

CHAPTER 11

TOWARDS POST-MANAGERIALISM: THE RISE OF 'CONTRIVED COLLEGIAL MANAGERIALISM' AT WITS

The research question addressed in this study is: What is the nature of management in higher education? This question has been investigated with reference to management change at a single university, the University of the Witwatersrand. As discussed in Chapter 1, the paradox that has been addressed in this thesis is why stakeholders have not been able to gain greater power and control at Wits despite their increased representation and participation promulgated in the Higher Education Act (101) of 1997. The answer to this paradox lies in the domination of university management and their associated modes of control.

The study has demonstrated that management change is not simply the adoption of corporate managerial practices but also about the ways in which these are adopted and the impact this has upon collegial relations, practices and processes in higher education institutions.

As discussed in Chapter 5, higher education is changing. Changes in state-institutional relations towards 'conditional autonomy', characterised by greater state interference and more diverse pressure from other stakeholders, such as business and market forces, create a new context of uncertainty and confusion within the higher education environment. For higher education management the central challenge is to find ways of balancing all these demands, while retaining a sense of distance, independence and autonomy.

It was demonstrated in Chapter 2, that these changes in higher education cannot be explained within narrow managerialist frameworks as described in the higher education management literature. This literature tends to focus on the adoption of managerial techniques, processes and approaches without giving sufficient attention to the impact that higher education change has upon collegial relations or the specific nature of higher education institutions. There is a lack of awareness of the ways in which previously institutionalised and established practices are altered or reframed within the new context. This approach has been referred to in the thesis as 'essentialist reductionist'.

At macro level, a post managerialist analysis is needed to move beyond generalised trends and processes in higher education management change and to come to grips with contextual specificities. Such an analysis is needed because of the tension between economic imperatives of efficiency and effectiveness and social justice imperatives of equity, or between managerialism and collegiality.

An investigation of the specific context of management change at the University of the Witwatersrand in Chapter 4 shows that the university management was confronted with different kinds of challenges as the context changed between 1984 and 1999, the eve of the recent restructuring initiatives. In the period of apartheid up to 1990, during the Tober era, the university was united in its stance against apartheid with the anticipation of the new state; during the Charlton era stakeholder expectations intensified and registered their demands for greater social justice. Unable to confront these pressures in the context of a 'policy vacuum', as discussed in Chapter 5, while also introducing significant changes in student profile, uncertainty and flux, instability and stalemate was evident. It was only through the efforts of a management team under Professor Bundy that attempts were made to balance the demands of economic rationality and social justice, expressed through the 1999 restructuring exercise.

Corporate managerial imperatives dominated the 1999 restructuring exercise as discussed in Chapter 6. This was demonstrated by an investigation of the agenda, process and organisational outcomes, managerial agendas, decision making processes and organisational design of flexible specialisation based upon the core/non-core demarcation.

The dominance of corporate managerial practices in higher education management is not only seen in the organisational design but also in the changed nature of management. An investigation was made of the various layers of management - the Senior Executive Team (SET) discussed in Chapter 7, the changing nature of the deanship, discussed in Chapter 8 and the introduction of a new management layer, the heads of school, in Chapter 9. These chapters demonstrate that, while the discourse of corporate managerialist structures and practices has been adopted, the purpose of structures such as SET has been evolving, and the implications of the corporate nature of the deanship and head of school position have not been commonly understood. The reality, however, has been the absence in the provision of academic leadership at the level of the deanship and even head of school, despite the incorporation of this requirement in the description of their duties and responsibilities, as well as tensions between upward and downward accountability.

The table below compares the nature of management at Wits before and after the 1999 restructuring exercise.

Table 14⁷³⁷: A comparison of the nature of management at Wits pre and post 1999

Pre 1999	Post 1999
Academics have some professional autonomy	Eroding of professional autonomy through increased state regulation
Students as secondary stakeholders	Students become primary stakeholders as they are defined as customers
Academics locus of power in senate	Senate downgraded
More space for intellectual engagement	Shrinking spaces for intellectual engagement
Management drawn from academics of high academic standing inside the university	Management drawn from inside and outside the institution
Administrative posts	Managerial posts
Academics in administrative posts as caretakers or academic leaders	Academic managers in full time management posts
'Equality among colleagues' albeit racialised	Greater sense of hierarchy among colleagues e.g. Head of school.
Vice-Chancellors drawn from academics	Vice-Chancellors still drawn from academics but tend to follow a corporate style of management

From the table above, it is clear that there has been a significant shift in power and authority away from academics to managers.

Academics have less professional autonomy than they had before and their locus of power traditionally in senate has been downgraded. The kinds of

⁷³⁷ This table is adapted but informed by the work of Webster and Mosoetsa (Webster, E. & Mosoetsa, S. (2001). At the Chalk Face: Managerialism and the changing Academic Workplace, 1995-2001, *Transformation*, 48.).

responsibilities associated with the posts and the areas where academics are drawn from have changed. Because of the pressure on the institution to survive economically and the pressure to fulfil the ideals of social justice and relevance, students have become primary stakeholders and have been redefined as customers or clients, suggesting that a university is like any other business that has a product to sell.

The ramifications of this have been felt among academics. What has emerged in the university in the post modern era is a form of distributed leadership with the strengthening of line managers which leaves decision making at the discretion of academics, provided that certain non-negotiables are kept under tight control. Chapter 10 demonstrates that the spaces and time for intellectual life have been weakened, as more time is spent on managerial obligations such as reporting, complying with managerial technologies (such as performance appraisal), handling much heavier workloads as the consequence of the period of 'policy vacuum', and less time on free, open and informal spaces and conversation among peers and seniors. This dominance of managerialism from above and the constraining of collegiality from below is best described through the notion 'contrived collegial managerialism'.

Hargreaves' (1994) notion of 'contrived collegiality' was drawn upon as it echoes this constriction of collegial relations and processes. Hargreaves (1994) in his work entitled 'Changing Teachers, Changing Times',⁷³⁸ introduces the notion 'contrived collegiality' as a term to describe the impact of centralised school based curriculum reform within the context of the implementation of managerialism upon relations between teachers.

He compares this to collaborative cultures associated with collegiality. Collaborative cultures have the following features: (i) spontaneity which is sustained through working relationships within the teaching community itself; (ii) voluntary working relations among teachers; through their own experiences they

⁷³⁸ Hargreaves, A. (1994). *Changing Teachers, Changing Times: Teachers' Work and Culture in the Postmodern Age*. London: Cassell.

have realised that such relations are both enjoyable and productive; (iii) development orientated work takes place when teachers work together to meet their own development to which they are committed and which they need to respond to the external environment; they do so selectively and not merely out of compulsion and obligation; (iv) teachers work together when they are able to and when they have a need to; and (v) outcomes of their work cannot be predicted in advance as they are developed in collaboration and over time.⁷³⁹

In contrast to the features of 'collaborative cultures', 'contrived collegiality' is defined by Hargreaves (1994) as: (i) administrative regulation of teachers' work; (ii) an introduction of compulsion for teachers to work together, such as in peer coaching, team teaching and collaborative planning arrangements; (iii) teachers' activities becoming implementation orientated, as teachers are required to implement mandates of those who are usually senior to them, such as a new curriculum, or co-operative learning strategies; (iv) part of the regulation is to fix teachers' activities into a particular time and place; teachers have to meet, for example, in collaborative planning meetings; and (v) predictability of outcomes as a means to ensure administrative regulation over teachers' activities.⁷⁴⁰ When reviewing these features, the collaborative relations are encouraged but restricted and regulated for managerial purposes; they are controlled and lack spontaneity.

Hargreaves' (1994) discussion on collegiality and contrived collegiality is represented in the table below.

⁷³⁹ Hargreaves, A. (1994). *Changing teachers, changing times: Teachers' work and culture in the postmodern age*. London: Cassell. p.192-193; Bush, T. (1995). Collegial Models. *Theories of Educational Management* (2nd ed.). London: Paul Chapman Publishing Ltd. p. 69.

⁷⁴⁰ Hargreaves, A. (1994). *Changing teachers, changing times: Teachers' work and culture in the postmodern age*. London: Cassell. p. 195-196; Bush, T. (1995). Collegial Models. *Theories of Educational Management*. (2nd ed.). London: Paul Chapman Publishing Ltd. p. 69.

Table 15: A comparison between Collegiality and Contrived Collegiality

Collegiality	Contrived Collegiality
Spontaneous	Administratively regulated
Voluntary	Compulsory
Unpredictable	Predictable outcomes
Informal	Fixed in time and place
Geared towards development	Geared to implement government's mandate

While Hargreaves' (1994) study is focused upon schools, his discussion on collegiality and the ways in which it may be restricted is relevant to the university context and of interest to this thesis insofar as he considers the impact of managerial relations upon collaborative cultures or collegiality. What he does not refer to (which is central to this study) is that collegiality provides academic leadership, while contrived collegiality undermines academic leadership.

11.1 Possibilities and Limits of 'Contrived Collegial Managerialism'

Ramirez's framework of contradiction and tension informs higher education change and with it management change; a post managerialist analysis allows one to consider the following possibilities.

Firstly, it allows one to move beyond tracing management changes in processes, structures, technologies and practices associated with the private sector towards incorporating an understanding of the specific contextual dimensions brought about by the demands for social justice.

Secondly, it allows one to discover the adaptation or unique form or nature of managerialism in the particular context. For example, while in a typical workplace managerialism is based upon a Taylorist conception of work, in higher education institutions professionalism is based upon workplace autonomy. Because of the very nature of academic work or profession, workplace managerialism cannot be simplistically and unilaterally implemented.

Thirdly, it allows for a process of investigating and unearthing the legacy of practices, processes and structures instead of their displacement. It allows one to come to grips with the ways in which management existed prior to the implementation of managerialism.

Fourthly, it allows one to consider ways in which the implementation of new technologies and processes gives rise to new relations, tensions and contradictions.

Practically, post-managerialism means that neither managerialism in a corporate typical form alone, nor the legacy of collegiality even if in racialised or limited form, can be preserved within institutions. What is likely to take place is a coexistence of these two phenomena and, depending upon the strengths of social agents on either side of these, the specific form will be shaped into a combination of the two.

What this study points to is possibly an unintended consequence of the imposition of managerialism - a vacuum in academic leadership. Developing an approach to counteract this is critical for preserving the integrity and specificity of higher education institutions.

As Birnbaum (2000) states:

... it would be a mistake to believe that fads have no consequences at all for the organisation or systems that adopt them. Some of these consequences may be negative, as people become cynical and resistant to

new ideas, the judgements of leaders is questioned, and funds and energy are seen as being diverted from important institutional activities.⁷⁴¹

As an alternative to the domination of managerialism in universities, 'shared governance' has been proposed. Tierney and Minor (2003) refer to different meanings of 'shared governance' as fully collaborative, consultative and distributed decision making.⁷⁴² Birnbaum (2003) refers to 'shared governance' as the drawing together of hard and soft governance or economic rationality and the socialisation and expectations of participants established over time within higher education institutions. He regards the domination of hard governance as particularly detrimental to the core purpose of these institutions. While recognising that shared governance is under attack because it takes longer for decisions to be made and therefore has implications for the responsiveness of institutions to society, he argues that different actors have different contributions to make to the governance of institutions: "trustees are concerned with responsiveness, administration with efficiency, and faculty with academic values".⁷⁴³

What Birnbaum attempts to establish through the notion of shared governance, is that faculty should continue to play an important role in decision making within higher education institutions. Shattock (2002) and Dearlove (2002) refer to the notion of shared governance.

Shattock states: "Institutions work best when governance is seen as a partnership between the corporate and the collegial approaches, and where a sense of common

⁷⁴¹ Birnbaum, R. (2000). The Life Cycle of Academic Management Fads. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 71(1), 14.

⁷⁴² Cited in Currie, J. (2003). *Shared Academic Governance in an Australian Experimental University*. Draft paper prepared for Roundtable on Governance in Higher Education. Santa Fe: New Mexico. p. 17.

⁷⁴³ Birnbaum, R. (2003). *The End of Shared Governance: Looking Ahead or Looking Back*. Draft paper prepared for Roundtable on Governance in Higher Education. Santa Fe: New Mexico. p. 1-27.

purpose informs the balance of the relationships.”⁷⁴⁴ Dearlove (2002) argues in similar vein:

Blending collegiality and managerialism, academics and administrators; keeping the show on the road whilst providing space for change; balancing the competing claims of departments; ensuring that academic work is backed by the institution whilst encouraging academics to be entrepreneurial; looking out whilst looking in, all call for difficult judgements and for complicated understandings of university and academics.⁷⁴⁵

Essentially this notion ‘shared governance’ suggests a ‘collegial managerial’ arrangement. However, I agree with Professor Harris, one of Professor Currie’s interviewees, a member of the Academic Council at Murdoch University, that “If you think that the prime function of the University is promotion of academic ideals, then I actually think that we should define a far heavier weighting to academic interests on Academic Council”.⁷⁴⁶ As discussed in Chapter 4, the Vice-Chancellor, Professor Bundy, shared a similar approach when he argued for the coexistence of managerialism and collegiality. This study shows that a balance was not struck, however, and that instead managerialism tended to dominate over academia as conveyed by the term ‘contrived collegial managerialism’.

What the notion ‘shared governance’ does not address is the kind of leadership needed as a consequence of the weakening of academic leadership caused by the rise of managerialism, as evidenced in this study.

The new mode of management privileges a new kind of leadership, which celebrates the entrepreneurial academic. As discussed in Chapter 6, the creation of new units, centres and initiatives (such as the Donald Gordon Medical Centre) provides spaces for a entrepreneurial academic to claim leadership and to use that

⁷⁴⁴ Shattock, M. (2002). Re-Balancing Modern Concepts of University Governance. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 56(3), 235-244.

⁷⁴⁵ Dearlove, J. (2002). A Continuing Role for Academics: The Governance of UK Universities in the Post-Dearing Era. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 56(3), 257-275.

⁷⁴⁶ Currie, J. (2003). *Shared Academic Governance in an Australian Experimental University*. Draft paper prepared for Roundtable on Governance in Higher Education. Santa Fe: New Mexico. p. 18.

space for developing units which are essentially micro-enterprises, surplus generating entities. The idea is that the university will become like an industrial park with numerous micro-enterprises or units which compete with one another and the external market. This model of an individual leader being given autonomy, and possibly the space, to become an entrepreneur, building small enterprises throughout the institution, is best described as a form of distributed leadership since distributed leadership allows for the creation of leadership throughout various levels within organisations.⁷⁴⁷

The current trend of domination and control of the academic profession by managers, and the tendency for the loosely coupled organisational form to be further loosened, as space is created for centres to be established and orientated towards entrepreneurial activities, needs to give attention to the provision and strengthening of academic leadership.

While academic leadership must be fostered, it should not cultivate hierarchical, managerial relations, which inhibit the space to liberate individuals' energies and capacities that can generate innovative ideas. By academic leadership is meant the ability to identify individuals who have the ability and potential to develop and grow *intellectual endeavours* and who themselves may be groomed into becoming the new generation of academic leaders.

Given the organisational form of academia, sometimes referred to as loosely coupled⁷⁴⁸ or organised anarchy, based on a matrix structure, in which disciplinary departments are the cells of the organisation and belong both to the institution and

⁷⁴⁷ Hargreaves, A., & Fink, D. (2003). Sustaining Leadership. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 696.

⁷⁴⁸ By 'loosely coupled' is meant that units within organisations are linked or interconnected or are responsive to each other, yet simultaneously retain their independent identities (Weick, K.E. Reading 7: Educational Organisations as Loosely Coupled Systems in *The Nature of Academic Organisation*, 127-128).

to the discipline,⁷⁴⁹ there is no specific place from which academic leadership can be provided. Clarke (1983) captures this notion:

The enterprise, or individual institution, is commonly a comprehensive grouping, in that it links together such disparate specialities as chemists, psychologists, and historians, specialists and non-specialists, professors, students and administrators...The discipline is clearly a specialised form of organisation in that it knots together chemists and chemists, psychologists and psychologists, historians and historians. It specialises by subject, that is, by knowledge domain.⁷⁵⁰

Academic leadership is provided from different sites within the institution and takes on different forms and may shift between different periods as professors gain increasing access to shorter term funding and are required to act more as project managers and professional grant writers.⁷⁵¹ Academic leadership is highly contextualised, but sites can be identified from which it may be drawn. It may emerge from individual initiative and commitment and from a variety of organisational sites, such as the discipline, department, school, faculty and institution. In some instances leadership could be found in the head of department, chair or head of school.

While individual initiatives need to be encouraged and grown, specific organisational sites have to be identified by the institutional leadership. Given the managerial focus of positions such as head of school, deanship and senior leadership, the position of head of department, the chair and research team leaders should be pursued as avenues through which academic leadership could be offered.

⁷⁴⁹ A matrix structure captures both the processes of centralisation and decentralisation (Oloyede, O. (2002). *Disciplinary Cultures and Academic Leadership. Society in Transition*, 33(1), 118).

⁷⁵⁰ Clarke (1983:28-29), cited in Oloyede, O. (2002). *Disciplinary cultures and academic leadership. Society in Transition*, 33(1), 119-120.

⁷⁵¹ Enders, J. (2000). A Chair System in Transition: Appointments, Promotions, and Gate-keeping in German Higher Education. P.G. Altbach (Ed.). *The Changing Academic Workplace Comparative Perspectives*. Center for International Higher Education Lynch School of Education, Boston College Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts. p. 42.

The head of department position is the leadership position of the disciplinary organisational form in instances in which the department is the discipline. In these instances the head of department provides disciplinary leadership. Given that the nature of disciplines differs as the basic knowledge and values cultivated within the disciplines differ, disciplines tend to exhibit a variety of disciplinary cultures, which in turn require a variety of academic leadership. Oloyede (2002) cites three types of cultures: the culture of humanities, science and the culture which contains elements of both, to identify different kinds of academic leaders needed for different disciplines. For History, academic leadership that fosters an individualistic tradition is needed; in Sociology, which has a critical tradition yet is riddled by numerous interest groups, a diplomatic kind of academic leadership is required; Physics, which tends toward discovering exact knowledge, requires leadership that is inspiring, conducive to problem solving and hard⁷⁵² leadership; Biology, which is a heterogeneous discipline with many growing specialisms, requires a form of leadership which enables others.⁷⁵³ Through strengthening academic leadership at this level, disciplinary knowledge, the basis of interdisciplinary knowledge, will be strengthened. The problem with current attempts to strengthen disciplinary knowledge is that they tend to be market orientated without sufficient articulation with their disciplinary basis, as evident in the Wits Graduate School of Humanities.

The chair system is another avenue through which academic leadership can be strengthened. In the German system the position of the chair is based on the Humboldtian⁷⁵⁴ system, which combines the chair with director of a research unit. The career path to the position of chair is preceded by a lengthy process likened to

⁷⁵² The notion 'hard' is inspired by Kekale's (1997) study, which differentiates between 'hard', and 'soft' disciplines, in which 'hard' disciplines are convergent and 'soft' disciplines are divergent in their knowledge base (Cited in Oloyede, O. (2002). *Disciplinary Cultures and Academic Leadership. Society in Transition*, 33(1), 122).

⁷⁵³ Oloyede, O. (2002). *Disciplinary Cultures and Academic Leadership. Society in Transition*, 33(1), 120-127.

⁷⁵⁴ The Humboldtian system maintains that teaching has to be informed by an involvement in research and argues in favour of the research imperative.

the guild system. This entails the attainment of a doctorate, a five year period of the post-doctorate involving preparing for *Habilitation*, attaining *Habilitation* or *Privatdosent*, an informal status of private tutor, and the appointment to professorship after having successfully competed with other candidates. The chair is connected to the *Ordinarius*, or the full professor as civil servant. The chair receives funding from the state, has maximum autonomy over his or her research and teaching and is able to draw in researchers around a particular intellectual endeavour. While the German system has historically been extremely hierarchical, with post-doctorates able to gain access to research monies only through a senior professor and not able to choose their own area of intellectual pursuit, the chair system has offered an important avenue through which intellectual leadership can be provided. Furthermore, the chair system, or system of Academic Oligarchy,⁷⁵⁵ is currently under threat as it is subject to reform characterised by the weakening of the autonomy of the professor. The position is subjected to managerial domination through the introduction of performance evaluation of research as opposed to the previous system of renewal of research funds.⁷⁵⁶

As discussed in Chapter 6, in instances where disciplinary boundaries have collapsed, the research imperative to teaching is weakened. This is an important dimension, not only in developing students, but also in developing academics. In these cases, attention could be given to developing clearly demarcated thrusts, clusters or research communities that are able to develop common research agendas and feed their findings into the teaching.

Through strengthening academic leadership in its various forms and locations, the power of academics can be increased and the initial intentions of the university to contribute to knowledge production and dissemination can be protected and

⁷⁵⁵ This is based on Robert Michels' notion of the iron law of oligarchy in which it is argued that, as organisations and society become larger and more complex, control and decision making becomes more concentrated in the hands of an elite (Johnson, A.G. (2003). *The Blackwell Dictionary of Sociology A User's Guide to Sociological Language*. (2nd ed.). Blackwell Publishing. p. 213).

⁷⁵⁶ Enders, J. (2000). A Chair System in Transition: Appointments, Promotions, and Gate-keeping in German Higher Education. P.G. Altbach (Ed.). *The Changing Academic Workplace Comparative Perspectives*. Centre for International Higher Education Lynch School of Education, Boston College Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts. p.25-49.

secured into the future. At the same time, the social meaning of research and universities needs to be contested, as universities prioritise partnerships with industry to bring in cash. As an alternative strategy, Currie and Subotzky (2000) argue that community partnerships should be developed, 'curiosity-driven research' fostered and an 'independent critical voice in society' encouraged.⁷⁵⁷

This does not only entail preserving and developing academic leadership but also developing the institutions' managerial functions necessary as a consequence of the growth of institutions. As Birnbaum (2000) states:

Fads⁷⁵⁸ contain a kernel of truth that can help institutions reconsider familiar processes. Fads may have important latent functions in cuing attention, promoting action, and increasing the variety necessary for organisational evolution.⁷⁵⁹

Professor Bundy pointed out that managerialism presents opportunities as well.

The allocation of managerial duties to senior academics and the professoriate is in the words of an academic 'a waste of an academic'.⁷⁶⁰ Their time has to be spent nurturing the future professoriate. Instead academics with management experience should enter management positions with academic leadership consciously fostered through the various avenues discussed above.

⁷⁵⁷ Currie, J. & Subotzky, G. (2000). Alternative Responses to Globalisation from European and South African Universities. In N.P. Stromquist & K. Monkman (Eds.), *Globalisation and Education Integration and Contestation across Cultures*. USA: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers Inc. p.148.

⁷⁵⁸ By 'fad' is meant a 'craze'.

⁷⁵⁹ Birnbaum, R. (2000). The Life Cycle of Academic Management Fads. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 71(1), 14.

⁷⁶⁰ Focus group discussion with academic staff in the Faculty of Humanities, University of the Witwatersrand, 19 February 2004.

11.2 Observations

Observation One: Management to be guided by specific context/s

Restructuring should be informed by the specific institutional context, and within the institution, the specific context of faculties, schools, departments, disciplines and other units.

During the 1999 restructuring exercise the university management was guided by the typical industry based 'one size fits all' approach to restructuring. This was shown in the agenda, process and outcomes of restructuring. What this study has demonstrated is that despite the universal approach, different meanings have been attached to different processes and structures because of the different contexts within Wits. For example, while school staff meetings take place in the School of Education, this is unheard of in the School of Social Science, as this school is organised very differently. Furthermore, the workings of the faculty structure are very different in the Faculty of Humanities from those in the Faculty of Commerce, Law and Management; Management has great difficulty, being situated geographically on a separate campus requiring its own independent faculty organisation, as opposed to the Faculty of Humanities situated on the main campus, in close proximity to central services such as the Finance Office.

Future restructuring exercises should be guided by the local concerns, processes and structures if the outcome is to be more appropriate to the local or specific context.

Observation Two: Management to take into account voices from below

During the process of restructuring, the voices of the management of the university gained prominence over other voices within the institution, even though extensive processes and structures were set up to ensure the representation of all affected by restructuring. The consequence of this has been that, whether during the support service review process or the academic restructuring process, many felt that their voices did not carry through to the end of the restructuring process. For example, the discussion on the demise of heads of departments was followed through despite opposition from within the School of Social Science, and the

Faculty of Management was downgraded into a school despite opposition from the Faculty of Management. By following a 'one size fits all' approach the restructuring exercise was largely imposed from above. By following an approach which is inclusive of specific voices and concerns, greater credence could be given to voices from below.

Observation Three: Management to be guided by a more flexible and loosely defined approach

The process of imposition has culminated in the implementation of a stringent, newly established, rule bound process characterised by a system of upward accountability. Being open to voices from below and adopting a more context specific approach would allow management to be much more flexible in its implementation of procedures and processes throughout the institution, while retaining a shared understanding of values and principles which guide various units or departments.

Observation Four: Management to express renewed commitment to the development of academic leadership

The restructuring exercise has emphasised the growth in the numbers, areas and methods of management throughout Wits, at the expense of protecting and nurturing academic leadership. Given the very different contexts within the institution, academic staff should, within their specific places, discuss ways in which they experience the loss of academic leadership and methods in which this could be re-kindled and cultivated. Various avenues may be considered such as through the head of department, chair, head of discipline and head of research clusters.

Observation Five: Management to give attention to growing collegial opportunities

A significant negative consequence of restructuring has been less time spent by academics on closer interaction or collaboration because of the increased time spent on teaching larger classes and attending to more paper work. Another consequence, because of the re-organisation of space, has been the dismantling of shared social and intellectual spaces such as the tearoom. Faculties, schools and departments should consider ways in which collaborative spaces and opportunities can be recultivated and grown.

Observation Six: Management to display greater transparency and critical reflection with respect to restructuring and its costs

Establishing the costs of restructuring at Wits was unachievable in the course of this research project. Without a systematic understanding of the costs and benefits of restructuring, it is very difficult to make an assessment. Throughout the interviews, however, respondents consistently argued that restructuring incurred more costs than savings. If all interest groups, stakeholders and institutional members are to value and substantively participate in restructuring initiatives and processes, transparency needs to be encouraged. A critical way of doing this would be the creation of spaces within the institution for an institution wide assessment of the 1999 restructuring exercise with particular attention to the costs thereof, before any further restructuring initiatives are pursued. The costs of restructuring should not only be reviewed with reference to their financial implications but also their human and community implications.