’s:
Corporate Social Responsibility:
Costs – Costs Control, Cost Accounting, Cost Efficiency: 1
Credit – Credit Strength:
Critical Mass:
Culture – Cultural Change, cultural Assets, Cultural Understanding, Continuous improvement, Multi-Culturalism, Culture Climate: 1111111111111
Customers:
Discrimination:
Disinvest: 11
Decision - Decision-Making Structure:
Deficits:
Deliver – Delivering, Delivery:
Demand & Supply:
Dependency – Reduced Dependency:
Depreciation:
Distribution - Redistribution:
Diversification:
Divisions:
Dividends:
Economy – Economic, Impact, regional: 111
Economic Climate:
Economic Development:
Economic Recession:
Efficiency – Business-Like, Efficiency Gains, Effective: 111
Employees – Highly-Skilled:
Employers - Regard: 11
Employment – Careers, Accredited Student Placements: 11111111111
Endowment(s):
Enterprise – Enterprising:
Entrepreneurship:
Equipment –Replacement, Safe, User-Friendly: 1
Equity:
Estate – Developments, Maintenance: 11
Excel:
Executive Team: 1
Expansion:
Expenses:
Facilities - Expansion, Repairs, Purpose –Built, Disposal:
Feedback:
Forecast:
Financial – Contribution, Fees, Finance, Financing, Funding, Performance, Strength,
Sustainability: 111

Financial Assistance/Support – Scholarships, Funding:
Financial Barriers:
Fundraising – Philanthropy, Development Campaign: 1
Future – Equipping Students for the Future, direction: 1
Goals – Financial, Non-Financial: 11111111
Grants – Applications, Funding, Funding Capacity, Revenue Contracts: 11111111
Group:
Grow - Growth, Revenue, Fees, Turnover: 1
Harassment:
Human Resources:
Implementation:
Incentivise - Incentives:
Income – Discretionary Funds, Income Sources, Income Streams, Income Generation, Real Income: 111111
Increase – Numbers: 1
Industry – Links: 11111
Inflation:
Innovate – Innovation:
Intellectual Property: 11
Inventor:
Investment – Sound, Capital Investment: 1111111111
Investors, Financiers, Business Angels:
IT – Use Authorizations, Data Storage Centre:
Job Description:
Knowledge Transfer – Technology Transfer, Transmission: 111
Launch:
Legal – Ordinances:
Legislation:
Licences:
Lobby – Campaign:
Long-Term – Short-term Trends:
Loss – Shortfall:
Management – Executives, Managers: 11
Market – Marketing, Market Share, Marketplace, Market Needs, Marketing Differentiation, Market Focus, Market Tool, Offered: 11111
Market Mix – Product Mix:
Maximise:
Mission: 111
Model - Modes:
Motivated: 1
Needs:
Negotiations:
Nominating Committee:
Objectives - Targets:
Offer – Offered:
Operations – Operating, Operating Statement:
Overhead Costs:
Ownership:
Patents:
Partnerships – Alliances, Partners: 111111111111111111
Pay-Roll Costs:
Performance: 11111111111111111
Pipeline:
Plan – Planning, Planning Period: 1
Policies & Procedures:
Politics:
Price – Pricing Strategies:
Priorities – Business, National:
Processes – efficient, procedures:
Productivity - Productivity Gains, Productive, Production:
Product(s):
Projects – Targeted Projects: 1111111111111
Professions – Professional Societies, Professional Bodies, Professional Services, Professional Development, Professionalism: 1111
Profit – Surplus:
Public Sector – Government Links:
Public Funds: 1111
Public Interest:
Purchasing:
Ratios – Key Ratios:
Recruitment – Intake, Applications: 111
Reduce Government Funding Dependency:
Re-engineering:
Regulation – Government Regulation, Regulators:
Reports – Internal, External, To Government:
Research Commercialisation:
Reserves:
Resources: 11
Responsibility(ies):
Results – Action, Solutions, Solution-oriented, Outcomes, Problem-solving: 1
ROI - Return on (Public) Investment:
Retention: 1
Revenue:
Rewards: 11
Risk(s):
Safe:
Sale:
Security:
Sickness Absence – Employees:
Skills – Development, Lifelong, Transferable, Useful: 111
Solutions:
Specifications:
Spin-offs:
Sponsors:
Stakeholders: 11
Start-ups:
Strategic Map:
Strategy – Strategic, Strategic Plan, Strategic Framework, Strategic Priorities: 11111111111111111111111111111111
Subsidiaries:
Surplus(es) – profitability: 1
Sustainable – Economic Impact, Sustainable Growth, Sustainable Development,
Sustainability,
  Sustainable Relationships, Underpin: 1111111111
Survey:
Systems:
Targets:
Tariff:
Teamwork - Teams: 1
Technology(ies) – Technological, Techniques: 11
Testing – Tested:
Training:
Trends:
Turnover – Reduction:
Values – Core: 1
Value – for Money, Value-Added: 111
Ventures – Joint Ventures:
Waste – Waste Management:
Wealth Creation:
Welfare – Student Welfare: 11
Work – Conduct, World of Work, workforce, working conditions, Workload, Work
Options, Workplace, Undertaken: 11
Working Capital:
Working with Businesses:
STRATEGICTM MANAGEMENT WORDING

Accounting – Accountable, Accountability:
Advertising:
Aid – Student Aid, Scholarships, Bursaries, Financial Support:
Allocation – Re-allocation, Apportion:
Appraisal:
Approved – Endorsed, Authorized:
Asset(s): 111111
Audit:
Balance Sheet – Off Balance Sheet: 1
Brand – Well-Known, Trusted:
Beliefs: 111
Benchmarking – Key Performance Indicators, League-tables, Ratings: Builds - Building Capacity, Capability: 11111111111111111
Benefits of Scale:
Budgets – Adequate, Balanced:
Bureaucracy:
Business – Links, Private Sector, Enterprises, Companies, Potential, Business-facing: 11111111111111111111
Cash – Cash Flow: 1
Capitalising – Capital Expenditure: 1111
Challenges - Fiscal: 11
Change(s), amendments, updates: 1111111111
Chairman - Chair:
Compensation – Benefits, Pensions, Appraisals: 1111
Competition – Competitive, Competitive Advantage/Disadvantage, Position of Strength: 11111111
Commercial: 1
Communication: 1
Computer Applications:
Consolidation:
Consultancy – to Business, to Government, With Employees: 1111
Contracts – Standard Terms & Conditions:
Control:
Core Activities, Critical Mass: 1
Corporate (Corporation) – Relationships, Enterprise, Organisations, Institutional, SME’s:
Corporate Social Responsibility:
Costs – Costs Control, Cost Accounting, Cost Efficiency: 1111
Credit – Credit Strength: 1
Critical Mass:
Culture – Cultural Change, cultural Assets, Cultural Understanding, Continuous improvement, Multi-Culturalism, Culture Climate: 11111111
Customers:
Discrimination: 1
Disinvest:
Decision - Decision-Making Structure:
Deficits:
Deliver – Delivering, Delivery:
Demand & Supply: 1
Dependency – Reduced Dependency:
Depreciation:
Distribution - Redistribution:
Diversification: 1
Divisions:
Dividends: 1
Economy – Economic, Impact, regional: 111
Economic Climate: 111
Economic Development: 111
Economic Recession:
Efficiency – Business-Like, Efficiency Gains, Effective: 11111111111
Employees – Highly-Skilled: 1
Employers - Regard: 11
Employment – Careers, Accredited Student Placements: 1111111111111
Endowment(s):
Enterprise – Enterprising:
Entrepreneurship:
Equipment – Replacement, Safe, User-Friendly: 11111111111
Equity:
Estate – Developments, Maintenance:
Excel:
Executive Team:
Expansion: 1
Expenses:
Facilities - Expansion, Repairs, Purpose –Built, Disposal:
Feedback:
Forecast:
Financial – Contribution, Fees, Finance, Financing, Funding, Performance, Strength, Sustainability: 11111111111
Financial Assistance/Support – Scholarships, Funding:
Financial Barriers:
Fundraising – Philanthropy, Development Campaign: 1
Future – Equipping Students for the Future, direction:
Goals – Financial, Non-Financial: 111
Grants – Applications, Funding, Funding Capacity, Revenue Contracts: 111
Group:
Grow - Growth, Revenue, Fees, Turnover: 111111111
Harassment: 1
Human Resources:
Implementation:
Incentivise - Incentives:
Income – Discretionary Funds, Income Sources, Income Streams, Income Generation, Real Income:

Increase – Numbers:
Industry – Links: 1
Inflation: 1
Innovate – Innovation: 1111111
Intellectual Property: 11
Inventor:
Investment – Sound, Capital Investment: 111111
Investors, Financiers, Business Angels:
IT – Use Authorizations, Data Storage Centre: 11
Job Description:
Knowledge Transfer – Technology Transfer, Transmission: 1111
Launch:
Legal – Ordinances:
Legislation:
Licences: 1
Lobby – Campaign:
Long-Term – Short-term Trends: 1111
Loss – Shortfall:
Management – Executives, Managers: 1111
Market – Marketing, Market Share, Marketplace, Market Needs, Marketing Differentiation, Market Focus, Market Tool, Offered: 1111
Market Mix – Product Mix:
Maximise:
Mission: 1111
Model - Modes:
Motivated: 1
Needs:
Negotiations:
Nominating Committee:
Objectives - Targets: 111
Offer – Offered:
Operations – Operating, Operating Statement:
Overhead Costs: 1
Ownership:
Patents: 1
Partnerships – Alliances, Partners: 11111111111
Pay-Roll Costs: 1
Performance: 1111
Pipeline:
Plan – Planning, Planning Period: 111111
Policies & Procedures: 1
Politics:
Price – Pricing Strategies:
Priorities – Business, National: 1111111111
Processes – efficient, procedures: 111
Productivity- Productivity Gains, Productive, Production: 1111
Product(s): 1111
Projects – Targeted Projects: 11111
Professions – Professional Societies, Professional Bodies, Professional Services, Professional Development, Professionalism: 111
Profit – Surplus:
Public Sector – Government Links: 1111111
Public Funds:
Public Interest:
Purchase - Purchasing:
Ratios – Key Ratios: 1
Recruitment – Intake, Applications: 11111
Reduce Government Funding Dependency:
Re-engineering:
Regulation – Government Regulation, Regulators:
Reports – Internal, External, To Government:
Research Commercialisation: 1
Reserves:
Resources: 11111111
Responsibility(ies):
Results – Action, Solutions, Solution-oriented, Outcomes, Problem-solving: 111111
ROI - Return on (Public) Investment:
Retention: 1
Revenue:
Rewards: 11
Risk(s):
Safe:
Sale:
Security:
Sickness Absence – Employees:
Skills – Development, Lifelong, Transferable, Useful: 1111111111
Solutions:
Specifications:
Spin-offs: 1
Sponsors:
Stakeholders:
Start-ups:
Strategic Map:
Strategy – Strategic, Strategic Plan, Strategic Framework, Strategic Priorities: 111111111111111111111111
Subsidiaries:
Surplus(es) – profitability: 111
Sustainable – Economic Impact, Sustainable Growth, Sustainable Development,
Sustainability,
  Sustainable Relationships, Underpin: 111111111
Survey:
Systems: 1111
Targets: 1
Tariff:
Teamwork - Teams:
Technology(ies) – Technological, Techniques: 11111111
Testing – Tested:
Training: 11
Trends:
Turnover – Reduction:
Values – Core: 111
Value – for Money, Value-Added:
Ventures – Joint Ventures:
Waste – Waste Management:
Wealth Creation:
Welfare – Student Welfare:
Work – Conduct, World of Work, workforce, working conditions, Workload, Work
Options, Workplace, Undertaken: 1
Working Capital:
Working with Businesses: 11
Accounting – Accountable, Accountability:
Advertising: 1
Aid – Student Aid, Scholarships, Bursaries, Financial Support:
Allocation – Re-allocation, Apportion:
Appraisal:
Approved – Endorsed, Authorized:
Asset(s):
Audit:
Balance Sheet – Off Balance Sheet:
Brand – Well-Known, Trusted: 1
Beliefs:
Benchmarking – Key Performance Indicators, League-tables, Ratings: Builds - Building Capacity, Capability: 1111
Benefits of Scale:
Budgets – Adequate, Balanced:
Bureaucracy:
Business – Links, Private Sector, Enterprises, Companies, Potential, Business-facing:
Cash – Cash Flow:
Capitalising - Capital Expenditure:
Challenges - Fiscal:
Change(s), amendments, updates: 111111111
Chairman - Chair:
Compensation – Benefits, Pensions, Appraisals:
Competition – Competitive, Competitive Advantage/Disadvantage, Position of Strength: 11111
Commercial: 1
Communication:
Computer Applications:
Consolidation:
Consultancy – to Business, to Government, With Employees:
Contracts – Standard Terms & Conditions:
Control:
Core Activities, Critical Mass:
Corporate (Corporation) – Relationships, Enterprise, Organisations, Institutional, SME’s:
Corporate Social Responsibility:
Costs – Costs Control, Cost Accounting, Cost Efficiency:
Credit – Credit Strength:
Critical Mass:
Culture – Cultural Change, cultural Assets, Cultural Understanding, Continuous improvement, Multi-Culturalism, Culture Climate: 1
Customers:
Discrimination:
Disinvest:
Decision - Decision-Making Structure:
Deficits:
Deliver – Delivering, Delivery:
Demand & Supply:
Dependency – Reduced Dependency:
Depreciation:
Distribution - Redistribution:
Diversification:
Divisions:
Dividends:
Economy – Economic, Impact, regional:
Economic Climate:
Economic Development:
Economic Recession:
Efficiency – Business-Like, Efficiency Gains, Effective: 111
Employees – Highly-Skilled:
Employers - Regard: 1
Employment – Careers, Accredited Student Placements: 11111111
Endowment(s):
Enterprise – Enterprising:
Entrepreneurship:
Equipment – Replacement, Safe, User-Friendly:
Equity:
Estate – Developments, Maintenance:
Excel:
Executive Team:
Expansion:
Expenses:
Facilities - Expansion, Repairs, Purpose –Built, Disposal:
Feedback:
Forecast:
Financial – Contribution, Fees, Finance, Financing, Funding, Performance, Strength, Sustainability: 111
Financial Assistance/Support – Scholarships, Funding:
Financial Barriers:
Fundraising – Philanthropy, Development Campaign:
Future – Equipping Students for the Future, direction:
Goals – Financial, Non-Financial: 111111
Grants – Applications, Funding, Funding Capacity, Revenue Contracts: 111111111111
Group:
Grow - Growth, Revenue, Fees, Turnover:
Harassment:
Human Resources:
Implementation:
Incentivise - Incentives:
Income – Discretionary Funds, Income Sources, Income Streams, Income Generation, Real Income:
Increase – Numbers:
Industry – Links:
Inflation:
Innovate – Innovation: 111
Intellectual Property:
Inventor:
Investment – Sound, Capital Investment:
Investors, Financiers, Business Angels:
IT – Use Authorizations, Data Storage Centre:
Job Description:
Knowledge Transfer – Technology Transfer, Transmission:
Launch:
Legal – Ordinances:
Legislation:
Licences:
Lobby – Campaign:
Long-Term – Short-term Trends:
Loss – Shortfall:
Management – Executives, Managers: 11
Market – Marketing, Market Share, Marketplace, Market Needs, Marketing Differentiation, Market Focus, Market Tool, Offered: 1111111
Market Mix – Product Mix:
Maximise:
Mission: 11111111111111111
Model - Modes:
Motivated:
Needs:
Negotiations:
Nominating Committee:
Objectives - Targets: 111
Offer – Offered:
Operations – Operating, Operating Statement:
Overhead Costs:
Ownership:
Patents:
Partnerships – Alliances, Partners: 11
Pay-Roll Costs:
Performance: 11
Pipeline:
Plan – Planning, Planning Period: 111
Policies & Procedures:
Politics:
Price – Pricing Strategies:
Priorities – Business, National: 1111
Processes – efficient, procedures:
Productivity- Productivity Gains, Productive, Production:
Product(s):
Projects – Targeted Projects:

Professions – Professional Societies, Professional Bodies, Professional Services, Professional Development, Professionalism:
Profit – Surplus:
Public Sector – Government Links:
Public Funds:
Public Interest:
Purchasing:
Ratios – Key Ratios:
Recruitment – Intake, Applications:
Reduce Government Funding Dependency:
Re-engineering:
Regulation – Government Regulation, Regulators:
Reports – Internal, External, To Government:
Research Commercialisation:
Reserves:
Resources:
Responsibilities: 1
Results – Action, Solutions, Solution-oriented, Outcomes, Problem-solving:
ROI - Return on (Public) Investment: 1
Retention:
Revenue:
Rewards:
Risk(s): 1
Safe:
Sale:
Security:
Sickness Absence – Employees:
Skills – Development, Lifelong, Transferable, Useful: 11
Solutions:
Specifications:
Spin-offs:
Sponsors:
Stakeholders:
Start-ups:
Strategic Map:
Strategy – Strategic, Strategic Plan, Strategic Framework, Strategic Priorities:
1111111111111111
Subsidiaries:
Surplus(es) – profitability: 1
Sustainable – Economic Impact, Sustainable Growth, Sustainable Development,
Sustainability,
  Sustainable Relationships, Underpin:
Survey:
Systems:
Targets:
Tariff:
Teamwork - Teams:
Technology(ies) – Technological, Techniques:
Testing – Tested:
Training:
Trends:
Turnover – Reduction:
Values – Core: 1
Value – for Money, Value-Added: 11
Ventures – Joint Ventures:
Waste – Waste Management:
Wealth Creation:
Welfare – Student Welfare:
Work – Conduct, World of Work, workforce, working conditions, Workload, Work
Options, Workplace, Undertaken:
Working Capital:
Working with Businesses:
ACCOUNTING – Accountable, Accountability: 1
Advertising:
Aid – Student Aid, Scholarships, Bursaries, Financial Support:
Allocation – Re-allocation, Apportion:
Appraisal:
Approved – Endorsed, Authorized:
Asset(s):
Audit:
Balance Sheet – Off Balance Sheet:
Brand – Well-Known, Trusted: 11
Beliefs:
Benchmarking – Key Performance Indicators, League-tables, Ratings: Builds - Building Capacity, Capability: 11111111111111111111111111111111
Benefits of Scale:
Budgets – Adequate, Balanced:
Bureaucracy:
Business – Links, Private Sector, Enterprises, Companies, Potential, Business-facing:
1111111111
11111111111111111111111111111111
Cash – Cash Flow:
Capitalising - Capital Expenditure: 1
Challenges - Fiscal:
Change(s), amendments, updates: 111
Chairman - Chair:
Compensation – Benefits, Pensions, Appraisals:
Competition – Competitive, Competitive Advantage/Disadvantage, Position of Strength: 11
Commercial: 111
Communication:
Computer Applications:
Consolidation:
Consultancy – to Business, to Government, With Employees: 11111
Contracts – Standard Terms & Conditions:
Control:
Core Activities, Critical Mass: 1
Corporate (Corporation) – Relationships, Enterprise, Organisations, Institutional, SME’s:
111111111111
1111
Corporate Social Responsibility:
Costs – Costs Control, Cost Accounting, Cost Efficiency:
Credit – Credit Strength:
Critical Mass:
Culture – Cultural Change, cultural Assets, Cultural Understanding, Continuous improvement, Multi-Culturalism, Culture Climate: 1111111111111111111
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 Disinvest:

 Decision - Decision-Making Structure:
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 Deliver – Delivering, Delivery: 11111

 Demand & Supply:

 Dependency – Reduced Dependency: 1

 Depreciation:

 Distribution - Redistribution:

 Diversification:

 Divisions:

 Dividends:

 Economy – Economic, Impact, regional: 111111111
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 Economic Recession:

 Efficiency – Business-Like, Efficiency Gains, Effective: 1111111111111111111

 Employees – Highly-Skilled: 11

 Employers - Regard: 11111

 Employment – Careers, Accredited Student Placements: 1111111111111111

 Endowment(s):

 Enterprise – Enterprising: 1111111111111111111

 Entrepreneurship: 111111

 Equipment –Replacement, Safe, User-Friendly: 11111111

 Equity:

 Estate – Developments, Maintenance: 1

 Excel: 111

 Executive Team:

 Expansion: 1

 Expenses: 1

 Facilities - Expansion, Repairs, Purpose –Built, Disposal:

 Feedback: 11111

 Forecast: 1

 Financial – Contribution, Fees, Finance, Financing, Funding, Performance, Strength, Sustainability: 111

 11111

 Financial Assistance/Support – Scholarships, Funding:

 Financial Barriers:

 Fundraising – Philanthropy, Development Campaign: 11

 Future – Equipping Students for the Future, direction:

 Goals – Financial, Non-Financial:

 Grants – Applications, Funding, Funding Capacity, Revenue Contracts: 1

 Group: 1111
Grow - Growth, Revenue, Fees, Turnover: 11111
Harassment:
Human Resources:
Implementation:
Incentivise - Incentives:
Income – Discretionary Funds, Income Sources, Income Streams, Income Generation, Real Income: 11
Increase – Numbers: 1
Industry – Links: 11111
Inflation:
Innovate – Innovation: 11111111111111111
Intellectual Property:
Inventor:
Investment – Sound, Capital Investment: 11111
Investors, Financiers, Business Angels:
IT – Use Authorizations, Data Storage Centre: 1111111
Job Description:
Knowledge Transfer – Technology Transfer, Transmission: 111111
Launch:
Legal – Ordinances:
Legislation:
Licences:
Lobby – Campaign:
Long-Term – Short-term Trends:
Loss – Shortfall:
Management – Executives, Managers: 111
Market – Marketing, Market Share, Marketplace, Market Needs, Marketing Differentiation, Market Focus, Market Tool, Offered: 1111111111
Market Mix – Product Mix:
Maximise:
Mission: 1111
Model - Modes: 1111
Motivated:
Needs: 11111111111
Negotiations:
Nominating Committee:
Objectives - Targets:
Offer – Offered:
Operations – Operating, Operating Statement: 111
Overhead Costs:
Ownership: 11
Patents:
Partnerships – Alliances, Partners: 11111111111
Pay-Roll Costs:
Performance: 11111
Pipeline:
Plan – Planning, Planning Period: 111
Policies & Procedures:
Politics:
Price – Pricing Strategies:
Priorities – Business, National: 1
Processes – efficient, procedures:
Productivity- Productivity Gains, Productive, Production: 1
Product(s): 111
Projects – Targeted Projects: 1
Professions – Professional Societies, Professional Bodies, Professional Services, Professional Development, Professionalism: 1111111111111
Profit – Surplus:
Public Sector – Government Links: 1111111111
Public Funds: 1
Public Interest:
Purchase - Purchasing:
Ratios – Key Ratios:
Recruitment – Intake, Applications: 11111111
Reduce Government Funding Dependency: 1
Re-engineering:
Regulation – Government Regulation, Regulators:
Reports – Internal, External, To Government: 1
Research Commercialisation:
Reserves:
Resources: 11
Responsibility(ies):
Results – Action, Solutions, Solution-oriented, Outcomes, Problem-solving: 111111
ROI - Return on (Public) Investment:
Retention:
Revenue:
Rewards: 1
Risk(s): 1
Safe: 1
Sale:
Security:
Sickness Absence – Employees:
Skills – Development, Lifelong, Transferable, Useful: 1111111111
Solutions:
Specifications:
Spin-offs:
Sponsors:
Stakeholders: 1
Start-ups: 1
Strategic Map:
Strategy – Strategic, Strategic Plan, Strategic Framework, Strategic Priorities:
1111111111111111
1111
Subsidiaries: 111
Surplus(es) – profitability: 111
Sustainable – Economic Impact, Sustainable Growth, Sustainable Development,
Sustainability,
Sustainable Relationships, Underpin: 11111111111111
Survey: 1
Systems:
Targets: 111
Tariff: 11
Teamwork - Teams: 111
Technology(ies) – Technological, Techniques: 11
Testing – Tested:
Training: 11
Trends:
Turnover – Reduction:
Values – Core: 111111
Value – for Money, Value-Added: 111111
Ventures – Joint Ventures: 1111
Waste – Waste Management:
Wealth Creation:
Welfare – Student Welfare: 1
Work – Conduct, World of Work, workforce, working conditions, Workload, Work
Options, Workplace, Undertaken: 11111111111111
Working Capital:
Working with Businesses: 11
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STRATEGETRIC™ SOCIOMETRIC WORDING

NONE
STRATEGETRIC™ Sociometric Wording

Academic – Academic Staff, Focused, Goals, Challenge: 11111111111
Academic Portfolio – Contents: Arts, Creative Arts, Humanities, Education, Sciences, Engineering, Finance, Technology, Mathematics, Law, Business, Health - Standards:
Academic - Freedom, Responsibilities, Environment : 111
Academic Support – Academic Apprentices:
Access: I
Achievement – Delivery, enhanced academic performance:
Acquisition – Acquire:
Administration - Administrative:
Admissions:
Advice:
Agreement – Agree, Approve:
Aims- Aspiration(s):
Alignment: 11
Analysis – Critical Reflection:
Appropriateness:
Archives:
Areas – Approaches, Active, Activities, Fields, Catchment, Directions: 11
Autonomous:
Balance:
Barriers:
Benefit – Beneficiaries, Students, Student Needs, Student-centred, locally, the World: 11111111
Best Practice(s):
Best-known:
Board – Council, Congregation:
Broadening: 11111111111
Carbon Emissions – Reduction:
Catalysts – Drivers:
Capabilities – Unique University Capabilities, Capacity:
Central:
Challenges – Challenging, Demanding, Domestic and Global:
Characteristics – Attributes, Characterises:
Charities: 1
Charter:
Citizenship:
Climate:
Coaching:
Collegiality – Colleges, Collegiate, Collegial University: 1111111
Colleagues:
Collaborate - Collaboration, Collaborative, Participation:
Commitment:
Committee(s), Task Force, groups:
Communication – Targeted, Communication Value:
Community – Alumni, Awareness, Benefit, Civic Roots, Engagement, Local, People,
Region, Society – needs, Support, university, Volunteering: 111111111
Comparison:
Complaints:
Completion - Complete:
Comprehensive:
Conferences – Workshops, Exchanges, Lectures:
Confidence:
Contemporary:
Consolidation:
Consumption – Energy usage, water usage:
Context:
Contribution – to community: 111111
Continue – Continuing, ongoing, Lifelong:
Conventional Thinking:
Coordination:
Counselling:
Country-of-Origin:
Courtesy:
Creative – Creativity, Create, Creation:
Curiosity – Intellectual:
Curriculum – Content:
Cycle:
Debate:
Defining:
Delegation – Delegated:
Demands – Future Demands:
Democracy:
Demonstrable - Demonstrate:
Depth – In-Depth: 1
Destination of Choice:
Development – Career, Cultural, Forwarding-Thinking, General, Organisational, Social:
Difficult - Complexity:
Dignity:
Disabilities:
Disaster Recovery:
Discipline(s) – academic, Inter-Disciplinary, Multi-Disciplinary, Schools, Institutions,
Faculties, departments, Collegiate: 1111
Discovery (ies):

Discrimination: 1
Distance Learning – Remote Learning:
Distinction – academic:
Distinctive:
Diversity – Diverse, Under-Represented Groups, Minorities:

Duplication:

Dynamism:

Education – Breadth, continuing education, Depth, Enriching, Experience, Inspiring,
Professional, tutorials, Unique Model: 11

Efforts – Implementation:

Élite – University:

Element:

Embedding - Embedded:

Embracing:

Emphasis – Care:

Empowerment:

Enabling – Enabler, Ensure, Implement:

Encourage – Encouragement: 11

Engagement – Action, Activities, Maximising Potential:

Enhancement – Enrichment, Social: 1111

Enjoyment:

Environment (Cohesive, Dynamic, Excellent, Healthy, Intellectual, Positive, Rewarding,
Safe, Working, Learning, Recreational, Supportive, Pastoral): 11

Equality – of Opportunity, Disadvantaged Groups:

Esteem – Eminence, National, international:

Ethical:

Evidence - Evidenced-Based Approaches:

Examinations:

Exemplar – Example, Exemplary:

Excellence – Academic, Expertise, Centres of Excellence, Outstanding: 111

Exceptional:

Expansion:

Expectations – Of Students, Of Staff, Of Stakeholders:

Experience – Student Experience, Outcomes, Positive, Supportive: 111111111111

Expertise - Experts:

Expression:

Extra-Curricular:

Family:

Features:

Fieldwork:

Flexibility - Flexible:

Framework - Framing:

Focus:

Foster:

Foundation:


Full potential:

Full-time – Part-time, non-matriculated:

Fundamental: 1

Gender:
Generation – Next Generation:
Guide – Guiding, Guidelines:
Governance – Good Governance:
Hallmark:
Healthcare: 1
Heritage:
Higher Education:
Hub:
Ideas- Issues:
Impact – social, cultural, Global:
Improvement – Improved, Upgrades:
Independent:
Influential - influence:
Information – Information-Sharing, Informed:
Infrastructure – Development, Framework, Maintenance, Structure: 11
Initiatives - Enquiry:
Inquiry – a questioning spirit: 1
Insufficiency:
Integration – Interaction, Integrated: 1
Integrity:
Intellectual:
Intensive:
International – Ambitions, Global Networks, Global Footprint, Global University,
Recognition, Relationships, Staff, Student Body, World, World-Class: 1
Investigate – Investigation: 1
Involvement – Pro-active Involvement:
Justification – Justify:
Key:
Knowledge – New, Advancement, Knowledge-Related: 111
Leading- leadership, Thought Leadership, Agenda-Setting:
Learning – Lifelong Learning, flexible learning: 111
Legacy:
Library – Provision: in - maintenance:
Material:
Mentoring:
Methods – Mechanisms, Modus Operandi, Protocols:
Mind-Set:
Minimise - Minimal:
Momentum:
Museum(s) – Botanic Garden, Choirs, Collections, Galleries, Theatres, Orchestras, music:
111111
Negotiation – Influence:
Network:
Norms:
Nurture(s):
Obligation – Mutual Obligation:
Occur – Happen:
Open – Openness, Open Access:
Opportunities – Exchange Opportunities: 11111111111111
Organisation – behavior:
Originality:
Outputs:
Outreach:
Oversight:
Overloading:
Paramount:
Parity:
Participation: 111111111
Patterns:
People-Based:
Portfolio:
Positioning - Position: 11
Positive:
Potential:
Premise:
Preparation:
Preservation – Preserve:
Prevention – Inhibit:
Primacy – Importance:
Principle:
Proactive:
Problems:
Process(es):
Professionalism:
Profile:
Programmes – Flexible, modular, Regular:
Progress - Progression:
Promote – Promotion:
Propose – Proposal:
Protection:
Provision - Provide: 11
Publishing:
Public – Engagement, Policy, Services, Sector, Understanding:
Purpose:
Qualification – Courses, Degree, Entry, Certificate, Diploma, Joint Honors, Summer Schools: 11
Quality – Quality Outputs, Calibre: 111
Recognition – Academic, Renowned: 1
Recommendations:
Recreation: 11
Reduction:
Regard by Professional Bodies:
Registry:
Reinforce:
Relationships – lifelong: 111
Relevance – Relevant, In Touch, update:
Representation - Representative:
Reputation:
Requirements:
Responsive – Responsiveness, Respond, Responsibility:
Respect – Mutual:
Restructuring:
R & D – Blue Sky, cutting edge, intensive, Enquiry, Investigation, Fundamental, Applied,
Practice-based, Researchers, Research-Active, New and Better Ways: 111
Revision:
Robust - Rigour:
Role – Central Role:
Sabbatical Leave:
Satisfaction:
Scheduling - Scheduled:
Scholars:
Scholarship: 1
Sectors – Emerging:
Selective - Selected:
Self-Governance:
Self-awareness:
Services:
Shared:
Significance – Academic:
Social Justice:
Stages – Phases:
Standard(s) – Highest, Criteria, Outstanding: 111
Standard – low-grade:
Stimulation – Stimulating: 11
Strength – Areas of, strengthen:
Student Charter:
Studies – Completion, Further, Overseas:
Subsidiarity:
Subvention:
Success – Future Success, Key Successes:
Suffered:
Suitable – Suitable Channels:
Supervision:
Support – Supported, Supportive: 11
Synergy:
Talent:
Teaching – Teachers, Educators, Pedagogic: 11
Theme(s):
Thinking – Conventional Thinking, Critical Thinking:
Timely – Timescales:
Track Record:
Traditional - Traditions:
Transcripts:
Transformational:
Transparency:
Unaffected:
Uncertainty:
Understanding:
Units:
Unsatisfactory:
Usage:
Variety - Variance:
Valuing People:
Virtual Circle:
Vision(s) - Expectations:
Well-Being – work-Life Balance:
STRATEGETRIC™ SOCIOMETRIC WORDING

Academic – Academic Staff, Focused, Goals, Challenge: 11111111
Academic Portfolio – Contents: Arts, Creative Arts, Humanities, Education, Sciences, Engineering, Finance, Technology, Mathematics, Law, Business, Health - Standards:
Academic - Freedom, Responsibilities, Environment:
Academic Support – Academic Apprentices:
Access:
Achievement – Delivery, enhanced academic performance:
Acquisition – Acquire:
Administration - Administrative:
Admissions:
Advice:
Agreement – Agree, Approve:
Aims- Aspiration(s):
Alignment:
Analysis – Critical Reflection:
Appropriateness:
Archives:
Areas – Approaches, Active, Activities, Fields, Catchment, Directions:
Autonomous:
Balance:
Barriers:
Benefit – Beneficiaries, Students, Student Needs, Student-centred, locally, the World:
11111111
Best Practice(s):
Best-known:
Board – Council, Congregation:
Broadening:
Carbon Emissions – Reduction:
Catalysts – Drivers:
Capabilities – Unique University Capabilities, Capacity:
Central:
Challenges – Challenging, Demanding, Domestic and Global:
Characteristics – Attributes, Characterises:
Charities:
Charter:
Citizenship:
Climate:
Coaching:
Collegiality – Colleges, Collegiate, Collegial University:
Colleagues:
Collaborate - Collaboration, Collaborative, Participation:
Commitment: 1111111111111111111111111
Committee(s), Task Force, groups:
Communication – Targeted, Communication Value:
Community – Alumni, Awareness, Benefit, Civic Roots, Engagement, Local, People,
Region, Society – needs, Support, university, Volunteering: 1111111111111111111
Comparison:
Complaints:
Completion - Complete:
Comprehensive:
Conferences – Workshops, Exchanges, Lectures:
Confidence:
Contemporary:
Consolidation:
Consumption – Energy usage, water usage:
Context:
Contribution – to community:
Continue – Continuing, ongoing, Lifelong:
Conventional Thinking:
Coordination:
Counselling:
Country-of-Origin:
Courteous:
Creative – Creativity, Create, Creation:
Curiosity – Intellectual:
Curriculum – Content:
Cycle:
Debate:
Defining:
Delegation – Delegated:
Demands – Future Demands:
Democracy:
Demonstrable - Demonstrate:
Depth – In-Depth:
Destination of Choice:
Development – Career, Cultural, Forwarding-Thinking, General, Organisational, Social:
1111111111111111111
Difficult - Complexity:
Dignity:
Disabilities:
Disaster Recovery:
Discipline(s) – academic, Inter-Disciplinary, Multi-Disciplinary, Schools, Institutions,
Faculties, departments, Collegiate:
Discovery (ies):
Distance Learning – Remote Learning:
Distinction – academic:
Distinctive:
Diversity – Diverse, Under-Represented Groups, Minorities:
Dynamism:
Education – Breadth, continuing education, Depth, Enriching, Experience, Inspiring,
Professional, tutorials, Unique Model:
Efforts – Implementation:
Élite – University:
Element:
Embedding - Embedded:
Embracing:
Emphasis – Care:
Empowerment:
Enabling – Enabler, Ensure, Implement:
Encourage – Encouragement:
Engagement – Action, Activities, Maximising Potential:
Enhancement – Enrichment, Social:
Enjoyment:
Environment (Cohesive, Dynamic, Excellent, Healthy, Intellectual, Positive, Rewarding,
Safe, Working, Learning, Recreational, Supportive, Pastoral):
Equality – of Opportunity, Disadvantaged Groups:
Esteem – Eminence, National, international:
Ethical:
Evidence - Evidenced-Based Approaches:
Examinations:
Exemplar – Example, Exemplary:
Excellence – Academic, Expertise, Centres of Excellence, Outstanding:
Exceptional:
Expansion:
Expectations – Of Students, Of Staff, Of Stakeholders:
Experience – Student Experience, Outcomes, Positive, Supportive:
Expertise - Experts:
Expression:
Extra-Curricular:
Family:
Features:
Fieldwork:
Flexibility - Flexible:
Framework - Framing:
Focus:
Foster:
Foundation:
Freedom – Freedom of Thought, Freedom of Speech – Without Penalty:
Full potential:
Full-time – Part-time, non-matriculated:
Fundamental:
Gender:
Generation – Next Generation:
Guide – Guiding, Guidelines:
Governance – Good Governance:
Hallmark:
Heritage:
Higher Education:
Hub:
Ideas- Issues:
Impact – social, cultural, Global:
Improvement – Improved, Upgrades:
Independent:
Influential - influence:
Information – Information-Sharing, Informed:
Infrastructure – Development, Framework, Maintenance, Structure:
Initiatives - Enquiry:
Inquiry:
Insufficiency:
Integration – Interaction, Integrated:
Integrity:
Intellectual:
Intensive:
International – Ambitions, Global Networks, Global Footprint, Global University, Recognition, Relationships, Staff, Student Body, World, World-Class: 11111111111
Investigate – Investigation:
Involvement – Pro-active Involvement:
Justification – Justify:
Key:
Knowledge – New, Advancement, Knowledge-Related: 11111111
Leading- leadership, Thought Leadership, Agenda-Setting:
Learning – Lifelong Learning, flexible learning: 11111111111
Legacy:
Library – Provision: in - maintenance:
Material:
Mentoring:
Methods – Mechanisms, Modus Operandi, Protocols:
Mind-Set:
Minimise - Minimal:
Momentum:
Museum(s) – Botanic Garden, Choirs, Collections, Galleries, Theatres, Orchestras:
Negotiation – Influence:
Network:
Norms:
Nurture(s): 111111111111111111111111111
Obligation – Mutual Obligation:
Occur – Happen:
Open – Openness, Open Access:
Opportunities – Exchange Opportunities:
Organisation – behavior:
Originality:
Outputs:
Outreach:
Oversight:
Overloading:
Paramount:
Parity:
Participation:
Patterns:
People-Based:
Portfolio:
Positioning - Position:
Positive:
Potential:
Premise:
Preparation:
Preservation – Preserve:
Prevention – Inhibit:
Primacy – Importance:
Principle:
Proactive:
Problems:
Process(es):
Professionalism:
Profile:
Programmes – Flexible, modular, Regular:
Progress - Progression:
Promote – Promotion:
Propose – Proposal:
Protection:
Provision - Provide: 1111111111111111111111111111
Publishing:
Public – Engagement, Policy, Services, Sector, Understanding: 11111111
Purpose:
Qualification – Courses, Degree, Entry, Certificate, Diploma, Joint Honors, Summer Schools:
Quality – Quality Outputs, Calibre: 111111111111111111111111111111
Recognition – Academic, Renowned:
Recommendations:
Recreation:
Reduction:
Regard by Professional Bodies:
Registry:
Reinforce:
Relationships – lifelong:
Relevance – Relevant, In Touch, update:
Representation - Representative:
Reputation:
Requirements:
Responsive – Responsiveness, Respond, Responsibility:
Respect – Mutual:
Restructuring:
R & D – Blue Sky, cutting edge, intensive, Enquiry, Investigation, Fundamental, Applied,
Practice-based, Researchers, Research-Active, New and Better Ways: 1111111111
Revision:
Robust - Rigour:
Role – Central Role:
Sabbatical Leave:
Satisfaction:
Scheduling - Scheduled:
Scholars:
Scholarship:
Sectors – Emerging:
Selective - Selected:
Self-Governance:
Self-awareness:
Services:
Shared:
Significance – Academic:
Social Justice:
Stages – Phases:
Standard(s) – Highest, Criteria, Outstanding: 1111111111111111111111111
Standard – low-grade:
Stimulation – Stimulating:
Strength – Areas of, strengthen:
Student Charter:
Studies – Completion, Further, Overseas:
Subsidiarity:
Subvention:
Success – Future Success, Key Successes:
Suffered:
Suitable – Suitable Channels:
Supervision:
Support – Supported, Supportive:
Synergy:
Talent:
Teaching – Teachers, Educators, Pedagogic: 1111111111
Theme(s):
Thinking – Conventional Thinking, Critical Thinking:
Timely – Timescales:
Track Record:
Traditional - Traditions:
Transcripts:
Transformational:
Transparency:
Unaffected:
Uncertainty:
Understanding:
Units:
Unsatisfactory:
Usage:
Variety - Variance:
Valuing People:
Virtual Circle:
Vision(s) - Expectations:
Well-Being – work-Life Balance:
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Academic – Academic Staff, Focused, Goals, Challenge: 111
Academic Portfolio – Contents: Arts, Creative Arts, Humanities, Education, Sciences, Engineering, Finance, Technology, Mathematics, Law, Business, Health - Standards:
Academic - Freedom, Responsibilities, Environment:
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Access:
Achievement – Delivery, enhanced academic performance: 111
Acquisition – Acquire:
Administration - Administrative:
Admissions:
Advice:
Agreement – Agree, Approve:
Aims- Aspiration(s): 111111
Alignment:
Analysis – Critical Reflection:
Appropriateness:
Archives:
Areas – Approaches, Active, Activities, Fields, Catchment, Directions: 11
Autonomous:
Balance:
Barriers:
Benefit – Beneficiaries, Students, Student Needs, Student-centred, locally, the World: 111
Best Practice(s):
Best-known: 1
Board – Council, Congregation:
Broadening:
Carbon Emissions – Reduction:
Catalysts – Drivers:
Capabilities – Unique University Capabilities, Capacity:
Central:
Challenges – Challenging, Demanding, Domestic and Global: 1
Characteristics – Attributes, Characterises:
Charities:
Charter:
Citizenship:
Climate:
Coaching:
Collegiality – Colleges, Collegiate, Collegial University:
Colleagues:
Collaborate - Collaboration, Collaborative, Participation: 1
Commitment: 11
Committee(s), Task Force, groups:
Communication – Targeted, Communication Value: 11
Community – Alumni, Awareness, Benefit, Civic Roots, Engagement, Local, People,
Region, Society – needs, Support, university, Volunteering: 1111111111
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Complaints:
Completion - Complete:
Comprehensive:
Conferences – Workshops, Exchanges, Lectures:
Confidence:
Contemporary:
Consolidation:
Consumption – Energy usage, water usage:
Context:
Contribution – to community: 111111
Continue – Continuing, ongoing, Lifelong: 11
Conventional Thinking:
Coordination:
Counselling:
Country-of-Origin:
Courtesy:
Creative – Creativity, Create, Creation:
Curiosity – Intellectual: 1
Curriculum – Content:
Cycle:
Debate:
Defining:
Delegation – Delegated:
Demands – Future Demands:
Democracy:
Demonstrable - Demonstrate:
Depth – In-Depth:
Destination of Choice:
Development – Career, Cultural, Forwarding-Thinking, General, Organisational, Social:
Difficult - Complexity:
Dignity:
Disabilities:
Disaster Recovery:
Discipline(s) – academic, Inter-Disciplinary, Multi-Disciplinary, Schools, Institutions,
Faculties, departments, Collegiate: 1
Discovery (ies):
Distance Learning – Remote Learning:
Distinction – academic:
Distinctive:
Diversity – Diverse, Under-Represented Groups, Minorities: 1
Duplication:
Dynamism:
Education – Breadth, continuing education, Depth, Enriching, Experience, Inspiring,
Professional, tutorials, Unique Model: 111
Efforts – Implementation:
Élite – University: 111
Element: 11
Embedding - Embedded:
Embracing:
Emphasis – Care:
Empowerment:
Enabling – Enabler, Ensure, Implement: 11111
Encourage – Encouragement:
Engagement – Action, Activities, Maximising Potential: 11111
Enhancement – Enrichment, Social:
Enjoyment:
Environment (Cohesive, Dynamic, Excellent, Healthy, Intellectual, Positive, Rewarding,
Safe, Working, Learning, Recreational, Supportive, Pastoral): 1111
Equality – of Opportunity, Disadvantaged Groups: 1
Esteem – Eminence, National, international:
Ethical:
Evidence - Evidenced-Based Approaches:
Examinations:
Exemplar – Example, Exemplary:
Excellence – Academic, Expertise, Centres of Excellence, Outstanding: 11
Exceptional:
Expansion:
Expectations – Of Students, Of Staff, Of Stakeholders: 11
Experience – Student Experience, Outcomes, Positive, Supportive:
Expertise - Experts: 111
Expression:
Extra-Curricular:
Family:
Features:
Fieldwork:
Flexibility - Flexible:
Framework - Framing:
Focus:
Foster:
Foundation:
Freedom – Freedom of Thought, Freedom of Speech – Without Penalty:
Full potential:
Full-time – Part-time, non-matriculated:
Fundamental:
Gender:
Generation – Next Generation:
Guide – Guiding, Guidelines:
Governance – Good Governance:
Hallmark:
Heritage:
Higher Education:
Hub:
Ideas - Issues:
Impact – social, cultural, Global:
Improvement – Improved, Upgrades:
Independent:
Influential - influence:
Information – Information-Sharing, Informed: 1111
Infrastructure – Development, Framework, Maintenance, Structure:
Initiatives - Enquiry:
Inquiry:
Insufficiency:
Integration – Interaction, Integrated:
Integrity: 1
Intellectual:
Intensive:
International – Ambitions, Global Networks, Global Footprint, Global University,
Recognition, Relationships, Staff, Student Body, World, World-Class: 111111
Investigate – Investigation:
Involvement – Pro-active Involvement:
Justification – Justify:
Key:
Knowledge – New, Advancement, Knowledge-Related:
Leading- leadership, Thought Leadership, Agenda-Setting:
Learning – Lifelong Learning, flexible learning: 1111
Legacy:
Library – Provision: in - maintenance:
Material:
Mentoring:
Methods – Mechanisms, Modus Operandi, Protocols:
Mind-Set:
Minimise - Minimal:
Momentum:
Museum(s) – Botanic Garden, Choirs, Collections, Galleries, Theatres, Orchestras:
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Collaborate - Collaboration, Collaborative, Participation:
Commitment:
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Comparison:
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Context:
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Cycle:
Debate:
Defining:
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Depth – In-Depth:
Destination of Choice:
Development – Career, Cultural, Forwarding-Thinking, General, Organisational, Social:
Difficult - Complexity:
Dignity:
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Disaster Recovery:
Discipline(s) – academic, Inter-Disciplinary, Multi-Disciplinary, Schools, Institutions,
Faculties, departments, Collegiate:
Discovery (ies):
Distance Learning – Remote Learning:
Distinction – academic:
Distinctive:
Diversity – Diverse, Under-Represented Groups, Minorities:
Duplication:
Dynamism:
Education – Breadth, continuing education, Depth, Enriching, Experience, Inspiring,
Professional, tutorials, Unique Model:
Efforts – Implementation:
Élite – University:
Element:
Embedding - Embedded:
Embracing:
Emphasis – Care:
Empowerment:
Enabling – Enabler, Ensure, Implement:
Encourage – Encouragement:
Engagement – Action, Activities, Maximising Potential:
Enhancement – Enrichment, Social:
Enjoyment:
Environment (Cohesive, Dynamic, Excellent, Healthy, Intellectual, Positive, Rewarding,
Safe, Working, Learning, Recreational, Supportive, Pastoral):
Equality – of Opportunity, Disadvantaged Groups:
Esteem – Eminence, National, international:
Ethical:
Evidence - Evidenced-Based Approaches:
Examinations:
Exemplar – Example, Exemplary:
Excellence – Academic, Expertise, Centres of Excellence, Outstanding:
Exceptional:
Expansion:
Expectations – Of Students, Of Staff, Of Stakeholders:
Experience – Student Experience, Outcomes, Positive, Supportive:
Expertise - Experts:
Expression:
Extra-Curricular:
Family:
Features:
Fieldwork:
Flexibility - Flexible:
Framework - Framing:
Focus:
Foster:
Foundation:
Freedom – Freedom of Thought, Freedom of Speech – Without Penalty:
Full potential:
Full-time – Part-time, non-matriculated:
Fundamental:
Gender:
Generation – Next Generation:
Guide – Guiding, Guidelines:
Governance – Good Governance:
Hallmark:
Heritage:
Higher Education:
Hub:
Ideas - Issues:
Impact – social, cultural, Global:
Improvement – Improved, Upgrades:
Independent:
Influential - influence:
Information – Information-Sharing, Informed:
Infrastructure – Development, Framework, Maintenance, Structure:
Initiatives - Enquiry:
Inquiry:
Insufficiency:
Integration – Interaction, Integrated:
Integrity:
Intellectual:
Intensive:
International – Ambitions, Global Networks, Global Footprint, Global University,
Recognition, Relationships, Staff, Student Body, World, World-Class:
Investigate – Investigation:
Involvement – Pro-active Involvement:
Justification – Justify:
Key:
Knowledge – New, Advancement, Knowledge-Related: 1
Leading- leadership, Thought Leadership, Agenda-Setting:
Learning – Lifelong Learning, flexible learning: 1111
Legacy:
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Material:
Mentoring:
Methods – Mechanisms, Modus Operandi, Protocols:
Mind-Set:
Minimise - Minimal:
Momentum:
Museum(s) – Botanic Garden, Choirs, Collections, Galleries, Theatres, Orchestras:
Negotiation – Influence:
Network:
Norms:
Nurture(s):
Obligation – Mutual Obligation:
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Open – Openness, Open Access:
Opportunities – Exchange Opportunities:
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Proactive:
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Process(es):
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Progress - Progression:
Promote – Promotion:
Propose – Proposal:
Protection:
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Publishing:
Public – Engagement, Policy, Services, Sector, Understanding:
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Reduction:
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Reinforce:
Relationships – lifelong:
Relevance – Relevant, In Touch, update:
Representation - Representative:
Reputation:
Requirements:
Responsive – Responsiveness, Respond, Responsibility:
Respect – Mutual:
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Suffered:
Suitable – Suitable Channels:
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Synergy:
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Teaching – Teachers, Educators, Pedagogic: 1
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Collaborate - Collaboration, Collaborative, Participation: 11
Commitment: 111111111
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Improvement – Improved, Upgrades:
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Discovery (ies):
Distance Learning – Remote Learning:

Distinction – academic:

Distinctive:

Diversity – Diverse, Under-Represented Groups, Minorities:

Duplication:

Dynamism:

Education – Breadth, continuing education, Depth, Enriching, Experience, Inspiring, Professional, tutorials, Unique Model:

Efforts – Implementation:

Élite – University:

Element:

Embedding - Embedded:

Embracing:

Emphasis – Care:

Empowerment:

Enabling – Enabler, Ensure, Implement:

Encourage – Encouragement:

Engagement – Action, Activities, Maximising Potential:

Enhancement – Enrichment, Social:

Enjoyment:

Enrich:

Environment (Cohesive, Dynamic, Excellent, Healthy, Intellectual, Positive, Rewarding, Safe, Working, Learning, Recreational, Supportive, Pastoral):

Equality – of Opportunity, Disadvantaged Groups:

Esteem – Eminence, National, international:

Ethical:

Evidence - Evidenced-Based Approaches:

Examinations:

Exemplar – Example, Exemplary:

Excellence – Academic, Expertise, Centres of Excellence, Outstanding:

Exceptional:

Expansion:

Expectations – Of Students, Of Staff, Of Stakeholders:

Experience – Student Experience, Outcomes, Positive, Supportive:

Expertise - Experts:

Expression:

Extra-Curricular:

Family:

Features:

Fieldwork:

Flexibility - Flexible:

Framework - Framing:

Focus:

Foster:

Foundation:

Freedom – Freedom of Thought, Freedom of Speech – Without Penalty:
Full-time – Part-time, non-matriculated: 1
Fundamental:
Gender:
Generation – Next Generation:
Guide – Guiding, Guidelines:
Governance – Good Governance:
Hallmark:
Heritage:
Higher Education:
Home – At Home: 1
Hub:
Ideas- Issues: 111111111
Impact – social, cultural, Global:
Improvement – Improved, Upgrades: 111
Independent:
Influential - influence:
Information – Information-Sharing, Informed:
Infrastructure – Development, Framework, Maintenance, Structure:
Initiatives - Enquiry:
Inquiry:
Insufficiency:
Integration – Interaction, Integrated: 11111
Integrity:
Intellectual: 1111
Intensive:
International – Ambitions, Global Networks, Global Footprint, Global University, Recognition, Relationships, Staff, Student Body, World, World-Class:
1111111111111111111111111111111111111111111
Investigate – Investigation:
Involvement – Pro-active Involvement:
Justification – Justify:
Key: 111
Knowledge – New, Advancement, Knowledge-Related: 1111
Leading- leadership, Thought Leadership, Agenda-Setting: 111111111111111111
Learning – Lifelong Learning, flexible learning:
111111111111111111111111111111111111111111
Legacy:
Liaison: 11
Library – Provision: in - maintenance:
Maintained: 11111111
Material: 1
Media: 1111111
Mentoring:
Methods – Mechanisms, Modus Operandi, Protocols: 11111111111111
Mind-Set:
Minimise - Minimal:
Momentum:
Museum(s) – Botanic Garden, Choirs, Collections, Galleries, Theatres, Orchestras:
Negotiation – Influence:
Network:
Norms:
Nurture(s):
Obligation – Mutual Obligation:
Occur – Happen:
Open – Openness, Open Access: 1111111111111111111111111
Opportunities – Exchange Opportunities: 1111111
Organisation – behavior:
Originality:
Outputs:
Outreach: 1
Oversight:
Overloading:
Paramount:
Parity:
Participation: 11
Patterns:
People-Based: 1
Population – Mobile Population: 1
Portfolio:
Positioning - Position: 1
Positive:
Potential – Full potential: 111
Premise:
Preparation:
Presence: 1111111111111111
Preservation – Preserve:
Prevention – Inhibit:
Primacy – Importance:
Principle:
Proactive:
Problems:
Process(es):
Professionalism:
Profile: 11
Programmes – Flexible, modular, Regular:
Progress - Progression:
Promote – Promotion: 1111
Propose – Proposal:
Protection:
Provision - Provide: 111111111111111111
Publishing: 1
Public – Engagement, Policy, Services, Sector, Understanding:
Purpose: 11
Qualification – Courses, Degree, Entry, Certificate, Diploma, Joint Honors, Summer Schools: 1111111111111111
Quality – Quality Outputs, Calibre: 111
Recognition – Academic, Renowned: 1
Recommendations:
Recreation:
Reflects: 11
Reduction:
Regard by Professional Bodies:
Registry:
Reinforce:
Relationships – lifelong:
Relevance – Relevant, In Touch, update:
Representation - Representative:
Reputation: 11
Requirements:
Responsive – Responsiveness, Respond, Responsibility:
Respect – Mutual:
Restructuring:
R & D – Blue Sky, cutting edge, intensive, Enquiry, Investigation, Fundamental, Applied, Practice-based, Researchers, Research-Active, New and Better Ways:
11111111111111111111111111
Revision:
Robust - Rigour: 111
Role – Central Role:
Sabbatical Leave:
Satisfaction:
Scheduling - Scheduled:
Scholars:
Scholarship: 111
Sectors – Emerging:
Selective - Selected: 11
Self-Governance:
Self-awareness:
Services: 111111
Shared: 11
Significance – Academic:
Social Justice: 11
Stages – Phases:
Standard(s) – Highest, Criteria, Outstanding: 1111111111111111
Standard – low-grade: 1
Stimulation – Stimulating: 1
Strength – Areas of, strengthen: 111
Student Charter:
Studies – Completion, Further, Overseas:
Subsidiarity:
Subvention:
Success – Future Success, Key Successes: 111
Suffered:
Suitable – Suitable Channels:
Supervision:
Support – Supported, Supportive: 111111111111111111
Synergy:
Talent:
Teaching – Teachers, Educators, Pedagogic: 1111111111111
Theme(s):
Thinking – Conventional Thinking, Critical Thinking:
Timely – Timescales:
Track Record:
Traditional - Traditions:
Transcripts:
Transformational:
Transparency:
Unaffected:
Uncertainty:
Understanding:
Units:
Unsatisfactory:
Usage: 1111111111111
Variety - Variance:
Valuing People:
Vibrant: 11111111
Virtual Circle:
Vision(s) - Expectations:
Well-Being – work-Life Balance:
STRATEGETRIC™ SOCIOMETRIC WORDING

Academic – Academic Staff, Focused, Goals, Challenge:
Academic Portfolio – Contents: Arts, Creative Arts, Humanities, Education, Sciences, Engineering, Finance, Technology, Mathematics, Law, Business, Health - Standards:
Academic - Freedom, Responsibilities, Environment:
Academic Support – Academic Apprentices:
Access:
Achievement – Delivery, enhanced academic performance:
Acquisition – Acquire:
Administration - Administrative:
Admissions:
Advice:
Agreement – Agree, Approve:
Aims- Aspiration(s):
Alignment:
Analysis – Critical Reflection:
 Appropriateness:
Archives:
Areas – Approaches, Active, Activities, Fields, Catchment, Directions:
Autonomous:
Balance:
Barriers:
Benefit – Beneficiaries, Students, Student Needs, Student-centred, locally, the World:
Best Practice(s):
Best-known:
Board – Council, Congregation:
Broadening:
Carbon Emissions – Reduction:
Catalysts – Drivers:
Capabilities – Unique University Capabilities, Capacity:
Central:
Challenges – Challenging, Demanding, Domestic and Global:
Characteristics – Attributes, Characterises:
Charities:
Charter:
Citizenship:
Climate:
Coaching:
Collegiality – Colleges, Collegiate, Collegial University:
Colleagues:
Collaborate - Collaboration, Collaborative, Participation:
Commitment: 11111111
Committee(s), Task Force, groups:
Communication – Targeted, Communication Value:
Community – Alumni, Awareness, Benefit, Civic Roots, Engagement, Local, People, Region, Society – needs, Support, university, Volunteering: 11111
Comparison:
Complaints:
Completion - Complete:
Comprehensive:
Conferences – Workshops, Exchanges, Lectures:
Confidence:
Contemporary:
Consolidation:
Consumption – Energy usage, water usage:
Context:
Contribution – to community:
Continue – Continuing, ongoing, Lifelong:
Conventional Thinking:
Coordination:
Counselling:
Country-of-Origin:
Courtesy:
Creative – Creativity, Create, Creation:
Curiosity – Intellectual:
Curriculum – Content:
Cycle:
Debate:
Defining:
Delegation – Delegated:
Demands – Future Demands:
Democracy:
Demonstrable - Demonstrate:
Depth – In-Depth:
Destination of Choice:
Development – Career, Cultural, Forwarding-Thinking, General, Organisational, Social:
Difficult - Complexity:
Dignity:
Disabilities:
Disaster Recovery:
Discipline(s) – academic, Inter-Disciplinary, Multi-Disciplinary, Schools, Institutions, Faculties, departments, Collegiate:
Discovery (ies):
Distance Learning – Remote Learning:
Distinction – academic:
Distinctive:
Diversity – Diverse, Under-Represented Groups, Minorities:
Duplication:
Dynamism:
Education – Breadth, continuing education, Depth, Enriching, Experience, Inspiring,
Professional, tutorials, Unique Model: 11111111
Efforts – Implementation:
Élite – University:
Element:
Embedding - Embedded:
Embracing:
Emphasis – Care:
Empowerment:
Enabling – Enabler, Ensure, Implement:
Encourage – Encouragement:
Engagement – Action, Activities, Maximising Potential:
Enhancement – Enrichment, Social: 11111111
Enjoyment:
Environment (Cohesive, Dynamic, Excellent, Healthy, Intellectual, Positive, Rewarding,
Safe, Working, Learning, Recreational, Supportive, Pastoral):
Equality – of Opportunity, Disadvantaged Groups:
Esteem – Eminence, National, international:
Ethical:
Evidence - Evidenced-Based Approaches:
Examinations:
Exemplar – Example, Exemplary:
Excellence – Academic, Expertise, Centres of Excellence, Outstanding: 11111111
Exceptional:
Expansion:
Expectations – Of Students, Of Staff, Of Stakeholders:
Experience – Student Experience, Outcomes, Positive, Supportive:
Expertise - Experts:
Expression:
Extra-Curricular:
Family:
Features:
Fieldwork:
Flexibility - Flexible:
Framework - Framing:
Focus:
Foster:
Foundation:
Freedom – Freedom of Thought, Freedom of Speech – Without Penalty:
Full potential:
Full-time – Part-time, non-matriculated:
Fundamental:
Gender:
Generation – Next Generation:
Guide – Guiding, Guidelines:
Governance – Good Governance:
Hallmark:
Heritage:
Higher Education:
Hub:
Ideas- Issues:
Impact – social, cultural, Global:
Improvement – Improved, Upgrades:
Independent:
Influential - influence:
Information – Information-Sharing, Informed:
Infrastructure – Development, Framework, Maintenance, Structure:
Initiatives - Enquiry:
Inquiry:
Insufficiency:
Integration – Interaction, Integrated:
Integrity:
Intellectual:
Intensive:
International – Ambitions, Global Networks, Global Footprint, Global University, Recognition, Relationships, Staff, Student Body, World, World-Class: 111
Investigate – Investigation:
Involvement – Pro-active Involvement:
Justification – Justify:
Key:
Knowledge – New, Advancement, Knowledge-Related:
Leading- leadership, Thought Leadership, Agenda-Setting:
Learning – Lifelong Learning, flexible learning: 111
Legacy:
Library – Provision: in - maintenance:
Material:
Mentoring:
Methods – Mechanisms, Modus Operandi, Protocols:
Mind-Set:
Minimise - Minimal:
Momentum:
Museum(s) – Botanic Garden, Choirs, Collections, Galleries, Theatres, Orchestras:
Negotiation – Influence:
Network:
Norms:
Nurture(s):
Obligation – Mutual Obligation:
Occur – Happen:
Open – Openness, Open Access:
Opportunities – Exchange Opportunities:
Organisation – behavior:
Originality:
Outputs:
Outreach:
Oversight:
Overloading:
Paramount:
Parity:
Participation:
Patterns:
People-Based:
Portfolio:
Positioning - Position:
Positive:
Potential:
Premise:
Preparation:
Preservation – Preserve:
Prevention – Inhibit:
Primacy – Importance:
Principle:
Proactive:
Problems:
Process(es):
Professionalism:
Profile:
Programmes – Flexible, modular, Regular:
Progress - Progression:
Promote – Promotion:
Propose – Proposal:
Protection:
Provision - Provide: 11111111
Publishing:
Public – Engagement, Policy, Services, Sector, Understanding:
Purpose:
Qualification – Courses, Degree, Entry, Certificate, Diploma, Joint Honors, Summer
Schools:
Quality – Quality Outputs, Calibre:
Recognition – Academic, Renowned:
Recommendations:
Recreation:
Reduction:
Regard by Professional Bodies:
Registry:
Reinforce:
Relationships – lifelong:
Relevance – Relevant, In Touch, update:
Representation - Representative:
Reputation:
Requirements:
Responsive – Responsiveness, Respond, Responsibility: 11111111
Respect – Mutual:
Restructuring:
R & D – Blue Sky, cutting edge, intensive, Enquiry, Investigation, Fundamental, Applied, Practice-based, Researchers, Research-Active, New and Better Ways: 111
Revision:
Robust - Rigour:
Role – Central Role:
Sabbatical Leave:
Satisfaction:
Scheduling - Scheduled:
Scholars:
Scholarship:
Sectors – Emerging:
Selective - Selected:
Self-Governance:
Self-awareness:
Services:
Shared:
Significance – Academic:
Social Justice:
Stages – Phases:
Standard(s) – Highest, Criteria, Outstanding:
Standard – low-grade:
Stimulation – Stimulating:
Strength – Areas of, strengthen:
Student Charter:
Studies – Completion, Further, Overseas:
Subsidiarity:
Subvention:
Success – Future Success, Key Successes:
Suffered:
Suitable – Suitable Channels:
Supervision:
Support – Supported, Supportive:
Synergy:
Talent:
Teaching – Teachers, Educators, Pedagogic: 111
Theme(s):
Thinking – Conventional Thinking, Critical Thinking:
Timely – Timescales:
Track Record:
Traditional - Traditions:
Transcripts:
Transformational:
Transparency:
Unaffected:
Uncertainty:
Understanding:
Units:
Unsatisfactory:
Usage:
Variety - Variance:
Valuing People:
Virtual Circle:
Vision(s) - Expectations:
Well-Being – work-Life Balance:
Table 7.2
OXFORD UNIVERSITY – 5 YEAR STRATEGIC PLAN
( 2009 – 2013)
STRATEGETRIC™ SOCIOMETRIC WORDING
Academic – Academic Staff, Focused, Goals, Challenge:
1111111111111111111111111111111
1111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111
Academic Portfolio –Contents: Arts, Creative Arts, Humanities, Education, Sciences,
Engineering ,
Finance, Technology, Mathematics, Law, Business, Health - Standards:
1111111111111111111
Academic - Freedom, Responsibilities, Environment :
Academic Support – Academic Apprentices: 1:
Access: 1111111111111111111
Achievement – Delivery, enhanced academic performance:
1111111111111111111111111111111
Acquisition – Acquire: 111
Administration - Administrative: 11111111111111111111111111111111
Admissions: 111111111111111
Advice: 11111111111
Agreement – Agree, Approve: 11111111111111
Aims- Aspiration(s): 111111111111111111
Alignment: 11111111111111111111111111111111
Analysis – Critical Reflection: 11111111
Appropriateness: 1111111111111111111
Archives: 1111
Areas – Approaches, Active, Activities, Fields, Catchment, Directions:
111111111111111111111111111
1111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111
Autonomous: 1
Balance: 1111
Barriers: 1111
Benefit – Beneficiaries, Students, Student Needs, Student-centred, locally, the World:
11111111111 11111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111
111111111111111111111111111111
Best Practice(s): 11111111
Best-known: 1
Board – Council, Congregation: 11111111111111111111
Broadening: 11
Carbon Emissions – Reduction: 111
Catalysts – Drivers: 111
Capabilities – Unique University Capabilities, Capacity: 11111
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Central: 11
Challenges – Challenging, Demanding, Domestic and Global: 11111111111111111111
Characteristics – Attributes, Characterises: 1111
Charities: 1
Charter:
Citizenship:
Climate: 11
Coaching:
Collegiality – Colleges, Collegiate, Collegial University:
1111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111
Delegation – Delegated: 11
Demands – Future Demands: 11
Democracy: 11
Demonstrable - Demonstrate: 1
Depth – In-Depth: 11
Destination of Choice:
Development – Career, Cultural, Forwarding-Thinking, General, Organisational, Social:
Difficult - Complexity: 11
Dignity:
Disabilities: 11
Disaster Recovery:
Discipline(s) – academic, Inter-Disciplinary, Multi-Disciplinary, Schools, Institutions, Faculties, departments, Collegiate:
Discovery (ies): 11
Distance Learning – Remote Learning:
Distinction – academic: 1
Distinctive: 11
Diversity – Diverse, Under-Represented Groups, Minorities: 11
Dynamism: 1
Education – Breadth, continuing education, Depth, Enriching, Experience, Inspiring, Professional, tutorials, Unique Model:
Efforts – Implementation: 11
Élite – University:
Element: 11
Embedding - Embedded: 11
Embracing:
Emphasis – Care: 11
Empowerment:
Enabling – Enabler, Ensure, Implement: 11
Encourage – Encouragement: 11
Engagement – Action, Activities, Maximising Potential:
Enhancement – Enrichment, Social:
Enjoyment:
Environment (Cohesive, Dynamic, Excellent, Healthy, Intellectual, Positive, Rewarding, Safe, Working, Learning, Recreational, Supportive, Pastoral):
Equality – of Opportunity, Disadvantaged Groups: 1
Esteem – Eminence, National, international: 1
Ethical: 1
Evidence - Evidenced-Based Approaches: 1
Examinations: 1
Exemplar – Example, Exemplary:
Excellence – Academic, Expertise, Centres of Excellence, Outstanding:
  1
Exceptional: 1
Expansion: 1
Expectations – Of Students, Of Staff, Of Stakeholders: 1
Experience – Student Experience, Outcomes, Positive, Supportive: 1
Expertise - Experts: 1
Expression: 1
Extra-Curricular:
Family:
Features: 1
Fieldwork: 1
Flexibility - Flexible: 1
Framework - Framing: 1
Focus: 1
Foster: 1
Foundation: 1
Freedom – Freedom of Thought, Freedom of Speech – Without Penalty: 1
Full potential:
Full-time – Part-time, non-matriculated:
Fundamental: 1
Gender: 1
Generation – Next Generation:
Guide – Guiding, Guidelines: 1
Governance – Good Governance: 1
Hallmark: 1
Heritage: 1
Higher Education: 1
Hub: 1
Ideas- Issues: 1
Impact – social, cultural, Global: 1
Improvement – Improved, Upgrades:
  1
Independent: 1
Influential - influence:
Information – Information-Sharing, Informed: 1
Infrastructure – Development, Framework, Maintenance, Structure:
Initiatives - Enquiry: 1
Inquiry: 1
Insufficiency: 1
Integration – Interaction, Integrated: 1
Integrity: 1
Intellectual: 1
Intensive: 1
International – Ambitions, Global Networks, Global Footprint, Global University, Recognition, Relationships, Staff, Student Body, World, World-Class:
1
Integrity – Integrated: 1
Investigate – Investigation: 1
Involvement – Pro-active Involvement: 1
Justification – Justify: 1
Key: 1
Knowledge – New, Advancement, Knowledge-Related: 1
Leading-leadership, Thought Leadership, Agenda-Setting: 1
Learning – Lifelong Learning, flexible learning: 1
Legacy:
Library – Provision: 1
Limitations: 1
Links - Linkages: 1
Long-term Role:
Low-use: 1
Maintain - maintenance: 1
Material: 1
Mentoring:
Methods – Mechanisms, Modus Operandi, Protocols: 1
Mind-Set:
Minimise - Minimal: 1
Momentum:
Museum(s) – Botanic Garden, Choirs, Collections, Galleries, Theatres, Orchestras:
1
Negotiation – Influence:
Network:
Norms: 1
Nurture(s):
Obligation – Mutual Obligation: 1
Occur – Happen: 1
Open – Openness, Open Access: 1
Opportunities – Exchange Opportunities: 1
Organisation – behavior: 1
Originality:
Outputs: 1
Outreach: 1
Oversight: 1
Overloading: 1
Paramount:
Parity: 11
Participation: 1111
Patterns: 11
People-Based:
Portfolio: 11111
Positioning - Position: 11
Positive: 11
Potential: 11111
Premise: 1
Preparation: 11
Preservation – Preserve: 1
Prevention – Inhibit: 11
Primacy – Importance: 111111111111111111111111111111111
Principle: 111
Proactive:
Problems: 111
Process(es): 1
Professionalism:
Profile: 111
Programmes – Flexible, modular, Regular: 111111111111111111111111111111111
Progress - Progression: 1111111111111
Promote – Promotion: 1111111111111
Propose – Proposal; 1111111111111
Protection:
Provision - Provide:
1111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111
1111111111111
Publishing: 11111111
Public – Engagement, Policy, Services, Sector, Understanding: 111
Purpose: 11
Qualification – Courses, Degree, Entry, Certificate, Diploma, Joint Honors, Summer Schools: 111111111111111111111111111111111
Quality – Quality Outputs, Calibre: 11111111111111111111111111111111111111111
Recognition – Academic, Renowned: 11111111111111111111111
Recommendations: 11111111
Recreation: 1
Reduction: 11111111111111111111111
Regard by Professional Bodies:
Registry:
Reinforce:
Relationships – lifelong: 11111111111111111
Relevance – Relevant, In Touch, update: 11111111111111111
Representation - Representative: 11111
Talent: 1
Teaching – Teachers, Educators, Pedagogic:
11111111111111111111111111111111
11111111111111111111111111111111
Theme(s):
Thinking – Conventional Thinking, Critical Thinking: 11
Timely – Timescales: 111
Track Record: 11
Traditional - Traditions: 1111
Transcripts: 1
Transformational: 11
Transparency: 111
Unaffected: 1
Uncertainty: 11
Understanding: 1111111111
Units: 1
Unsatisfactory: 11
Usage: 11111111111
Variety - Variance: 11111
Valuing People:
Virtual Circle:
Vision(s) - Expectations: 1
Well-Being – work-Life Balance:
STRATEGETRIC™ SOCIOMETRIC WORDING

Academic – Academic Staff, Focused, Goals, Challenge: 11111111
Academic - Freedom, Responsibilities, Environment:
Academic Support – Academic Apprentices:
Access: 1
Achievement – Delivery, enhanced academic performance: 1111
Acquisition – Acquire:
Administration - Administrative: 11111111
Admissions: 111111
Advice:
Agreement – Agree, Approve: 1
Aims- Aspiration(s): 1111111
Alignment:
Analysis – Critical Reflection: 1
 Appropriateness: 1111
Archives:
Areas – Approaches, Active, Activities, Fields, Catchment, Directions:
11111111111111111111
Autonomous:
Balance: 1
Barriers:
Benefit – Beneficiaries, Students, Student Needs, Student-centred, locally, the World:
Best Practice(s): 111
Best-known:
Board – Council, Congregation: 11111111111111111111
Broadening:
Carbon Emissions – Reduction:
Catalysts – Drivers:
Capabilities – Unique University Capabilities, Capacity:
Central:
Challenges – Challenging, Demanding, Domestic and Global:
Characteristics – Attributes, Characterises: 1
Charities:
Charter: 1
Citizenship:
Climate:
Coaching:
Collegiality – Colleges, Collegiate, Collegial University:
Colleagues:
Collaborate - Collaboration, Collaborative, Participation: 1
Commitment:
Committee(s), Task Force, groups: 1111111111111111
Communication – Targeted, Communication Value: 11
Community – Alumni, Awareness, Benefit, Civic Roots, Engagement, Local, People, Region, Society – needs, Support, university, Volunteering: 111111
Comparison:
Complaints: 11
Completion - Complete: 1
Comprehensive:
Conferences – Workshops, Exchanges, Lectures:
Confidence:
Contemporary:
Consolidation:
Consumption – Energy usage, water usage:
Context: 1111
Contributions – to community: 1
Continue – Continuing, ongoing, Lifelong: 11111111111111
Conventional Thinking:
Coordination: 11
Counselling:
Country-of-Origin:
Courteous:
Creative – Creativity, Create, Creation:
Curiosity – Intellectual:
Curriculum – Content: 1
Cycle:
Debate:
Defining: 11
Delegation – Delegated:
Demands – Future Demands: 11
Democracy:
Demonstrable - Demonstrate: 11
Depth – In-Depth:
Destination of Choice:
Development – Career, Cultural, Forwarding-Thinking, General, Organisational, Social: 111111
11111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111
Difficult - Complexity:
Dignity:
Disabilities: 111
Disaster Recovery:
Discipline(s) – academic, Inter-Disciplinary, Multi-Disciplinary, Schools, Institutions, Faculties, departments, Collegiate:
111111111111111111111111111111111111111111
Discovery (ies):
Distance Learning – Remote Learning:
Distinction – academic: 1
Distinctive:
Diversity – Diverse, Under-Represented Groups, Minorities: 1111111
Duplication:
Dynamism:
Education – Breadth, continuing education, Depth, Enriching, Experience, Inspiring,
Professional, tutorials, Unique Model: 1111111111111111
Efforts – Implementation: 1111111
Élite – University:
Element:
Embedding - Embedded: 11
Embracing:
Emphasis – Care: 1
Empowerment:
Enabling – Enabler, Ensure, Implement: 111111111111111111
Encourage – Encouragement: 1111
Engagement – Action, Activities, Maximising Potential: 111111
Enhancement – Enrichment, Social: 11111111
Enjoyment:
Environment (Cohesive, Dynamic, Excellent, Healthy, Intellectual, Positive, Rewarding,
Safe,
   Working, Learning, Recreational, Supportive, Pastoral): 1
Equality – of Opportunity, Disadvantaged Groups: 11
Esteem – Eminence, National, international:
Ethical:
Evidence - Evidenced-Based Approaches: 1
Examinations: 1
Exemplar – Example, Exemplary:
Excellence – Academic, Expertise, Centres of Excellence, Outstanding: 1111
Exceptional:
Expansion:
Expectations – Of Students, Of Staff, Of Stakeholders: 11111111111111
Experience – Student Experience, Outcomes, Positive, Supportive: 111111
Expertise - Experts:
Expression:
Extra-Curricular:
Family:
Features: 1
Fieldwork:
Flexibility - Flexible: 11
Framework - Framing:
Focus: 11
Foster:
Foundation:
Freedom – Freedom of Thought, Freedom of Speech – Without Penalty:
Full potential: 1
Full-time – Part-time, non-matriculated: 1111
Fundamental:
Gender: 1
Generation – Next Generation:
Guide – Guiding, Guidelines:
Governance – Good Governance:
Hallmark:
Heritage:
Higher Education:
Hub:
Ideas- Issues: 1111111
Impact – social, cultural, Global: 1
Improvement – Improved, Upgrades: 1111111
Independent:
Influential - influence:
Information – Information-Sharing, Informed: 11
Infrastructure – Development, Framework, Maintenance, Structure: 1
Initiatives - Enquiry:
Inquiry:
Insufficiency:
Integration – Interaction, Integrated: 1111111
Integrity:
Intellectual:
Intensive:
International – Ambitions, Global Networks, Global Footprint, Global University,
Recognition, Relationships, Staff, Student Body, World, World-Class: 11111111111111
Investigate – Investigation: 11
Involvement – Pro-active Involvement: 11
Justification – Justify: 11
Key: 1
Knowledge – New, Advancement, Knowledge-Related: 1
Laboratory: 1
Leading- leadership, Thought Leadership, Agenda-Setting: 1
Learning – Lifelong Learning, flexible learning: 1111111111111111111111
Legacy:
Library – Provision: 11
Limitations:
Links - Linkages: 1
Long-term Role:
Low-use:
Maintain - maintenance: 1111
Material:
Mentoring:
Methods – Mechanisms, Modus Operandi, Protocols: 1111111
Mind-Set:
Minimise - Minimal:
Momentum:
Museum(s) – Botanic Garden, Choirs, Collections, Galleries, Theatres, Orchestras:
Negotiation – Influence:
Network:
Norms: 1
Nurture(s):
Obligation – Mutual Obligation:
Occur – Happen:
Open – Openness, Open Access:
Opportunities – Exchange Opportunities: 111
Organisation – behavior:
Originality:
Outputs: 1
Outreach:
Oversight:
Overloading:
Paramount:
Parity:
Participation: 1
Patterns:
People-Based:
Portfolio:
Positioning - Position: 1
Positive:
Potential: 1111
Premise:
Preparation: 1
Preservation – Preserve:
Prevention – Inhibit:
Primacy – Importance: 11
Principle: 1
Proactive:
Problems:
Process(es):
Professionalism:
Profile:
Programmes – Flexible, modular, Regular: 1
Progress - Progression: 1111
Promote – Promotion: 111111111
Propose – Proposal: 1111
Protection: 1
Provision - Provide: 111111111111111111
Publishing:
Public – Engagement, Policy, Services, Sector, Understanding:
Purpose: 111
Qualification – Courses, Degree, Entry, Certificate, Diploma, Joint Honors, Summer
Schools: 11111111111111111111111111
Quality – Quality Outputs, Calibre: 1111111111
Recognition – Academic, Renowned:
Recommendations:
Recreation: 111
Regard by Professional Bodies:
Registry: 1
Reinforce:
Relationships – lifelong:
Relevancy – Relevant, In Touch, update: 1111111111
Representation - Representative: 1
Reputation: 11
Requirements: 111
Responsive – Responsiveness, Respond, Responsibility: 111
Respect – Mutual:
Restructuring:
R & D – Blue Sky, cutting edge, intensive, Enquiry, Investigation, Fundamental, Applied, Practice-based, Researchers, Research-Active, New and Better Ways: 11111111111111
Revision: 1
Robust - Rigour:
Role – Central Role: 11
Sabbatical Leave:
Satisfaction: 11
Scheduling - Scheduled:
Scholars:
Scholarship:
Sectors – Emerging: 1
Selective - Selected:
Self-Governance:
Self-awareness:
Services: 1111111
Shared:
Significance – Academic: 1
Social Justice:
Stages – Phases: 1
Standard(s) – Highest, Criteria, Outstanding: 1111111111
Standard – low-grade:
Stimulation – Stimulating: 1
Strength – Areas of, strengthen: 1
Student Charter:
Studies – Completion, Further, Overseas: 1
Subsidiarity:
Subvention:
Success – Future Success, Key Successes:
Suffered:
Suitable – Suitable Channels:
Supervision: 111
Support – Supported, Supportive: 11111111111111111111
Synergy:
Talent:
Teaching – Teachers, Educators, Pedagogic: 11111111111111111111
Theme(s):
Thinking – Conventional Thinking, Critical Thinking:
Timely – Timescales: 1
Track Record:
Traditional - Traditions:
Transcripts:
Transformational:
Transparency:
Unaffected:
Uncertainty:
Understanding: 11
Units:
Unsatisfactory:
Usage:
Variety - Variance: 1
Valuing People:
Virtual Circle:
Vision(s) - Expectations:
Well-Being – work-Life Balance: 11
STRATEGETRIC™ SOCIOMETRIC WORDING

Academic – Academic Staff, Focused, Goals, Challenge: 1
Academic - Freedom, Responsibilities, Environment:
Academic Support – Academic Apprentices:
Access:
Achievement – Delivery, enhanced academic performance: 1111111111111111
Acquisition – Acquire:
Administration - Administrative: 111
Admissions:
Advice: 1
Agreement – Agree, Approve:
Aims - Aspiration(s): 1
Alignment:
Analysis – Critical Reflection:
Appropriateness: 1
Archives:
Areas – Approaches, Active, Activities, Fields, Catchment, Directions: 1111111111111111
Autonomous:
Balance:
Barriers:
Benefit – Beneficiaries, Students, Student Needs, Student-centred, locally, the World: 11111
Best Practice(s): 11
Best-known:
Board – Council, Congregation:
Broadening:
Carbon Emissions – Reduction: 1
Catalysts – Drivers:
Capabilities – Unique University Capabilities, Capacity: 11
Central:
Challenges – Challenging, Demanding, Domestic and Global: 111
Characteristics – Attributes, Characterises:
Charities:
Charter:
Citizenship: 11
Climate:
Coaching:
Discovery (ies): 1
Distance Learning – Remote Learning:
Distinction – academic:
Distinctive:
Diversity – Diverse, Under-Represented Groups, Minorities: 111111111111
Duplication:
Dynamism:
Education – Breadth, continuing education, Depth, Enriching, Experience, Inspiring,
Professional, tutorials, Unique Model: 111
Efforts – Implementation:
Élite – University:
Element:
Embedding - Embedded:
Embracing:
Emphasis – Care:
Empowerment:
Enabling – Enabler, Ensure, Implement:
Encourage – Encouragement: 111111111111
Engagement – Action, Activities, Maximising Potential: 1
Enhancement – Enrichment, Social: 1111
Enjoyment:
Environment (Cohesive, Dynamic, Excellent, Healthy, Intellectual, Positive, Rewarding,
Safe,
Working, Learning, Recreational, Supportive, Pastoral): 111111
Equality – of Opportunity, Disadvantaged Groups: 1
Esteem – Eminence, National, international:
Ethical:
Evidence - Evidenced-Based Approaches:
Examinations:
Exemplar – Example, Exemplary:
Excellence – Academic, Expertise, Centres of Excellence, Outstanding: 111111
Exceptional:
Expansion:
Expectations – Of Students, Of Staff, Of Stakeholders: 11
Experience – Student Experience, Outcomes, Positive, Supportive: 11111111
Expertise - Experts: 1
Expression:
Extra-Curricular: 11111
Family:
Features:
Fieldwork:
Flexibility - Flexible: 1
Framework - Framing:
Focus:
Foster:
Foundation:
Freedom – Freedom of Thought, Freedom of Speech – Without Penalty:
Full potential:
Full-time – Part-time, non-matriculated:
Fundamental:
Gender:
Generation – Next Generation:
Guide – Guiding, Guidelines:
Governance – Good Governance: 11
Hallmark:
Heritage: 1
Higher Education:
Hub:
Ideas- Issues:
Impact – social, cultural, Global:
Improvement – Improved, Upgrades: 111111111111111111111111111111111
Independent:
Influential - influence: 111
Information – Information-Sharing, Informed:
Infrastructure – Development, Framework, Maintenance, Structure: 111111111111111111111111111111111
Initiatives - Enquiry: 11111
Inquiry:
Insufficiency:
Integration – Interaction, Integrated: 11111
Integrity:
Intellectual:
Intensive:
International – Ambitions, Global Networks, Global Footprint, Global University,
Recognition, Relationships, Staff, Student Body, World, World-Class:
111111111111111111111111111111111
Investigate – Investigation:
Involvement – Pro-active Involvement: 1
Justification – Justify:
Key:
Knowledge – New, Advancement, Knowledge-Related: 111
Leading- leadership, Thought Leadership, Agenda-Setting: 11
Learning – Lifelong Learning, flexible learning: 111111111
Legacy:
Library – Provision:
Limitations:
Links - Linkages:
Long-term Role:
Low-use:
Maintain - maintenance:
Material:
Mentoring:
Methods – Mechanisms, Modus Operandi, Protocols: 1
Mind-Set:
Minimise - Minimal:
Momentum:
Museum(s) – Botanic Garden, Choirs, Collections, Galleries, Theatres, Orchestras:
Negotiation – Influence:
Network:
Norms:
Nurture(s): 11
Obligation – Mutual Obligation:
Occur – Happen:
Open – Openness, Open Access:
Opportunities – Exchange Opportunities: 111111
Organisation – behavior:
Originality: 1
Outputs:
Outreach:
Oversight:
Overloading:
Paramount:
Parity:
Participation: 111
Patterns:
People-Based:
Portfolio:
Positioning - Position:
Positive:
Potential: 1111
Premise:
Preparation:
Preservation – Preserve:
Prevention – Inhibit:
Primacy – Importance:
Principle:
Proactive:
Problems:
Process(es): 11
Professionalism:
Profile:
Programmes – Flexible, modular, Regular: 111111
Progress - Progression: 1111
Promote – Promotion: 111111
Propose – Proposal;
Protection:
Provision - Provide:
Publishing:
Public – Engagement, Policy, Services, Sector, Understanding:
Purpose:
Qualification – Courses, Degree, Entry, Certificate, Diploma, Joint Honors, Summer
Schools: 1
Quality – Quality Outputs, Calibre: 111111111
Recognition – Academic, Renowned: 1111
Recommendations:
Recreation:
Reduction:
Regard by Professional Bodies:
Registry:
Reinforce: 1
Relationships – lifelong: 1
Relevance – Relevant, In Touch, update: 1
Representation - Representative:
Reputation: 11
Requirements:
Responsive – Responsiveness, Respond, Responsibility: 111
Respect – Mutual: 11
Restructuring:
R & D – Blue Sky, cutting edge, intensive, Enquiry, Investigation, Fundamental, Applied,
Practice-based, Researchers, Research-Active, New and Better Ways:
11111111111111111111111111111111111
Revision:
Robust - Rigour: 1
Role – Central Role:
Sabbatical Leave:
Satisfaction:
Scheduling - Scheduled:
Scholars:
Scholarship: 1
Sectors – Emerging: 1
Selective - Selected:
Self-Governance:
Self-awareness:
Services: 1
Shared:
Significance – Academic: 1
Social Justice:
Stages – Phases:
Standard(s) – Highest, Criteria, Outstanding: 111
Standard – low-grade:
Stimulation – Stimulating:
Strength – Areas of, strengthen: 111
Student Charter:
Studies – Completion, Further, Overseas:
Subsidiarity:
Subvention:
Success – Future Success, Key Successes: 111
Suffered:
Suitable – Suitable Channels:
Supervision:
Support – Supported, Supportive: 11111111111111111
Synergy: 1
Talent:
Teaching – Teachers, Educators, Pedagogic: 111111111111
Theme(s): 111111111
Thinking – Conventional Thinking, Critical Thinking:
Timely – Timescales: 1
Track Record:
Traditional – Traditions:
Transcripts:
Transformational:
Transparency:
Unaffected:
Uncertainty:
Understanding: 1
Units:
Unsatisfactory:
Usage:
Variety – Variance:
Valuing People: 1
Virtual Circle: 1
Vision(s) – Expectations: 11
Well-Being – work-Life Balance: 1
STRATEGERIC™ SOCIOMETRIC WORDING

Academic – Academic Staff, Focused, Goals, Challenge: 11
Academic Portfolio – Contents: Arts, Creative Arts, Humanities, Education, Sciences, Engineering, Finance, Technology, Mathematics, Law, Business, Health - Standards:
Academic - Freedom, Responsibilities, Environment: 1
Academic Support – Academic Apprentices: 1
Access:
Achievement – Delivery, enhanced academic performance: 111
Acquisition – Acquire:
Administration - Administrative: 1
Admissions:
Advice:
Agreement – Agree, Approve:
Aims- Aspiration(s):
Alignment:
Analysis – Critical Reflection:
 Appropriateness:
Archives:
Areas – Approaches, Active, Activities, Fields, Catchment, Directions: 1
Autonomous:
Balance: 1
Barriers:
Benefit – Beneficiaries, Students, Student Needs, Student-centred, locally, the World: 111111
Best Practice(s):
Best-known:
Board – Council, Congregation:
Broadening:
Carbon Emissions – Reduction:
Catalysts – Drivers:
Capabilities – Unique University Capabilities, Capacity:
Central:
Challenges – Challenging, Demanding, Domestic and Global:
Characteristics – Attributes, Characterises:
Charities:
Charter:
Citizenship:
Climate:
Coaching:
Collegiality – Colleges, Collegiate, Collegial University:
Colleagues:
Collaborate - Collaboration, Collaborative, Participation: 11111111
Commitment:
Committee(s), Task Force, groups:
Communication – Targeted, Communication Value: 11111111
Community – Alumni, Awareness, Benefit, Civic Roots, Engagement, Local, People, Region, Society – needs, Support, university, Volunteering: 1111
Comparison:
Complaints:
Completion - Complete:
Comprehensive:
Conferences – Workshops, Exchanges, Lectures:
Confidence:
Contemporary:
Consolidation:
Consumption – Energy usage, water usage:
Context:
Contribution – to community: 1
Continue – Continuing, ongoing, Lifelong:
Conventional Thinking:
Coordination:
Counselling:
Country-of-Origin:
Courtesy: 11
Creative – Creativity, Create, Creation: 1
Curiosity – Intellectual:
Curriculum – Content: 1
Cycle:
Debate:
Defining:
Delegation – Delegated:
Demands – Future Demands:
Democracy:
Demonstrable - Demonstrate:
Depth – In-Depth:
Destination of Choice:
Development – Career, Cultural, Forwarding-Thinking, General, Organisational, Social: 11111111
Difficult - Complexity:
Dignity: 111
Disabilities:
Disaster Recovery:
Discipline(s) – academic, Inter-Disciplinary, Multi-Disciplinary, Schools, Institutions, Faculties, departments, Collegiate: 11111111
Discovery (ies):
Distance Learning – Remote Learning:
Distinction – academic: 111
Distinctive:
Diversity – Diverse, Under-Represented Groups, Minorities:

Dynamism:

Education – Breadth, continuing education, Depth, Enriching, Experience, Inspiring, Professional, tutorials, Unique Model:

Efforts – Implementation:

Élite – University:

Element:

Embedding – Embedded:

Embracing:

Emphasis – Care:

Empowerment:

Enabling – Enabler, Ensure, Implement:

Encourage – Encouragement:

Engagement – Action, Activities, Maximising Potential:

Enhancement – Enrichment, Social:

Enjoyment:

Environment (Cohesive, Dynamic, Excellent, Healthy, Intellectual, Positive, Rewarding, Safe, Working, Learning, Recreational, Supportive, Pastoral):

Equality – of Opportunity, Disadvantaged Groups:

Esteem – Eminence, National, international:

Ethical:

Evidence – Evidenced-Based Approaches:

Examinations:

Exemplar – Example, Exemplary:

Excellence – Academic, Expertise, Centres of Excellence, Outstanding:

Exceptional:

Expansion:

Expectations – Of Students, Of Staff, Of Stakeholders:

Experience – Student Experience, Outcomes, Positive, Supportive:

Expertise – Experts:

Expression:

Extra-Curricular:

Family:

Features:

Fieldwork:

Flexibility – Flexible:

Framework – Framing:

Focus:

Foster:

Foundation:

Freedom – Freedom of Thought, Freedom of Speech – Without Penalty:

Full potential:

Full-time – Part-time, non-matriculated:
Fundamental:
Gender:
Generation – Next Generation:
Guide – Guiding, Guidelines:
Governance – Good Governance: 11
Hallmark:
Heritage:
Higher Education:
Hub:
Ideas - Issues:
Impact – social, cultural, Global: 111111111
Improvement – Improved, Upgrades: 1
Independent:
Influential - influence:
Information – Information-Sharing, Informed:
Infrastructure – Development, Framework, Maintenance, Structure: 11111111
Initiatives - Enquiry: 11111
Inquiry:
Insufficiency:
Integration – Interaction, Integrated: 1
Integrity: 1
Intellectual – Intellectual Curiosity: 11
Intensive:
International – Ambitions, Global Networks, Global Footprint, Global University,
Recognition, Relationships, Staff, Student Body, World, World-Class: 1111111111111
Investigate – Investigation:
Involvement – Pro-active Involvement:
Justification – Justify:
Key:
Knowledge – New, Advancement, Knowledge-Related: 1
Leading- leadership, Thought Leadership, Agenda-Setting: 111
Learning – Lifelong Learning, flexible learning: 111
Legacy:
Library – Provision: 1
Limitations:
Links - Linkages:
Long-term Role: 1
Low-use:
Maintain - maintenance:
Material:
Mentoring:
Methods – Mechanisms, Modus Operandi, Protocols:
Mind-Set:
Minimise - Minimal:
Momentum:
Museum(s) – Botanic Garden, Choirs, Collections, Galleries, Theatres, Orchestras:
Negotiation – Influence:
Network:
Norms:
Nurture(s):
Obligation – Mutual Obligation:
Occur – Happen:
Open – Openness, Open Access: 111
Opportunities – Exchange Opportunities:
Organisation – behavior: 1
Originality: 111
Outputs:
Outreach: 1
Oversight:
Overloading:
Paramount:
Parity:
Participation:
Patterns:
People-Based: 1
Portfolio:
Positioning - Position:
Positive:
Potential: 11
Premise:
Preparation:
Preservation – Preserve:
Prevention – Inhibit:
Primacy – Importance:
Principle:
Proactive:
Problems:
Process(es):
Professionalism:
Profile:
Programmes – Flexible, modular, Regular:
Progress - Progression:
Promote – Promotion:
Propose – Proposal;
Protection:
Provision - Provide:
Publishing:
Public – Engagement, Policy, Services, Sector, Understanding: 1111111
Purpose:
Qualification – Courses, Degree, Entry, Certificate, Diploma, Joint Honors, Summer Schools: Quality – Quality Outputs, Calibre: 111
Recognition – Academic, Renowned: 11
Recommendations:
Recreation:
Reduction:
Regard by Professional Bodies: 1
Registry:
Reinforce:
Relationships – lifelong: 111
Relevance – Relevant, In Touch, update: 111
Representation - Representative: 1
Reputation: 1
Requirements:
Responsive – Responsiveness, Respond, Responsibility:
Respect – Mutual: 1
Restructuring:
R & D – Blue Sky, cutting edge, intensive, Enquiry, Investigation, Fundamental, Applied, Practice-based, Researchers, Research-Active, New and Better Ways:
Revision:
Robust - Rigour: 111
Role – Central Role:
Sabbatical Leave:
Satisfaction:
Scheduling - Scheduled:
Scholars:
Scholarship: 1111111
Sectors – Emerging:
Selective - Selected:
Self-Governance:
Self-awareness:
Services:
Shared:
Significance – Academic: 1
Social Justice:
Stages – Phases:
Standard(s) – Highest, Criteria, Outstanding: 1
Standard – low-grade:
Stimulation – Stimulating:
Strength – Areas of, strengthen:
Student Charter:
Studies – Completion, Further, Overseas: 11
Subsidiarity:
Subvention:
Success – Future Success, Key Successes: 11
Suffered:
Suitable – Suitable Channels: 1
Supervision:
Support – Supported, Supportive:
Synergy:
Talent:
Teaching – Teachers, Educators, Pedagogic: 111
Theme(s):
Thinking – Conventional Thinking, Critical Thinking:
Timely – Timescales:
Track Record:
Traditional - Traditions:
Transcripts:
Transformational:
Transparency: 1
Unaffected:
Uncertainty:
Understanding: 1
Units:
Unsatisfactory:
Usage:
Variety - Variance:
Valuing People: 1
Virtual Circle:
Vision(s) - Expectations: 11
Well-Being – work-Life Balance:
BIRMINGHAM UNIVERSITY – 5 YEAR STRATEGIC PLAN
(2010 - 2015)

STRATEGETRIC™ SOCIOMETRIC WORDING

Academic – Academic Staff, Focused, Goals, Challenge: 11111111
Academic - Freedom, Responsibilities, Environment:
Academic Support – Academic Apprentices:
Access:
Achievement – Delivery, enhanced academic performance: 1111
Acquisition – Acquire:
Administration - Administrative:
Admissions:
Advice:
Agreement – Agree, Approve:
Aims- Aspiration(s):
Alignment:
Analysis – Critical Reflection:
Appropriateness:
Archives:
Areas – Approaches, Active, Activities, Fields, Catchment, Directions:
Autonomous:
Balance:
Barriers:
Benefit – Beneficiaries, Students, Student Needs, Student-centred, locally, the World: 1
Best Practice(s):
Best-known:
Board – Council, Congregation:
Broadening:
Carbon Emissions – Reduction:
Catalysts – Drivers:
Capabilities – Unique University Capabilities, Capacity:
Central:
Challenges – Challenging, Demanding, Domestic and Global: 11111
Characteristics – Attributes, Characterises:
Charities: 11
Charter:
Citizenship:
Climate:
Coaching:
Collegiality – Colleges, Collegiate, Collegial University:
Colleagues:
Collaborate - Collaboration, Collaborative, Participation: 111111
Commitment:
Committee(s), Task Force, groups:
Communication – Targeted, Communication Value:
Community – Alumni, Awareness, Benefit, Civic Roots, Engagement, Local, People, Region, Society – needs, Support, university, Volunteering: 111111111111111
Comparison:
Complaints:
Completion - Complete:
Comprehensive:
Conferences – Workshops, Exchanges, Lectures:
Confidence: 1
Contemporary:
Consolidation:
Consumption – Energy usage, water usage:
Context:
Contribution – to community: 1
Continue – Continuing, ongoing, Lifelong:
Conventional Thinking:
Coordination:
Counselling:
Country-of-Origin:
Courtesy:
Creative – Creativity, Create, Creation:
Curiosity – Intellectual: 111
Curriculum – Content:
Cycle:
Debate: 11
Defining:
Delegation – Delegated:
Demands – Future Demands:
Democracy:
Demonstrable - Demonstrate:
Depth – In-Depth:
Destination of Choice: 11
Development – Career, Cultural, Forwarding-Thinking, General, Organisational, Social: 11111
Difficult - Complexity:
Dignity:
Disabilities:
Disaster Recovery:
Discipline(s) – academic, Inter-Disciplinary, Multi-Disciplinary, Schools, Institutions, Faculties, departments, Collegiate: 111111111
Discovery (ies):
Distance Learning – Remote Learning:
Distinction – academic: 1
Distinctive: 1111111
Diversity – Diverse, Under-Represented Groups, Minorities: 1
Dynamism:
Education – Breadth, continuing education, Depth, Enriching, Experience, Inspiring,
Professional, tutorials, Unique Model:
Efforts – Implementation:
Élite – University: 1
Element:
Embedding - Embedded:
Embracing:
Emphasis – Care:
Empowerment:
Enabling – Enabler, Ensure, Implement:
Encourage – Encouragement:
Engagement – Action, Activities, Maximising Potential: 1111
Enhancement – Enrichment, Social: 111111111
Enjoyment:
Environment (Cohesive, Dynamic, Excellent, Healthy, Intellectual, Positive, Rewarding,
Safe,
Working, Learning, Recreational, Supportive, Pastoral): 1111111111111
Equality – of Opportunity, Disadvantaged Groups: 1
Esteem – Eminence, National, international: 11
Ethical:
Evidence - Evidenced-Based Approaches:
Examinations:
Exemplar – Example, Exemplary:
Excellence – Academic, Expertise, Centres of Excellence, Outstanding: 1111111111111
Exceptional:
Expansion:
Expectations – Of Students, Of Staff, Of Stakeholders:
Experience – Student Experience, Outcomes, Positive, Supportive: 111111111111111
Expertise - Experts:
Expression:
Extra-Curricular: 111
Family:
Features:
Fieldwork:
Flexibility - Flexible:
Framework - Framing:
Focus:
Foster:
Foundation:
Freedom – Freedom of Thought, Freedom of Speech – Without Penalty:
Full potential:
Full-time – Part-time, non-matriculated:
Fundamental:
Gender:
Generation – Next Generation:
Guide – Guiding, Guidelines:
Governance – Good Governance:
Hallmark:
Heritage: 1
Higher Education:
Hub:
Ideas- Issues: 11
Impact – social, cultural, Global: 111111111
Improvement – Improved, Upgrades:
Independent:
Influential - influence:
Information – Information-Sharing, Informed:
Infrastructure – Development, Framework, Maintenance, Structure: 1111
Initiatives - Enquiry: 1111111111
Inquiry:
Insufficiency:
Integration – Interaction, Integrated:
Integrity:
Intellectual:
Intensive:
International – Ambitions, Global Networks, Global Footprint, Global University,
Recognition, Relationships, Staff, Student Body, World, World-Class:
11111111111111111111111111111111
111111111111
Investigate – Investigation:
Involvement – Pro-active Involvement:
Justification – Justify:
Key:
Knowledge – New, Advancement, Knowledge-Related: 1
Leading- leadership, Thought Leadership, Agenda-Setting: 111111111
Learning – Lifelong Learning, flexible learning:
Legacy: 1
Library – Provision:
Limitations:
Links - Linkages:
Long-term Role:
Low-use:
Maintain - maintenance:
Material:
Mentoring: 1
Methods – Mechanisms, Modus Operandi, Protocols:
Mind-Set:
Minimise - Minimal:
Momentum:
Museum(s) – Botanic Garden, Choirs, Collections, Galleries, Theatres, Orchestras: 11111
Negotiation – Influence:
Network:
Norms:
Nurture(s):
Obligation – Mutual Obligation:
Occur – Happen:
Open – Openness, Open Access:
Opportunities – Exchange Opportunities: 1111
Organisation – behavior: 1111
Originality: 11
Outputs:
Outreach:
Oversight:
Overloading:
Paramount:
Parity:
Participation: 11
Patterns:
People-Based:
Portfolio:
Positioning - Position:
Positive:
Potential:
Premise:
Preparation:
Preservation – Preserve:
Prevention – Inhibit:
Primacy – Importance:
Principle:
Proactive:
Problems:
Process(es):
Professionalism:
Profile:
Programmes – Flexible, modular, Regular: 1
Progress - Progression:
Promote – Promotion:
Propose – Proposal;
Protection:
Provision - Provide:
Publishing:
Public – Engagement, Policy, Services, Sector, Understanding:
Purpose:
Qualification – Courses, Degree, Entry, Certificate, Diploma, Joint Honors, Summer Schools: Quality – Quality Outputs, Calibre: 11111111111111111111
Recognition – Academic, Renowned: 1
Recommendations:
Recreation:
Reduction:
Regard by Professional Bodies:
Registry:
Reinforce:
Relationships – lifelong:
Relevance – Relevant, In Touch, update:
Representation - Representative:
Reputation: 11
Requirements:
Responsive – Responsiveness, Respond, Responsibility:
Respect – Mutual:
Restructuring:
R & D – Blue Sky, cutting edge, intensive, Enquiry, Investigation, Fundamental, Applied, Practice-based, Researchers, Research-Active, New and Better Ways:
Revision:
Robust - Rigour: 1111
Role – Central Role:
Sabbatical Leave:
Satisfaction:
Scheduling - Scheduled:
Scholars:
Scholarship: 111111
Sectors – Emerging:
Selective - Selected:
Self-Governance:
Self-awareness:
Services:
Shared:
Significance – Academic: 11
Social Justice:
Stages – Phases:
Standard(s) – Highest, Criteria, Outstanding: 1
Standard – low-grade:
Stimulation – Stimulating:
Strength – Areas of, strengthen:
Student Charter:
Studies – Completion, Further, Overseas:
Subsidiarity:
Subvention:
Success – Future Success, Key Successes: 11111
Suffered:
Suitable – Suitable Channels:
Supervision:
Support – Supported, Supportive:
Synergy:
Talent:
Teaching – Teachers, Educators, Pedagogic: 111111111111
Theme(s):
Thinking – Conventional Thinking, Critical Thinking:
Timely – Timescales:
Track Record:
Traditional - Traditions:
Transcripts:
Transformational:
Transparency:
Unaffected:
Uncertainty:
Understanding:
Units:
Unsatisfactory:
Usage:
Variety - Variance:
Valuing People:
Virtual Circle: 1
Vision(s) - Expectations: 1111
Well-Being – work-Life Balance:
LANCASTER UNIVERSITY – 6 YEAR STRATEGIC PLAN
(2009 – 2015)

STRATEGETRIC™ SOCIOMETRIC WORDING

Academic – Academic Staff, Focused, Goals, Challenge: 1
Academic - Freedom, Responsibilities, Environment: 11
Academic Support – Academic Apprentices:
Access:
Achievement – Delivery, enhanced academic performance: 11
Acquisition – Acquire:
Administration - Administrative: 11
Admissions:
Advice:
Agreement – Agree, Approve:
Aims - Aspiration(s):
Alignment:
Analysis – Critical Reflection: 111
 Appropriateness:
Archives:
Areas – Approaches, Active, Activities, Fields, Catchment, Directions:
Autonomous:
Balance: 111
Barriers:
Benefit – Beneficiaries, Students, Student Needs, Student-centred, locally, the World: 1
Best Practice(s): 1
Best-known:
Board – Council, Congregation:
Broadening:
Carbon Emissions – Reduction:
Catalysts – Drivers: 1
Capabilities – Unique University Capabilities, Capacity:
Central:
Challenges – Challenging, Demanding, Domestic and Global: 1111111111
Characteristics – Attributes, Characterises:
Charities: 11
Charter:
Citizenship:
Climate:
Coaching: 1
Collegiality – Colleges, Collegiate, Collegial University: 111
Colleagues:
Collaborate - Collaboration, Collaborative, Participation: 1111111111
Commitment:
Committee(s), Task Force, groups:
Communication – Targeted, Communication Value: 11
Community – Alumni, Awareness, Benefit, Civic Roots, Engagement, Local, People, Region, Society – needs, Support, university, Volunteering: 1111111111111111111111111
Comparison:
Complaints:
Completion - Complete:
Comprehensive:
Conferences – Workshops, Exchanges, Lectures:
Confidence:
Contemporary:
Consolidation:
Consumption – Energy usage, water usage:
Context:
Contribution – to community:
Continue – Continuing, ongoing, Lifelong:
Conventional Thinking:
Coordination:
Counselling:
Country-of-Origin:
Courtesy:
Creative – Creativity, Create, Creation: 111
Curiosity – Intellectual:
Curriculum – Content:
Cycle:
Debate:
Defining:
Delegation – Delegated:
Demands – Future Demands:
Democracy:
Demonstrable - Demonstrate:
Depth – In-Depth:
Destination of Choice:
Development – Career, Cultural, Forwarding-Thinking, General, Organisational, Social: 1111
Difficult - Complexity:
Dignity:
Disabilities:
Disaster Recovery:
Discipline(s) – academic, Inter-Disciplinary, Multi-Disciplinary, Schools, Institutions, Faculties, departments, Collegiate: 11111
Discovery (ies):
Distance Learning – Remote Learning:
Distinction – academic:
Distinctive: 11111
Diversity – Diverse, Under-Represented Groups, Minorities: 111
Dynamism:
Education – Breadth, continuing education, Depth, Enriching, Experience, Inspiring,
Professional, tutorials, Unique Model:
Efforts – Implementation:
Élite – University: 1
Element:
Embedding - Embedded:
Embracing:
Emphasis – Care:
Empowerment:
Enabling – Enabler, Ensure, Implement:
Encourage – Encouragement:
Engagement – Action, Activities, Maximising Potential: 111111
Enhancement – Enrichment, Social: 11
Enjoyment:
Environment (Cohesive, Dynamic, Excellent, Healthy, Intellectual, Positive, Rewarding,
Safe,
Working, Learning, Recreational, Supportive, Pastoral): 111111111111111111111
Equality – of Opportunity, Disadvantaged Groups: 1111111
Esteem – Eminence, National, international:
Ethical: 11
Evidence - Evidenced-Based Approaches:
Examinations:
Exemplar – Example, Exemplary:
Excellence – Academic, Expertise, Centres of Excellence, Outstanding: 1111111
Exceptional:
Expansion:
Expectations – Of Students, Of Staff, Of Stakeholders: 1
Experience – Student Experience, Outcomes, Positive, Supportive: 1111111
Expertise - Experts:
Expression:
Extra-Curricular:
Family:
Features:
Fieldwork:
Flexibility - Flexible:
Framework - Framing:
Focus:
Foster:
Foundation:
Freedom – Freedom of Thought, Freedom of Speech – Without Penalty:
Full potential:
Full-time – Part-time, non-matriculated:
Fundamental:
Gender:
Generation – Next Generation:
Guide – Guiding, Guidelines:
Governance – Good Governance: 1
Hallmark:
Heritage:
Higher Education:
Hub:
Ideas- Issues: 11111111
Impact – social, cultural, Global: 1111111
Improvement – Improved, Upgrades: 111
Independent:
Influential - influence:
Information – Information-Sharing, Informed: 1
Infrastructure – Development, Framework, Maintenance, Structure: 111111
Initiatives - Enquiry: 1111
Inquiry:
Insufficiency:
Integration – Interaction, Integrated: 111111
Integrity: 1
Intellectual:
Intensive:
International – Ambitions, Global Networks, Global Footprint, Global University,
Recognition, Relationships, Staff, Student Body, World, World-Class:
1111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111111
Museum(s) – Botanic Garden, Choirs, Collections, Galleries, Theatres, Orchestras:
Negotiation – Influence: 1
Network:
Norms:
Nurture(s):
Obligation – Mutual Obligation:
Occur – Happen:
Open – Openness, Open Access:
Opportunities – Exchange Opportunities: 11111
Organisation – behavior:
Originality:
Outputs:
Outreach:
Oversight:
Overloading:
Paramount:
Parity:
Participation: 11
Patterns:
People-Based:
Portfolio:
Positioning - Position:
Positive:
Potential: 1
Premise:
Preparation:
Preservation – Preserve:
Prevention – Inhibit:
Primacy – Importance:
Principle:
Proactive:
Problems:
Process(es): 111
Professionalism: 1
Profile:
Programmes – Flexible, modular, Regular: 111111111
Progress - Progression: 1
Promote – Promotion:
Propose – Proposal;
Protection:
Provision - Provide:
Publishing:
Public – Engagement, Policy, Services, Sector, Understanding: 1
Purpose:
Qualification – Courses, Degree, Entry, Certificate, Diploma, Joint Honors, Summer Schools: 111111111
Quality – Quality Outputs, Calibre: 1111111111111111111
Recognition – Academic, Renowned: 111
Recommendations:
Recreation:
Reduction:
Regard by Professional Bodies:
Registry:
Reinforce:
Relationships – lifelong:
Relevance – Relevant, In Touch, update: 111
Representation - Representative:
Reputation: 1111111
Requirements:
Responsive – Responsiveness, Respond, Responsibility: 111
Respect – Mutual: 1
Restructuring:
R & D – Blue Sky, cutting edge, intensive, Enquiry, Investigation, Fundamental, Applied, Practice-based, Researchers, Research-Active, New and Better Ways:
111111111111111111111
Revision:
Robust - Rigour:
Role – Central Role:
Sabbatical Leave:
Satisfaction: 1
Scheduling - Scheduled:
Scholars:
Scholarship: 111
Sectors – Emerging: 1
Selective - Selected:
Self-Governance:
Self-awareness:
Services: 1111111
Shared:
Significance – Academic:
Social Justice:
Stages – Phases:
Standard(s) – Highest, Criteria, Outstanding: 111111111
Standard – low-grade:
Stimulation – Stimulating:
Strength – Areas of, strengthen:
Student Charter:
Studies – Completion, Further, Overseas: 1
Subsidiarity:
Subvention:
Success – Future Success, Key Successes: 1
Suffered:
Suitable – Suitable Channels: 1
Supervision:
Support – Supported, Supportive: 11111
Synergy:
Talent:
Teaching – Teachers, Educators, Pedagogic: 111111111111111111
Theme(s):
Thinking – Conventional Thinking, Critical Thinking:
Timely – Timescales: 1
Track Record:
Traditional - Traditions:
Transcripts:
Transformational:
Transparency:
Unaffected:
Uncertainty:
Understanding:
Units:
Unsatisfactory:
Usage:
Variety - Variance:
Valuing People:
Virtual Circle:
Vision(s) - Expectations: 111
Well-Being – work-Life Balance: 1
STRATEGETRIC™ SOCIOMETRIC WORDING

Academic – Academic Staff, Focused, Goals, Challenge: 1
Academic - Freedom, Responsibilities, Environment:
Academic Support – Academic Apprentices:
Access:
Achievement – Delivery, enhanced academic performance: 11111111
Acquisition – Acquire:
Administration - Administrative:
Admissions:
Advice:
Agreement – Agree, Approve:
Aims- Aspiration(s):
Alignment:
Analysis – Critical Reflection:
Appropriateness:
Archives:
Areas – Approaches, Active, Activities, Fields, Catchment, Directions:
Autonomous:
Balance:
Barriers:
Benefit – Beneficiaries, Students, Student Needs, Student-centred, locally, the World:
Best Practice(s):
Best-known:
Board – Council, Congregation:
Broadening:
Carbon Emissions – Reduction:
Catalysts – Drivers:
Capabilities – Unique University Capabilities, Capacity: 11
Central:
Challenges – Challenging, Demanding, Domestic and Global:
Characteristics – Attributes, Characterises:
Charities:
Charter:
Citizenship:
Climate:
Coaching:
Collegiality – Colleges, Collegiate, Collegial University:
Colleagues:
Collaborate - Collaboration, Collaborative, Participation:
Commitment:
Committee(s), Task Force, groups:
Communication – Targeted, Communication Value:
Community – Alumni, Awareness, Benefit, Civic Roots, Engagement, Local, People,
Region, Society – needs, Support, university, Volunteering: 1111
Comparison:
Complaints:
Completion - Complete:
Comprehensive:
Conferences –Workshops, Exchanges, Lectures:
Confidence:
Contemporary:
Consolidation:
Consumption – Energy usage, water usage:
Context:
Contribution – to community:
Continue – Continuing, ongoing, Lifelong:
Conventional Thinking:
Coordination:
Counselling:
Country-of-Origin:
Courteous:
Creative – Creativity, Create, Creation:
Curiosity – Intellectual:
Curriculum – Content:
Cycle:
Debate:
Defining:
Delegation – Delegated:
Demands – Future Demands:
Democracy:
Demonstrable - Demonstrate:
Depth – In-Depth:
Destination of Choice:
Development – Career, Cultural, Forwarding-Thinking, General, Organisational, Social:
Difficult - Complexity:
Dignity:
Disabilities:
Disaster Recovery:
Discipline(s) – academic, Inter-Disciplinary, Multi-Disciplinary, Schools, Institutions,
Faculties, departments, Collegiate:
Discovery (ies):
Distance Learning – Remote Learning:
Distinction – academic:
Distinctive: 111
Diversity – Diverse, Under-Represented Groups, Minorities: 1111
Duplication:
Dynamism:
Education – Breadth, continuing education, Depth, Enriching, Experience, Inspiring, Professional, tutorials, Unique Model: 11
Efforts – Implementation:
Élite – University:
Element:
Embedding - Embedded:
Embracing:
Emphasis – Care:
Empowerment:
Enabling – Enabler, Ensure, Implement:
Encourage – Encouragement:
Engagement – Action, Activities, Maximising Potential:
Enhancement – Enrichment, Social: 1
Enjoyment:
Environment (Cohesive, Dynamic, Excellent, Healthy, Intellectual, Positive, Rewarding, Safe,
Working, Learning, Recreational, Supportive, Pastoral): 1111
Equality – of Opportunity, Disadvantaged Groups:
Esteem – Eminence, National, international:
Ethical:
Evidence - Evidenced-Based Approaches:
Examinations:
Exemplar – Example, Exemplary:
Excellence – Academic, Expertise, Centres of Excellence, Outstanding: 111
Exceptional:
Expansion:
Expectations – Of Students, Of Staff, Of Stakeholders:
Experience – Student Experience, Outcomes, Positive, Supportive: 111
Expertise - Experts:
Expression:
Extra-Curricular:
Family:
Features:
Fieldwork:
Flexibility - Flexible:
Framework - Framing:
Focus:
Foster:
Foundation:
Freedom – Freedom of Thought, Freedom of Speech – Without Penalty:
Full potential:
Full-time – Part-time, non-matriculated:
Fundamental:
Gender:
Generation – Next Generation:
Guide – Guiding, Guidelines:
Governance – Good Governance:
Hallmark:
Heritage:
Higher Education:
Hub:
Ideas- Issues: 11
Impact – social, cultural, Global: 1
Improvement – Improved, Upgrades:
Independent:
Influential - influence:
Information – Information-Sharing, Informed:
Infrastructure – Development, Framework, Maintenance, Structure:
Initiatives - Enquiry:
Inquiry:
Insufficiency:
Integration – Interaction, Integrated: 1
Integrity:
Intellectual:
Intensive:
International – Ambitions, Global Networks, Global Footprint, Global University, Recognition, Relationships, Staff, Student Body, World, World-Class: 111111
Investigate – Investigation:
Involvement – Pro-active Involvement:
Justification – Justify:
Key:
Knowledge – New, Advancement, Knowledge-Related: 11
Leading- leadership, Thought Leadership, Agenda-Setting:
Learning – Lifelong Learning, flexible learning: 11111111
Legacy:
Library – Provision:
Limitations:
Links - Linkages:
Long-term Role:
Low-use:
Maintain - maintenance:
Material:
Mentoring:
Methods – Mechanisms, Modus Operandi, Protocols: 11
Mind-Set:
Minimise - Minimal:
Momentum:
Museum(s) – Botanic Garden, Choirs, Collections, Galleries, Theatres, Orchestras:
Negotiation – Influence:
Network:
Norms:
Nurture(s):
Obligation – Mutual Obligation:
Occur – Happen:
Open – Openness, Open Access:
Opportunities – Exchange Opportunities:
Organisation – behavior:
Originality:
Outputs:
Outreach:
Oversight:
Overloading:
Paramount:
Parity:
Participation:
Patterns:
People-Based:
Portfolio:
Positioning - Position:
Positive:
Potential:
Premise:
Preparation:
Preservation – Preserve:
Prevention – Inhibit:
Primacy – Importance:
Principle:
Proactive:
Problems:
Process(es):
Professionalism:
Profile:
Programmes – Flexible, modular, Regular:
Progress - Progression:
Promote – Promotion:
Propose – Proposal;
Protection:
Provision - Provide:
PUBLISHING:
Public – Engagement, Policy, Services, Sector, Understanding:
Purpose:
Qualification – Courses, Degree, Entry, Certificate, Diploma, Joint Honors, Summer
Schools: 111111
111111111111
Quality – Quality Outputs, Calibre:
Recognition – Academic, Renowned:
Recommendations:
Recreation:
Reduction:
Regard by Professional Bodies:
Registry:
Reinforce:
Relationships – lifelong:
Relevance – Relevant, In Touch, update:
Representation - Representative:
Reputation: 1
Requirements:
Responsive – Responsiveness, Respond, Responsibility: 1
Respect – Mutual:
Restructuring:
R & D – Blue Sky, cutting edge, intensive, Enquiry, Investigation, Fundamental, Applied, Practice-based, Researchers, Research-Active, New and Better Ways: 11111111
Revision:
Robust - Rigour: 1
Role – Central Role:
Sabbatical Leave:
Satisfaction:
Scheduling - Scheduled:
Scholars:
Scholarship: 1
Sectors – Emerging:
Selective - Selected:
Self-Governance:
Self-awareness:
Services:
Shared:
Significance – Academic:
Social Justice: 1
Stages – Phases:
Standard(s) – Highest, Criteria, Outstanding:
Standard – low-grade:
Stimulation – Stimulating:
Strength – Areas of, strengthen:
Student Charter:
Studies – Completion, Further, Overseas:
Subsidiarity:
Subvention:
Success – Future Success, Key Successes: 111
Suffered:
Suitable – Suitable Channels:
Supervision:
Support – Supported, Supportive:
Synergy:
Talent:
Teaching – Teachers, Educators, Pedagogic: 1
Theme(s):
Thinking – Conventional Thinking, Critical Thinking:
Timely – Timescales:
Track Record:
Traditional - Traditions:
Transcripts:
Transformational:
Transparency:
Unaffected:
Uncertainty:
Understanding:
Units:
Unsatisfactory:
Usage:
Variety - Variance:
Valuing People:
Virtual Circle:
Vision(s) - Expectations:
Well-Being – work-Life Balance:
Academic – Academic Staff, Focused, Goals, Challenge: 11111111111
Academic - Freedom, Responsibilities, Environment:
Academic Support – Academic Apprentices:
Access:
Achievement – Delivery, enhanced academic performance: 1111111111111111
Acquisition – Acquire:
Administration - Administrative:
Admissions:
Advice:
Agreement – Agree, Approve:
Aims- Aspiration(s): 111111111111111
Alignment: 11
Analysis – Critical Reflection: 111
Appropriateness: 1
Archives:
Areas – Approaches, Active, Activities, Fields, Catchment, Directions:
1111111111111111111
1111111111111111111111
Autonomous:
Balance: 11
Barriers:
Benefit – Beneficiaries, Students, Student Needs, Student-centred, locally, the World: 1111111111111
111
Best Practice(s): 1
Best-known:
Board – Council, Congregation:
Broadening: 111
Carbon Emissions – Reduction:
Catalysts – Drivers: 111111111
Capabilities – Unique University Capabilities, Capacity: 111
Central:
Challenges – Challenging, Demanding, Domestic and Global: 111111111111
Characteristics – Attributes, Characterises: 1111111111111111
Charities: 1
Charter: 111
Citizenship:
Climate:
Coaching:
Collegiality – Colleges, Collegiate, Collegial University:
Colleagues:
Collaborate - Collaboration, Collaborative, Participation: 11111
Commitment: 1111111111
Committee(s), Task Force, groups:
Communication – Targeted, Communication Value: 111
Community – Alumni, Awareness, Benefit, Civic Roots, Engagement, Local, People, Region, Society – needs, Support, university, Volunteering: 1111111111111111111111111
Comparison:
Complaints:
Completion - Complete:
Comprehensive:
Conferences – Workshops, Exchanges, Lectures:
Confidence: 111
Contemporary:
Consolidation:
Consumption – Energy usage, water usage:
Context: 1
Contribution – to community: 11111111
Continue – Continuing, ongoing, Lifelong: 1111111111111111111
Conventional Thinking: 1
Coordination:
Counselling:
Country-of-Origin:
Courtesy: 1
Creative – Creativity, Create, Creation: 11111111111
Curiosity – Intellectual:
Curriculum – Content: 1111111
Cycle:
Debate:
Defining: 11
Delegation – Delegated:
Demands – Future Demands: 11111
Democracy:
Demonstrable - Demonstrate: 11111
Depth – In-Depth:
Destination of Choice:
Development – Career, Cultural, Forwarding-Thinking, General, Organisational, Social: 111111111
Difficult - Complexity:
Dignity:
Disabilities:
Disaster Recovery:
Discipline(s) – academic, Inter-Disciplinary, Multi-Disciplinary, Schools, Institutions, Faculties, departments, Collegiate: 11111111
Discovery (ies):
Distance Learning – Remote Learning: 111
Distinction – academic:
Distinctive: 11111111
Diversity – Diverse, Under-Represented Groups, Minorities: 11111111
Duplication:
Dynamism:
Education – Breadth, continuing education, Depth, Enriching, Experience, Inspiring, Professional, tutorials, Unique Model: 11111111111111111
Efforts – Implementation:
Élite – University:
Element:
Embedding - Embedded: 111
Embracing: 1111
Emphasis – Care:
Empowerment: 1
Enabling – Enabler, Ensure, Implement: 111111
Encourage – Encouragement: 1111
Engagement – Action, Activities, Maximising Potential: 111111111111111111
Enhancement – Enrichment, Social: 11111111
Enjoyment: 1
Environment (Cohesive, Dynamic, Excellent, Healthy, Intellectual, Positive, Rewarding, Safe, Working, Learning, Recreational, Supportive, Pastoral): 1111111111111
Equality – of Opportunity, Disadvantaged Groups:
Esteem – Eminence, National, international:
Ethical: 1
Evidence - Evidenced-Based Approaches:
Examinations:
Exemplar – Example, Exemplary: 11111
Excellence – Academic, Expertise, Centres of Excellence, Outstanding: 111111
Exceptional:
Expansion:
Expectations – Of Students, Of Staff, Of Stakeholders: 1
Experience – Student Experience, Outcomes, Positive, Supportive: 1111111111111
Expertise - Experts: 111
Expression:
Extra-Curricular:
Family: 1
Features: 1
Fieldwork:
Flexibility - Flexible: 11111111
Framework - Framing: 1
Focus: 111111111
Foster:
Foundation:
Freedom – Freedom of Thought, Freedom of Speech – Without Penalty:
Full potential:
Full-time – Part-time, non-matriculated:
Fundamental:
Gender:
Generation – Next Generation: 111
Guide – Guiding, Guidelines: 1
Governance – Good Governance:
Hallmark:
Heritage: 11
Higher Education:
Hub:
Ideas-Issues:
Impact – social, cultural, Global: 11111
Improvement – Improved, Upgrades: 111
Independent:
Influential - influence: 1
Information – Information-Sharing, Informed:
Infrastructure – Development, Framework, Maintenance, Structure: 111
Initiatives - Enquiry: 1
Inquiry:
Insufficiency:
Integration – Interaction, Integrated: 11111
Integrity: 1111
Intellectual:
Intensive:
International – Ambitions, Global Networks, Global Footprint, Global University,
Recognition, Relationships, Staff, Student Body, World, World-Class:
1111111111111111111111111111111111
Investigate – Investigation:
Involvement – Pro-active Involvement: 11111
Justification – Justify:
Key: 111111111111111
Knowledge – New, Advancement, Knowledge-Related: 1111111111
Leading-leadership, Thought Leadership, Agenda-Setting: 11111111
Learning – Lifelong Learning, flexible learning: 11111111111111111111111111
Legacy:
Library – Provision:
Limitations:
Links - Linkages: 11
Long-term Role: 1
Low-use:
Maintain - maintenance:
Material:
Mentoring: 1
Methods – Mechanisms, Modus Operandi, Protocols: 11
Mind-Set: 11
Minimise - Minimal: 1
Momentum: 1
Museum(s) – Botanic Garden, Choirs, Collections, Galleries, Theatres, Orchestras:
Negotiation – Influence:
Network: 11
Norms:
Nurture(s):
Obligation – Mutual Obligation:
Occur – Happen:
Open – Openness, Open Access: 111
Opportunities – Exchange Opportunities: 111111111
Organisation – behavior:
Originality:
Outputs: 1
Outreach: 1
Oversight:
Overloading:
 Paramount: 1
Parity:
Participation: 1
Patterns: 1
People-Based: 1
Portfolio:
Positioning - Position: 1111
Positive: 111
Potential: 1
Premise:
Preparation: 111
Preservation – Preserve:
Prevention – Inhibit:
Primacy – Importance:
Principle:
Proactive: 1
Problems:
Process(es):
Profile: 11111111111111
Programmes – Flexible, modular, Regular: 11111111111111
Progress - Progression: 11
Promote – Promotion: 1111111
Propose – Proposal;
Protection:
Provision - Provide: 1111111111111111111
Publishing:
Public – Engagement, Policy, Services, Sector, Understanding:
Purpose:
Qualification – Courses, Degree, Entry, Certificate, Diploma, Joint Honors, Summer
Schools: 111111

Quality – Quality Outputs, Calibre: 1111111111111111
Recognition – Academic, Renowned: 1111111111111111
Recommendations:
Recreation:
Reduction:
Regard by Professional Bodies:
Registry:
Reinforce:
Relationships – lifelong: 1
Relevance – Relevant, In Touch, update:
Representation - Representative: 111111
Reputation: 111111
Requirements:
Responsive – Responsiveness, Respond, Responsibility: 1111111111111111
Respect – Mutual: 11111111
Restructuring:
R & D – Blue Sky, cutting edge, intensive, Enquiry, Investigation, Fundamental, Applied,
Practice-based, Researchers, Research-Active, New and Better Ways:
111111111111111111111111111111
Revision:
Robust - Rigour: 1
Role – Central Role: 1111
Sabbatical Leave:
Satisfaction:
Scheduling - Scheduled:
Scholars:
Scholarship: 11111
Sectors – Emerging: 11111
Selective - Selected: 1
Self-Governance:
Self-awareness: 1
Services: 111111
Shared:
Significance – Academic:
Social Justice:
Stages – Phases:
Standard(s) – Highest, Criteria, Outstanding: 1
Standard – low-grade:
Stimulation – Stimulating: 1
Strength – Areas of, strengthen: 1
Student Charter: 111
Studies – Completion, Further, Overseas: 11111
Subsidiarity:
Subvention:
Success – Future Success, Key Successes: 11111111111
Suffered:
Suitable – Suitable Channels:
Supervision:
Support – Supported, Supportive: 11111111111111111111
Synergy:
Talent:
Teaching – Teachers, Educators, Pedagogic: 1111111111
Theme(s):
Thinking – Conventional Thinking, Critical Thinking: 11
Timely – Timescales:
Track Record:
Traditional - Traditions: 1
Transcripts:
Transformational: 11
Transparency:
Unaffected:
Uncertainty:
Understanding:
Units:
Unsatisfactory:
Usage:
Variety - Variance:
Valuing People:
Virtual Circle:
Vision(s) - Expectations: 1111
Well-Being – work-Life Balance: 111
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Profitability (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ancient universities:</strong></td>
<td>The University of Oxford</td>
<td>4.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The University of Cambridge</td>
<td>0.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>19th Century Universities:</strong></td>
<td>Royal Holloway University of London</td>
<td>5.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cardiff University</td>
<td>2.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Red-Brick Universities:</strong></td>
<td>University of Birmingham</td>
<td>1.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plate-Glass Universities:</strong></td>
<td>Lancaster University</td>
<td>1.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distance-Learning Universities:</strong></td>
<td>Open University</td>
<td>8.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post-Polytechnic Universities:</strong></td>
<td>University of Hertfordshire</td>
<td>7.53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Listed in Order of Profitability (Surplus)

1. Distance-Learning Universities: Open University 8.36%

2. Post-Polytechnic Universities: University of Hertfordshire 7.53%

3. 19th Century University: Royal Holloway University of London 5.55%

4. Ancient university: The University of Oxford 4.37%

5. 19th Century University: Cardiff University 2.19%

6. Plate-Glass Universities: Lancaster University 1.88%

7. Red-Brick Universities: University of Birmingham 1.27%

8. Ancient university: The University of Cambridge 0.38%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROFIT (SURPLUS)</th>
<th>COMPARISON TO RESEARCH-LED UNIVERSITIES*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>MEAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Russell Group Universities: Birmingham, Bristol, Cardiff, Edinburgh, Glasgow, Leeds, Newcastle, Sheffield, Southampton, Warwick
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Table 8

INTERNET SURVEY RESULTS – DETAILS AS TO PROFITABILITY (SURPLUS) OF EACH OF THE 8 TIME-ERA SELECTED UK UNIVERSITIES IN 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Financial Results</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Net Surplus (Profit)</th>
<th>Profit Margin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OXFORD UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>FINANCIAL RESULTS</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>£1,016,100,000</td>
<td>971,800,000</td>
<td>44,400,000</td>
<td>4.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>FINANCIAL RESULTS</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>£1,322,000,000</td>
<td>1,317,000,000</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>0.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARDIFF UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>FINANCIAL RESULTS</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>£411,453,000</td>
<td>402,023,000</td>
<td>9,030,000</td>
<td>2.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>Financial Results 2012</td>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td>Net Surplus (Profit)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Holloway University of London</td>
<td></td>
<td>£ 136,759,000</td>
<td>129,173,000</td>
<td>7,586,000 (5.55%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham University</td>
<td></td>
<td>£ 472,000,000</td>
<td>466,000,000</td>
<td>6,000,000 (1.27%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster University</td>
<td></td>
<td>£ 184,185,000</td>
<td>180,720,000</td>
<td>3,465,000 (1.88%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open University</td>
<td></td>
<td>£ 453,600,000</td>
<td>415,000,000</td>
<td>37,900,000 (8.36%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>£232,836,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td>215,292,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Surplus (Profit)</td>
<td>17,544,000</td>
<td>(7.53%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 9 (CHAPTER 8)


APPENDIX 10
SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS/NON-RECOMMENDATIONS:
THE ROBBINS REPORT - 1963

The Robbins Report sets out some 178 different recommendations, on a disparate variety of UK higher educational governance topics. These are summarized under various headings, as follows:

1. Fundamental Tenets:15

1.1 There must be extensive development of existing types of institutions;

1.2 There should be more universities in large UK centres of population and particularly in great cities;

1.3 There should be multiple universities in big cities;

1.4 Higher education should be regarded as an ‘investment.’ “On a broad view of history...communities that have paid most attention to higher studies have in general been the most obviously progressive in respect of income and wealth.”

2. Overall Governance of the System:15

2.1 Where there is common provision, there should be coordinating principles;

2.2 Central government decisions should be coherent and take account of all UK higher education sectors;

2.3 Decentralisation should be inspired by common principles;

2.4 “Whilst there are some functions which must properly remain the responsibility of the professoriate” – such as the University Senate – “there are others where both senior and junior non-professional staff can and should play an important part;”

2.5 The Committee of UK universities Vice-Chancellors and Principals should be reconstituted to make it an effective agency for the dissemination and resolution of problems referred to it.


3.1 There must be free development of higher education institutions
within the realm of co-ordination, some principles of policy commonly accepted, and some organisation providing for rational allocation of scarce resources;

3.2 UK institutions of higher education should be free to stipulate their general entrance requirements, subject to the obligation to consult with the government;

3.3 It is reasonable to expect that the government, which is the source of finance, should have the right to co-ordinate and have influence: claims of and to academic freedom must be consistent with the maintenance of coherence through the UK university ‘system;’

3.4 Safeguards for academic freedom should be promoted by having an intermediate granting body between the government and UK universities. (In 1963 there was the Universities Grants Committee: to-day there are, inter alia, HEFCE and ESRC);

3.5 As to the level of financial accountability – there should be no detailed (public justification) of particular universities’ expenditures.

4 Specific Central Government Machinery and Powers of Direction and Co-ordination:15

4.1 The machinery through which the central UK government exercises its direction and co-ordination of UK universities, should be the University Grants Committee. (This is now HEFCE);

4.2 There should also be various ‘standing’ and ‘ad hoc’ committees;

4.3 There should be a specifically constituted ‘independent body’ to review academic salary structures – but – importantly – not other conditions of academic staff service: these should remain within the sole province of UK universities;

4.4 There should be created a new autonomous ‘Ministry’ – headed up by a ‘Minister of Arts and Science’ – for the above committees, etc. to report to;

4.5 There should be established a ‘Consultative Council’ to decide on “High Policy” in the higher education field, with a series of committees to facilitate coordinated action in specific fields;

4.6 The National Advisory Council on Education for Industry and Commerce should be continued;

4.7 The government should erect and continue an adequate statistical service;
(This now exists in the form of HESA). (According to the Robbins Report, in 1963 there was a paucity of information on higher education in general).

5. Teaching Purposes: 15

5.1 There should be instruction in ‘skills’ suitable to play a part in the general division of labour;

5.2 The aim of teaching should be to produce cultivated men and women;

5.3. There should be a balance between ‘teaching’ and ‘learning.’

6. Research at UK Universities: 15

The proper place, position and prominence of ‘research’ at UK universities is that there should be “a balance between teaching and academic research.” “Published work [currently] counts for too much in comparison with other kinds of excellence.”

7. Aimed-For Standards – Well-Rounded Excellence: 15

7.1 Higher education should “provide a background of culture and social habit” in partnership with the family upon which a healthy society depends;

7.2 The UK higher education system should produce as much high excellence as possible.

8. Expected Student Effort: 15

Students should be actuated by a sense of obligation to work at their studies in the light of the fact that so much of UK university education is funded out of the public purse.

9. Student Internships: 15

Students should be expected to spend a substantial part of their vacations on work related to their fields of study.
10. Curriculum Variety and Diversity: 

There should be more and varied student courses:

10.1 *in arts and humanities* – subjects to deepen the intellectual and spiritual life of the country;

10.2 *in scientific subjects* - as developments in science are increasingly part of daily life - industry, commerce and public service all need more people with a general education in scientific subjects.

11. Availability of Higher Education in the UK: 

11.1 Higher Education should be available in the UK for all those who are qualified by ability and attainment to pursue it and who wish to do so;

11.2 There should be more part-time study in the UK higher education environment. (Part-time education is growing at the same rate as full-time education);

11.3 There should be more intimate cooperation between professional bodies and institutions of higher learning in order to substantially boost the provision of continuing professional education for the many professional bodies that exist in the UK;

11.4 There should be more higher education availability to ‘adults.’ “There is here a considerable reserve of unused ability, which must be mobilized if the critical shortages in many professions are to be met.”

12. No Discriminatory Barriers: 

12.1 There should be equal academic awards for equal performance;

12.2 Any designations or limitations that cause differentiation between institutions that are performing similar functions should be removed;

12.3 There must be no freezing of higher education institutions into established hierarchies;
12.4 There must be full opportunity for all students to transfer from one institution to another, where appropriate.

13. Academic Staff - Level and Issues

13.1 The present staffing of UK higher education is, in general, relatively appropriate and should not be allowed to become less generous overall in the future. “There need be no serious shortage of potential teachers;”

13.2 There should be more utilisation of part-time teachers in the UK higher education environment;

13.3 However, there should be more professors per academic department;

13.4 There should be better support staff back-up for academic departments;

13.5 Teachers should be actuated by a high sense of professional obligation in the light of the fact that so much of UK university education is funded out of the public purse;

13.6 There should be some necessary limitations – which can be set by the government – relative to UK universities scope of freedom in setting staffing ratios.

14. Student Issues

14.1 Student fees should be higher – whether such additional monies are raised ‘out-of-pocket’ directly from students/their families, or from local authorities or other grant-making sources. (Students in 1963 accounted for approximately 20% of UK higher education institutions expenditures);

14.2 Relative to student loans - there should be some experimentation in this area;

14.3 (Strangely), the Robbins Committee recommended that higher student fees not be charged to overseas students as different from UK students.
15. Management Issues:

15.1 “…There are [functions] where both senior and junior non-
professional staff can and should play an important part;”

15.2 It is appropriate that the head or chairman of an academic
department be the person responsible for making decisions;

15.3 University administrations should have an ‘open’
communications imperative – widely disseminating
information about policies and plans;

15.4 As regards the position of Vice-Chancellor, governing bodies
should give serious attention to improving the ‘organisation’
of the position (presumably strengthening its managerial
responsibility and authority) – though the Committee
decreed to make any precise suggestions in this regard);

15.5 UK university Registry Departments would benefit from the
advice of modern business consultants.

16. Finance Issues:

16.1 (In a somewhat coy comment or recommendation, the Robbins
Committee spoke of ‘gifts’ and ‘endowments’ to units of the UK
higher education system as follows): “We should be glad to think
that all institutions of higher education had nest-eggs of this sort;”

16.2 UK university Finance Departments would benefit from the
advice of modern business consultants;

16.3 The government should have some say in the establishment of
basic salary and compensation structures;

16.4 The government must have the right to intervene financially,
because:

(1) Salaries are such a huge proportion of total UK universities
expenditures; and

(2) Salaries are largely funded by public money; and

(3) To keep the remuneration of various professions and
occupations within the government, and those of UK universities,
on a par;
16.5 The University Grants Committee should have financial autonomy;

16.6 The current quinquennial financial allocation system should be changed;

16.7 The central government should have the last word in the determination of the aggregate amount of money to be spent from public funds.

17. Strategic Benchmarks:15

17.1 The number of higher and further education students should be doubled from about 4.5% of the population in 1963 to about 10% by 1980 in order to meet the full range of national needs for educated manpower;

17.2 UK universities should be enlarged to 10,000 plus student apiece;

17.3 There should be a tripling of annual government expense on higher education over a period of 17 years (i.e. 1963-1980) – from £206,000,000 to £742,000,000;17

17.4 There should be £1,400,000,000 in capital expenditures over the same 17 year period;

17.5 Less financing of UK universities should come from direct UK government subsidy. (Strangely, there are no recommendations relative to UK universities and other higher education institutions in the area of loans/borrowing for capital expenditures on buildings and equipment).

18. Adjunct Amenities at UK Universities - Housing:15

There should be more university-based housing accommodation.

19. Areas That The Committee Steered Around – Making NO Recommendations:15

The Robbins Committee deliberately avoided making recommendations in the following areas:

(1) Regarding academic appointments and processes;

(2) Relative to curricula content and standards; and
(3) On the actual percentage balance between teaching and research at UK universities.
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GOVERNMENT PLANS - AS ENUNCIATED IN THE BROWNE REPORT – TO CHANGE THE EQUILIBRIUM OF UK UNIVERSITIES:
• The Browne Report and the Browne Review of Student finance shift the burden of paying for the majority of degree courses from state funding to the student, his/her family and other 3rd party payor avenues. (p.3)
• The arts, humanities and social sciences at UK universities will be starved of public funding. (p.3)

WHY UK UNIVERSITIES ARE ECONOMICALLY IMPORTANT:
Domestically:
• UK Universities and University Colleges form a core part of the UK’s economic infrastructure – both national and regional: they are embedded in the economic fabric of their local and regional areas and generate a lot of employment and output (original and by economic multiplier effect); they bring in export earnings and they contribute to the Gross Domestic Product (GDP). (p.4) (p.28 and 29).
• Collectively UK universities and UK university colleges provide some 640,000 full time equivalent jobs throughout Great Britain and contribute over £31,000,000,000 annually to GDP. Furthermore every £1 of revenue to a UK University/University College has a ‘multiplier effect’ of generating an additional £1.38 of spending in other mainly UK located industries.
• They also contribute to both economic ‘prosperity’ and economic ‘recovery’ through innovation, research and knowledge transfer. (p.28)

• They economically “provide for” local and regional citizens through direct employment and consulting contracts and benefit surrounding, national and international businesses through vendor contracts and orders. (p.28)

• They supply trained graduates into local, regional, national and international labour markets. They thus increase the ‘skills base’ of their locality, their region, the nation and internationally. They assist in the constant provision of educated, flexible and adaptable workers that enable their locality, their region and the nation to be more competitive. (p.28)

• They are generally amongst an area’s largest employers (directly and as a regional economic multiplier effect). They institutionally themselves provide jobs at a whole range of skills levels and occupations – academic staff – academic professionals (e.g. librarians) – technical staff (e.g. IT people) – administration staff (e.g. managers, secretarial and clerical staff) – and operational staff (e.g. trade-trained staff, cleaning staff and security wardens) - and they work with and through every sector of society – public, private and commercial. (p.4)(p.28)

• They have a huge direct and multiplier effect relative to local businesses which are tied directly and indirectly to the smooth ongoing functioning of the university/university college, for example: cafés, coffee houses, pubs, newsagents, grocery stores, night clubs and clothes shops. These local businesses in turn purchase goods and services from yet other businesses. And, of course, they hire staff who further create additional economic demand by purchasing goods and services from yet other local, regional and national businesses. (p.28)

• They create a diverse range of jobs and considerable revenue for a host of other local industries far beyond the confines of their campuses. (p.6)

• They help build a more solid future for their regions – through enhancing skills and encouraging innovation. (p.4)

• They are generally amongst the largest businesses operating in their locality and region and thus have a significant impact on their locality and region through their own expenditures, the expenditures of the their staff (academic and administrative) and that of their students (full-time, part-time - undergraduate, graduate and doctoral)

• Universities/university colleges have big ‘institutional buying power’ of their own: they manage large, complex estates which generate all kinds of operating and service needs e.g. light, heat, water, air conditioning, maintenance, landscaping, etc. They also are purchasers of vast amounts of supplies – for instance - furniture, equipment, stationary, computers, lab equipment and food. (p.28)

• They also create buoyant ‘rental and house-purchasing demand’ in their localities and regions – for academics and their families, students, non-academic personnel and their families.

• They are, too, magnets for regional, national and international conferences (on campus, at local hotels and conference centres)– business tourism - and their attendees, all of whom spend additional money there.

• As nonprofit institutions they tend to spend all of their income – particularly in cross-subsidising unprofitable or less profitable activities within their institution. (p.4)(p.32)

• A local university forced to ‘downsize’ or even close, will cause a huge drop in local student spending power (and particularly hurt small local businesses that service the university community) and greatly cut down innovative consulting with and exchange of contacts with local firms. (p.4)
Internationally:
• Universities and University Colleges bring in ‘export’ earnings to the UK economy. (p.4)
• They ‘import’ thousands of international students, academics and visitors – all of whom spend money in a university/university college’s regional economic area. (p.4)

WHAT UK UNIVERSITIES/UK UNIVERSITY COLLEGES ARE:
UK universities/UK university colleges are – each of them – operating corporate businesses: they are an ‘industrial sector’ in their own right. To survive and prosper in this highly competitive age they must ‘run their businesses – in large measure - like any other commercial enterprise. Profit and loss are necessarily defining concepts in their vocabulary.

THE CURRENT CONDITION OF UK UNIVERSITIES:
• Many UK universities today are essentially bankrupt – the Rt Hon. Vince Cable, the Business Secretary, HM’s Government. (p.3)
• In 2008-2009 27% of English universities/university colleges were in deficit. The average university surplus was 1.7%. (p.5)

SEVERE FISCAL PROBLEMS FOR UK UNIVERSITIES LOOMING ON THE HORIZON:
• The government wants to shift the burden of paying for the majority of degree courses to the student and his/her family. (p.3)
• Domestically and in the European Economic Community, family incomes are not high enough, taxation is too great and scholarship funding is too small (fundraising and development in the UK is too undeveloped, compared to the US), to support a quick ‘wholesale’ move from government to private student funding.
• Only a minority of UK universities have the infrastructure, research capabilities, reputation and sufficient fiscal ‘clout’ to be able to attract, service and capitalize on the actual and potential ‘foreign’ ‘international’ student market.
• The government’s current strategy – as enunciated through the Browne Report - will have a huge negative financial impact on British universities.
• 49 English universities are at high financial risk under the government’s plans here (many being newer universities and ‘specialist university colleges.’ (p.3)
• Any UK university or university college getting into severe financial problems or going bankrupt, will have a devastating effect on its surrounding community. The ‘trickle-down’ or ‘trickle-out’ investment effect of such institutions on their surrounding regional economies is huge. ‘Dysfunding’ of such institutions by the government will take away numerous jobs and revenue vital to the general lifeblood of such communities and regions. (p.3)

OTHER PROBLEMS LIKELY TO ARISE FROM IMPLEMENTATION OF THE BROWNE REPORT
• Grade inflation in a consumer-led culture – produced by the need to be competitive to obtain and retain students – particularly the academically poorer ones who nevertheless have the family resources to pay for higher education. (p.3)

SUMMARY: WHY UK UNIVERSITIES HISTORICALLY HAVE BEEN A GREAT SUCCESS STORY

CONCLUSION: LIKELY RESULTS FROM GOVERNMENT IMPLEMENTATION OF THE BROWNE REPORT
• Arts-based and teaching-focused universities and university colleges will face an uncertain future
• Only the ‘fiscally fittest’ universities will survive. (p.3)
• It will gradually remove UK universities from the central arena as a major participant in the
global knowledge economy that offers a wide breadth of subjects that are properly supported
(physically, intellectually and financially). (p.3)
• Removing government funding from arts, humanities and social sciences at UK
universities/university colleges will eliminate 80% of their current teaching budgets in those
areas. (p.5)
• 37.7% of English universities (49) – new universities and specialist institutions - will be in
serious financial trouble if the Browne report recommendations are implemented because of their
strong emphasis on teaching arts, humanities and social science subjects and a large roster of
students from the poorest disadvantaged backgrounds. (p.5 and 9) Their breakdown is as
follows:

3.1% (4) universities • at ‘very high’ risk:
• (more than 50% of their present
revenue coming from government ‘recurrent
funding’ for teaching art, humanities and social
science and for the poorest students)
• Less than 3% of total revenue derived from
high-paying international students

Bishop Grosseteste University College Lincoln, Newman University College, Norwich
University College of the Arts, Edge Hill University,

17.7% (23) universities • at ‘high’ risk:
• (40% but less than 50% of their
present revenue coming from government
‘recurrent funding’ for teaching art, humanities
and social science and for the poorest students)
• Over 3% but less than 6% only of total revenue
derived from international students

Harper Adams University College, Leeds College of Music, Leeds Trinity University
College, Rose Bruford College, St Mary’s University College Twickenham, The Arts College at
Bournemouth, University College Birmingham, University College Falmouth, University College
Plymouth St Mark and St John, Bath Spa University, Buckinghamshire New University,
Canterbury Christ Church University, Liverpool Hope University, Roehampton University,
Staffordshire University, The University of Chichester, The University of Lincoln, The University
of Winchester, The University of Wolverhampton, The University of Worcester, University of
Chester, University of Gloucestershire, York St John University

16.9% (22) universities • at ‘high-medium’ risk:
• (more than 33% but 40% or less) of their
present revenue coming from
government ‘recurrent funding’ for teaching art,
humanities and social science and for the
poorest students)
• Over 6% but less than 9% only of total revenue derived from international students

*Central School of Speech and Drama, Conservatoire for Dance and Drama, Trinity Laban Conservatoire of Music and Dance, Birmingham City University, De Montfort University, Leeds Metropolitan University, Liverpool John Moores University, London Metropolitan University, London South Bank University, Sheffield Hallam University, Southampton Solent University, The Manchester Metropolitan University, The Nottingham Trent University, The Open University, The University of Brighton, The University of Huddersfield, The University of Northampton, The University of Portsmouth, The University of Teesside, University for the Creative Arts, University of Cumbria, University of Derby*

• ‘Dysfunding’ of UK universities/university colleges will also have a significant “knock-on” negative multiplier “loss” effect on other industries such as manufacturing, distribution and business services in terms of funding for which they would additionally otherwise have qualified for from elsewhere, for every funding pound removed from UK higher education funding. (p.6)
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BACKGROUND SCENARIO:

• Government funding represents close to 75% of European universities’ financial structures. (p.2)

SOME STIMULUS IN THE FACE OF OTHERS CUTS:

• Norway and France have given some increases in funding to their universities as part of ‘stimulus packages.’ (p.1)
• Germany’s federal government has increased its government funding. However, the Länder authorities have cut their funding. (p.3)

DEGREE OF CUTS:

• Latvia – 66% government funding cut over the last 2 years (2009 and 2010).
• Italy – 20% government funding cut over the next 3 years (2011-2013).
• Greece – 30% government funding cuts in the academic and maintenance areas.
• Great Britain – up to 40% annual government funding cuts (2011-2015). Within these overall funding cuts will be a teaching funding cut of up to 79%.
• Scotland - government funding cuts will be about 16% in 2011. (p.3)
• Eire – annual government funding cuts of about 8.2% average have been implemented. The annual capital grant for infrastructure maintenance has been cut 50% (2011). (p.3)
• Iceland – 12% government funding cut. (p.3)
• Estonia – 17% government funding cut. (p.3)
• Romania – 10% government funding cut. (p.3)
• Lithuania - 8% government funding cut. (p.3)
• Czech Republic – 4% government funding cut. (p.3)
• Croatia, Serbia and Macedonia – 5% government funding cuts. (p.3)
• Portugal – salary cuts for public administration personnel will affect universities staffs. (p.3)
• Discarding of previous commitments to increase funding – Hungary, Belgium, Austria and Spain. (p.3)
• Philanthropic foundation grants – down 20% in the UK. (p.8)

TYPES OF DIRECT & INDIRECT CUTS:

• Closing offered programmes (p.5)
• Closing down smaller university departments (p.5)
• Closing down ‘associated’ university departments (p.5)
• Merging entire universities e.g. in Iceland (p.5)
• Merging individual department and faculties e.g. smaller language departments - in Latvia, Denmark (p.5)
• ‘Smaller local’ institutions offering programmes for which degrees are awarded by ‘bigger regional’ universities – e.g. further education colleges in the UK (p.5)
• Opening campuses abroad – to attract more international students – UK and Scotland (p.5)
• Strengthening campuses abroad – to attract more international students – UK and Scotland (p.5)
• Reducing the numbers of academic and managerial staff by:
  • hiring freezes – e.g. Latvia, Ireland, Italy (p.5)
  • redundancies – e.g. Latvia, Ireland, Italy, Hungary, the UK, and threatened in Austria (p.5)
  • salary freezes – e.g. Estonia (p.6)
  • lowering staff salaries – e.g. in Greece, Ireland, Spain, Portugal and Latvia (p.6)
• Bigger classroom sizes (p.6)
• Cutting back on library operating times and resources (p.6)
• Cutting back on counseling hours (p.6)
• Reduced investments in equipment (p.6)
• Reduced property renovations and new buildings (p.6)

Research Funding cuts – curtailing universities’ autonomy:
• Heavier ‘research’ cuts than ‘teaching’ cuts – e.g. in the Netherlands, Spain and Austria (p.6)
• Less money for research – e.g. Spain (p.6)
• Reduction/Suspension of research funding programmes - e.g. Austria. (p.6)
• Significant shifting to ‘applied’ research – e.g. Austria (p.6)
• Research Funding targeted to achieve specific objectives – e.g. Denmark, Ireland, Norway and Portugal (p.6)
• Research funding targeted to achieve strategic national priorities – e.g. in Finland, Poland and the UK (p.6)

• Competitive funding schemes – purpose to achieve better quality and efficiency: some being, in effect, bogus and leading to further vicious cycle financial non-sustainability. (p.6)
• Grants that do not cover the full costs of an activity (p.6)
• Cuts effected by indirect means - excessive fragmentation of funding sources and the time-consuming and obfuscating application and reporting processes. (p.7)
• Cuts in collaborative projects between universities and industry. (p.7)
• Cuts in philanthropic foundation grants – e.g. in Austria, Belgium, Finland, Germany, Norway, Switzerland, Portugal, the Netherlands and the UK. (p.8)

WHAT HAPPENS FOLLOWING CUTS:

• Government ‘funding cuts’ to universities throughout Europe have produced a whole series of operational ‘crises’ for these universities which will compromise their ability to perform their crucial multiple roles for years to come. These cuts are seriously affecting the local and regional economies surrounding these universities.
• The ‘funding cuts’ are likely to have crucial restructuring effects on higher education throughout Europe.
• Annual inflation, and inevitable annual increases in doing business at universities acts as a negative multiplier to government funding cuts. (p.2)
• 25 European universities are facing imminent financial default. (p.2)
• In Great Britain students are being required to cover the government reduction in universities/university colleges funding by their having to pay up to £9,000 in tuition fees. (p.3)
• Teaching has taken the biggest ‘hit’ in government funding reduction throughout Europe. (p.4)
• Universities autonomy has been further severely cut and therefore their abilities to overcome the general crisis has been further compromised. Their steering power has been considerably reduced. (p.7)

ALTERNATIVE REVENUE SOURCES:

• Student/family-paid tuition fees – e.g. in the UK – up to £9,000 per year. (P.7)
• A comprehensive student loan and subsidy system – c.f. the United States. (p.8)
• Raising fees for students from other parts of the country – e.g. students from England and Wales going to Scottish universities – c.f. the US systems higher fees for out-of-state students (p.8)
• Collaborative projects between universities and industry (p.8)
• Philanthropic foundation funding of people and projects (p.8)
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I. STATISTICS: SIZE, ACHIEVEMENT & REVENUE:

1. Neutral:

(1) 129 universities and university colleges
(2) English universities/university colleges overall statistics as of 2009-2010:

(i) Combined annual revenue: £22,000,000,000
(ii) Approximately £10,500,000,000 (47.7%) coming from government sources (including £7,900,000,000 distributed by HEFCE and £1,320,000,000 emanating from the 7 government-sponsored research councils)
(iii) Approximately £2,700,000,000 (12%) coming from student tuition fees which in turn were backed by student loans
(iv) Approximately £11,876,480,000 (56%) was spent annually on ‘staff costs.’ By 2010, pay for most staff at English universities/university colleges was considered comparable to other commercial sectors

(3) All English universities/university colleges are regulated in greater or lesser measure by HEFCE (the Higher Education Funding Council for England) which is funded by the government’s Department for Business, Innovation and Skills.
(4) The universities/university colleges vary greatly in terms of their balance between teaching, research and 3rd party activities
(5) The largest English university has annual revenue of over £1,000,000,000
6. Some 32 English universities/university colleges have annual revenue of below £50,000,000
7. 128 of the English universities/university colleges are charities; one university is a commercial corporation
8. Average annual increase in ‘staff costs’: 4%

2. Positive:

1. At English universities/university colleges in the 2008-2009 academic year:
   (i) 1,500,000 (full-time equivalent) students attended
   (ii) 566,000 graduation qualifications were attained
   (iii) 91,000 research papers produced (8% of the world total)
   (iv) Citations of UK research accounted for 12% of the world total

2. English universities/university colleges are internationally rated as the 2nd best in the world (US is 1st)
   (i) in the Academic Ranking of World Universities; and
   (ii) in the QS World University Rankings

3. English universities/university colleges are the 2nd most popular destination for international students

4. Aggregate annual universities/university colleges revenue grew 6% p.a. from 2006-2010, as a result of:
   (i) Higher ‘tuition fees’ supplements required from students and their families;
   (ii) Increases in student numbers
   (iii) Increased fees charged to non-EU international students

5. Average annual profitability (surplus) of universities/university college rose from 2% in 2006 to 3.6% in 2010. Profitability (Surplus) monies were spent on buildings and other physical infrastructure

3. Negative:

1. 12 (9%) English universities/university colleges made a loss in at least 2 years of the period 2007-2010
2. In the 2009-2010 academic year, 32 (25%) English universities/university colleges performed below at least one of the HEFCE financial benchmarks

II. DBIS DUTIES & RESPONSIBILITIES: the UK Government’s Department for Business, Innovation and Skills remit vis-à-vis English universities/university colleges:
III. HEFCE AUTHORITY, MISSION, DUTIES & RESPONSIBILITIES:

1. Authority:

HEFCE’s powers to regulate English universities/university colleges derive from:

1. its statutory power to attach ‘conditions’ to government funding that it distributes

2. its responsibility under the Charities Act 2006 to oversee compliance with charity law by 110 (85%) of English universities/university colleges

The governing bodies of English universities/university colleges have to annually account to HEFCE for the use of government funds, and comply with the latest terms of the Financial Memorandum from DBIS to HEFCE

NOTE: The Charity Commission remains responsible for overseeing compliance with charity law by 18 (14%) of English universities/university colleges that are “non-exempt” from the regulatory powers of the Charity Commission

2. Mission:

1. To generate government-related policy development at the English university level

2. To give advice to the government and other appropriate entities regarding English university-level higher education issues

3. To promote ‘good practice’ within English universities/university colleges

4. To administer designated funding to English universities/university colleges

5. To implement English university-level public policy initiatives

6. To regulate English universities/university colleges

7. To be ultimately accountable for ‘government funding’ distributed by it to English universities/university colleges

3. Duties and responsibilities:

1. To promote, fund and assess that the following occur at English universities/university colleges:
(i) High quality teaching
(ii) High quality research
(iii) Cost-effective teaching
(iv) Cost-effective research

(2) To promote ‘Value’ for money granted to English universities/university colleges by the government

(3) To ensure that university/university college students get a high-quality education that meets their needs and that of the economy and society

(4) To provide university education for everyone – regardless of limited financial means – for everyone who has the qualifications for and can benefit from it

(5) To encourage ongoing transformational change to help universities/university colleges establish and maintain long-term sustainable relationships with employers to meet their demands for highly competent and skilled employees.

(6) To maintain a dynamic internationally competitive research environment that makes a major ongoing contribution to economic prosperity and national wellbeing and which expands and disseminates knowledge

(7) To increase the universities/university colleges ‘knowledge base’ to enhance economic and social development

(8) To sustain a adaptive world class university/university college system

(9) To effectively deliver a ‘highest standards’ strategic plan

4. Administration expenses: HFCE spends around £17,000,000 annually on general administration

IV. HEFCE MONITORING RESPONSIBILITIES:

1. Monitoring Costs:

(1) To monitor:
   (i) the financial health of English Universities and university colleges
   (ii) the financial risk to any of the English universities/university colleges

HFCE currently spends about £2,000,000 p.a. (with a full-time equivalent staff of 29), on this regulatory activity

(2) History: NO university/university college has failed under this monitoring system
2. Current Monitoring Methodology:

A. Every English university/university college is required to interface with HEFCE:

(1) By providing to HEFCE an Annual Accountability Return, covering:
   (i) Financial performance;
   (ii) Financial forecasts;
   (iii) Student numbers;
   (iv) Government grant funding information;
   (v) Risk management information;
   (vi) Control information; and
   (vii) Governance information

(2) By filing with HFCE a Data Audit – every 3 years

(3) By completing an Assurance Review – carried out every 5 years

(4) By filing with HEFCE Scenario Planning Data to enable HEFCE to model the impact of changes on English universities/university colleges.
   (i) 2009: 64% (approximately 83) English universities/university colleges complied with this requirement (36% (46) did not). 35 (27%) of English universities/university colleges went above and beyond HEFCE’s basic requirements by providing additional data in this area.

(5) By attendance at an Annual Meeting between HEFCE representatives and Senior Officers of each English university/university college, to discuss:
   (i) Priorities;
   (ii) Strategies; and
   (iii) Reporting of adverse developments

B. HEFCE also:

(1) Obtains Regular Information, on an ongoing basis, regarding each English university/university college:
   (i) from the Quality Assurance Agency;
   (ii) from other funders and sources (governmental agencies and non-governmental entities); and

(2) Obtains yet more information from other sources that it deems ‘relevant.’

(3) Feeds data of various sorts into an evolving going concern risk model maintained on each English university/university college, to track the transition phase to the new
funding regime and additionally for longer term purposes. Input for the model includes:

(i) student demand assumptions;
(ii) fee levels;
(iii) miscellaneous public funding from third-party sources; and
(iv) financing for part-time students

3. Current criteria applied by HEFCE (in turn mandated by DBIS) for declaring an English university/university “at higher Risk:”

(1) The university/university college faces threats to the sustainability of its operations – currently;
(2) The university/university college faces threats to the sustainability of its operations in the medium term (the next 2-5 years);
(3) The university/university college has serious problems relating to ‘value for money’;
(4) The university/university college has serious problems relating to propriety;
(5) The university/university college has serious problems relating to regularity;
(6) The university/university college has materially ineffective risk management;
(7) The university/university college has materially ineffective control;
(8) The university/university college has materially ineffective governance.

4. Current ‘Material Adverse Change’ Occurrences - Requiring Immediate Reporting to HEFCE:

NOTE: each university/university college is given the discretion to decide what might be ‘material’ in its particular context.

(1) A ‘significant and immediate threat to financial position’ of an English university/university college

(2) ‘Significant fraud’ at an English university/university college

(3) A ‘major accounting breakdown’ at an English university/university college

5. Current ‘Areas of Concern’ Benchmarks:

Areas of Concern: Benchmark:

IMMEDIATE-TERM
1. Negative net cash 5+% of income for 35 consecutive days
(If an English university/university college expects this, they must notify HEFCE immediately and gain its ‘consent’ to remain in this position 4 English universities/university colleges did this 2005 - 2011
**SHORT-TERM**

2. **Net Liquidity – days of expenditure funds**
   
   Less than or equal to 10 days in 2+ years in succession

**MEDIUM-TERM**

3. **Net cash flow from operating activities – % of income**
   
   Negative in 2 or more years out of 3

4. **Historical cost surplus or deficit – % of income**
   
   A deficit in 2 or more years out of 3

**LONG-TERM**

5. **Staff costs - % of income**

   More than 64% in any year

6. **Affordability of borrowing - % of income**
   
   More than 4%

   (This ‘area’ is measured using an average of annual payment (interest and capital) over the period of the outstanding loans)

7. **Discretionary reserves (% of income)**

   Less than 10% in any year

**GENERATIONAL-TERM**

8. **Pensions status**

9. **Estates status**

6. **Historically:**

   (1) **2005-2010:**
   
   (i) depending on the year - between 4-7 (3 - 5.4%) of English universities/university colleges were on the HEFCE danger at higher risk list;
   
   (ii) staff costs as a % of revenue decreased, but in 2010-2011 increased again

   (2) **2007:**
   
   (i) 10 (7.8%) cases of English universities/university colleges with Areas of Concern;

   (3) **2007-2011:**
   
   (i) the discretionary reserves of English universities/university colleges increased overall percentagewise;
   
   (ii) 37 (28.7%) English universities/university colleges recorded 5+% profitability (surplus) during at least 2 of these 3 years;

   (4) **2008-2009 HEFCE Sector Level Report:**
   
   English universities/university colleges need to control costs better and that the overall level of surpluses was low;

   (5) **2010:**
   
   (i) 43 (33.3%) cases of English universities/university colleges with Areas of Concern;
   
   (ii) 35 (27.1%) cases of English universities/university colleges operated
below 1 or more benchmarks;

NOTE: English universities/university colleges that: (1) do not have medical intensive research operations; (2) are specialist music institutions; and (3) are arts institutions;

were the most likely categories of English universities/university colleges that were operating below HEFCE’s financial benchmarks

(iii) 5 (3.9%) English universities/university colleges had reserves exceeding 100% of their annual revenues

(iv) 12 (9.3%) English universities/university colleges had no long-Term Borrowings;

(6) December 2010:

(i) 7 (5%) of English universities/university colleges were classified by HEFCE as at higher risk;

(7) Since 2010:

(i) 7 English universities/university colleges have self-reported Material Adverse Change Occurrences to HEFCE;

(ii) 7 English universities/university colleges have failed to report material Adverse Change Occurrences to HEFCE;

(iii) 1 unnamed English university/university college made an urgent request and received an early payment of its government grant due to poor forecasting of cash requirements.

(8) 2010-2011: (i) Forecasts by the universities/university colleges themselves: show a deterioration in ‘Net Cash Flow from Operating Activities’ and ‘Historical Cost Surplus’

7. Current Lack of Transparency:

HEFCE currently does not make public its ‘risk assessments’ of individual English universities/university colleges for 3 years after it makes its initial negative assessment relative to it. The following are the rationales for this practice:

(1) To prevent any harm to the commercial position of such a university/university college;

(2) To ensure no harm to the sustainability of such a university/university college;

(3) To prevent any impairment of the provision given to current students;

(4) To encourage such impaired universities/university colleges to come forward in adequate time to confidentially discuss issues with HEFCE without fear of negative repercussions from HEFCE for doing so;

(5) Because HEFCE considers that students are already provided with sufficient information on English universities/university colleges;
(6) The 3 year delay is intended to allow universities/university colleges to address their problems in a timely – relatively positive environment - that otherwise might be more difficult to resolve if the problems became publicly known right away.

8. Additional Monitoring Methods Needed:

To develop a sustainable risk-based approach which minimizes regulatory costs but which amounts to a ‘tighter touch accountability’ regime than has been the case 2005-2010:

(1) Stronger and clear guide-lines for universities/university colleges as to self-reporting of short and long-term ‘material adverse changes’

(2) A systematic gradated risk-assessment system and an effective method for ‘brigading’ appropriate evidence on an ongoing basis.

   (i) There needs to be a better balance (the right balance) between ‘protecting’ the university institutions and the rights-to-know of students and the public about major current financial and other problems;
   (ii) There is also the important issue of government liability in the case of any Insolvency

(3) More regulatory resources – money

(4) Stronger powers to intervene where a university/university college is/or is about to be “in trouble” – in actual or potential difficulty to:

   (i) to protect the government and taxpayers (financial or managerial assistance, merging or closing down a university/university college); and
   (ii) to protect students

(5) Appropriate powers of regulation of universities/university colleges that do not receive any government funding, but who do have students who have financed their fees by loans

V. HISTORICALLY CONSERVATIVE FORECASTING BY ENGLISH UNIVERSITIES /UNIVERSITY COLLEGES:

2009-2010: (1) 94 (72.9%) of English universities/university colleges improved their Profitability (Surpluses) by more than 1% of revenue compared with their forecasts;

   (2) 28 (21.7%) of English universities/university colleges actual profitability (surplus) exceeded forecast by 5+% of annual revenues;

   (3) 8 (6.2%) of English universities/university colleges’ profablitity was 1+ % less
than they forecast;

(4) 2 (6.2%) of English universities/university colleges’ profitability was 5+ % less than they forecast.

VI. ‘MAJOR SHIFTS’ REQUIRED BY THE GOVERNMENT-ADOPTED LORD BROWNE OF MADINGLEY REPORT - STARTING WITH THE ACADEMIC YEAR 2012/2013:

1. The Major Shifts:

(1) Moving universities to a more ‘market-based’ and ‘financially-self-supporting’ form of corporate operation,
(2) Making ‘undergraduate education’ student tuition-fee based (undergraduate students may be charged directly up to £9000 p.a.)
(3) Developing a system of government-funded tuition loans
(4) Reducing ‘overall government funding’ to universities/university colleges (making government funding a very much smaller part of a university/university college’s annual revenue):

From: £10,500,000,000 (47.7%) in the academic year 2009-2010;
To:     £9,800,000,000 (44.5%) in the academic year 2010-2011
        £9,200,000,000 (41.8%) in the academic year 2011-2012
        £9,400,000,000 (42.7%) in the academic year 2012-2013

NOTE: By 2014: some universities/university colleges will receive little direct ongoing government funding.

Others, however, depending on:

(1) their science/liberal arts mix of course offerings; and
(2) the aggregate amount of government-backed student loans;

may see an equivalent amount of government monies (direct and indirect) coming to their university.

2. ‘Premium’ on Flexible Operations:

Over the period 2012-2014 there will be a huge onus on English universities/university colleges to adapt quickly to the rapidly changing environment.

3. Future Government Funds Will Only Be For:

(1) High cost subjects – e.g. sciences, etc.
(2) Targeted policy areas – e.g. to widen participation

4. Implications of These Giant Shifts:

The transition and the new environment will potentially cause a number of universities/university colleges to be at high risk of financially failing

VII. HEFCE’S ‘CAPACITY’ AND ‘APPROACH’ TO RESPONDING TO ENGLISH UNIVERSITIES/UNIVERSITY COLLEGES IN FINANCIAL TROUBLE:

1. Historically:

(1) There has been no disorderly failure of an English university/university college to date.

(2) Some fiscally poor performing university/university college entities have, however, been taken over by other universities/university colleges. Mergers, though, have had limited success.

(3) As of 2010: 7 (5%) of English universities/university colleges have been classified in the higher risk category for 4.3 years – a longer period of being in the ‘in trouble’ category than 5 years before.

   (i) Thames Valley University has been in the ‘high risk’ category since 1998, and remains there, though appears to be improving its financial profile.
   (ii) Middlesex University and Trinity Laban have recently moved out of the ‘higher risk’ category.

(4) 1999-2010: HEFCE provided £55,000,000 in special grant government funding or loans to English universities/university colleges ‘in financial trouble.’

2. Response Methodology:

(1) Stage I: HEFCE representatives meet with the ‘in trouble’ university/university college’s senior management.

(2) Stage II: HEFCE makes an Assessment of the ‘troubled’ university/university college’s strategies and actions.

(3) Stage III: HEFCE generally takes a multiple of the following actions:

   (i) Sending observers to governing body meetings;
   (ii) Requesting the appointment of new interim managers (e.g. an Accountable Officer);
   (iii) Requiring a Recovery Plan;
(iv) Encouraging collaboration opportunities with other universities/university Colleges;
(vi) Attaching additional conditions to government monies being provided;
(vii) Withdrawing government funding – in extreme cases.

(4) Current Weaknesses in the methodology:

As all English universities/university colleges are autonomous, HEFCE is heavily reliant on gaining the cooperation of such institutions’ governing bodies to address the ‘higher risk’ issues. This has generally occurred (though the London Metropolitan University fiscal and management crisis was an exception).

HEFCE HAS NO POWER TO STEP IN AND RUN AN AILING ENGLISH UNIVERSITY/UNIVERSITY COLLEGE

The ultimate concern is that if an English university/university college were to become insolvent: what would be the government’s liability here? There are no precedents to predict how this might unfold.

3. Outlook:

It is expected that HEFCE will have a much more substantial caseload of English universities/university colleges ‘in trouble’ as they make the transition to the new funding regime being imposed on them by the government in response to the Browne Report.
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