



Title	The Changing Shape of University Decision-Making Processes and the Consequences for Faculty Participation in Ireland
Authors(s)	Dowling-Hetherington, Linda
Publication date	2013
Publication information	Dowling-Hetherington, Linda. "The Changing Shape of University Decision-Making Processes and the Consequences for Faculty Participation in Ireland." Taylor and Francis, 2013. https://doi.org/10.1080/13583883.2013.790071 .
Publisher	Taylor and Francis
Item record/more information	http://hdl.handle.net/10197/7423
Publisher's statement	This is an electronic version of an article published in Tertiary Education and Management, 19(3): 219-232 (2013). Tertiary Education and Management is available online at: www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13583883.2013.790071 .
Publisher's version (DOI)	10.1080/13583883.2013.790071

Downloaded 2026-05-02 00:29:07

The UCD community has made this article openly available. Please share how this access benefits you. Your story matters! (@ucd_oa)



© Some rights reserved. For more information

The Changing Shape of University Decision-Making Processes and the Consequences for Faculty Participation in Ireland

Abstract

For faculty, the idea of collegial and participative decision-making has been one of the central values of academic life. Yet, despite evidence that universities in Ireland have experienced considerable institutional change in recent years, there remains a considerable dearth of research on its consequences for faculty participation in governance and decision-making processes. A case study of the School of Business at University College Dublin (UCD) is used to illustrate how a programme of large-scale institutional change has transformed the School's decision-making processes and the participation and influence of faculty in those processes. While the case study points to the reduced involvement of faculty in university governance, the most significant finding highlights the move towards a much more executive-style approach to management and a substantial loss of influence and involvement by faculty in School decision-making.

Keywords: collegiality, managerialism, decision-making, governance, Ireland, institutional change

Introduction

One of the fundamental values underpinning academic life is the notion of collegial decision-making and management (Sporn, 1999) and the participation of academic staff in institutional affairs (Farnham, 1999). Collegiality is based on principles of self-governance of faculties and a process of collective decision-making (Anderson,

Johnson & Saha, 2002; Farnham, 1999). It incorporates ideas of transparent flows of information, continuous feedback on the performance of the institution and the participation of faculty on committees (Middlehurst and Elton, 1992). Collegial decision-making is said to encourage faculty to display greater ownership of initiatives (Waring, 2008) and to create cohesion among staff within a community (Bennett, Crawford & Riches, 1992).

The shift towards a more bureaucratic and corporate approach to decision-making in U.S. universities has been noted (Feller, 2009) and, indeed, the recruitment of U.S. university Presidents to effect change and their role as chief executive officers has been well rehearsed in the literature (see Bargh, Boccock, Scott & Smith, 2000). Interestingly, some convergence in the governance and decision-making practices of U.S. universities and those that have been emerging in Irish universities could be suggested. Universities in Ireland have been experiencing considerable institutional change in recent years. In particular, the growth of managerialism has been noted with Sterling (2010) suggesting that much of the recent discussion there has drawn attention to the rejection of collaborative decision-making by ‘top-down management’ (p. 13). In addition, growing similarities around the recruitment of university presidents and in the nomenclature around this particular role in both countries is increasingly evident.

While countless international studies on higher education have reported on how faculty have been experiencing and responding to institutional change, the same cannot be said for Ireland where a general dearth of research exists on institutional change and the changing participation of faculty in governance and decision-making processes. This article begins with a brief discussion on the recent debate surrounding the replacement of collegial, participative decision-making with a more centralised

and managerial approach. The findings of a case study of University College Dublin (UCD) and its School of Business are then presented to illustrate how a programme of large-scale institutional change has transformed university governance and local School decision-making processes.

The Participative Decision-Making Debate

A participative, collegial approach to decision-making is one of the central values underpinning academic life. While faculty have previously been considerably influential in shaping institutional decision-making and governance, some commentators have suggested that the removal of collegial decision-making has become evident (Amaral, Tavares & Santos, 2012) and that the continued notion of a 'shared governance' is now under question (Locke, Cummings & Fisher, 2011: p. 11). Indeed, arguably, one of the key changes in higher education in recent years has been this shift away from structural collegiality and self-regulatory academic communities towards corporate, bureaucratic and explicit management approaches (Anderson *et al*, 2002).

Tensions between notions of collegiality and managerialism have been well rehearsed (see Clegg, 2003; Meek and Wood, 1998). Some commentators suggest that the long-established values of faculty are being compromised by managerialist approaches (Winter and Sarros, 2001), whilst others question whether the discourse of collegiality has become outdated by managerialist approaches (Hyde, Clarke & Drennan, 2013). A number of reasons for the decline in collegiality and the increase in centralised decision-making have been suggested, the most common of which are the failure of collegial institutions to adequately respond to environmental pressures

(Sanyal, 1995) and the slow pace of decision-making in such institutions (Sharma, 2009; Johnsrud and Rosser, 2002). It has been suggested that the move away from staff consultation has been a necessary outcome of attempts to create more efficient decision-making systems (Martin, 1999). In the Irish context, Clancy (2007: p. 117) draws attention to the ‘centralisation of power in university ‘managers’’ more as a consequence of the move towards competitive funding processes.

Yet, despite these changes, in research conducted by Sporn (1999), the need for collegial decision-making approaches in the context of significant changes in both process and structure was still evident and she advocated the need for such an approach in order for institutions to be sufficiently adaptive to their environment. Indeed, research has highlighted the positive effect of involvement and participation in decision-making on the morale of academics (Johnsrud and Rosser, 2002), on institutional loyalty and identity (Cummings, Williams & Finkelstein, 2012) and on job satisfaction (Lacy and Sheehan, 1997). Inherent in a collegial approach is the acceptance that power is diffused across the institution (Ackroyd and Ackroyd, 1999) and being a member of a community of academics, with common interests, allows this group a ‘voice’ in the affairs of the institution (Middlehurst, 1993: p. 73).

While faculty may lament the changing environment in which they work, changing governance arrangements are now an enduring feature of higher education (Larsen, Maassen & Stensaker, 2009) and issues around the power and responsibilities of various stakeholders in higher education represents one of the most significant governance challenges facing the sector (Moraru, Praisler, Marin & Bentea, 2013). The disillusionment felt by faculty as a result of their lack of input into decision-making has been noted (Winter, Taylor & Sarros, 2000), with staff exhibiting feelings of disaffection towards the institution where a more corporate-like

orientation is adopted (Meek and Wood, 1998). The challenge for higher education leaders now may very well be to create a hybrid governance and decision-making system that allows institutions to respond speedily to external changes whilst also allowing for a continuation of collegial approaches through a process of devolved decision-making to constituent parts of the institution. Indeed, the notion of ‘distributed leadership’ has recently been put forward as a possible approach to reducing the gap between faculty and other staff (see Jones, Lefoe, Harvey & Ryland, 2012).

Case Study – Findings

A case study to examine how, and to what extent, institutional change has impacted upon faculty at one of the largest Schools at UCD (the School of Business) was undertaken. The research covered the five-year period since the appointment of the new President in 2004 and involved twenty-eight interviews with faculty and manager-academics. The interviews were with: nineteen faculty (A1-A19); five Heads of Subject Areas (H1-H5); three School Directors (D1-D3); and the Head of School (Dean). Only the research findings relating to faculty participation in decision-making are presented in this article and the use of direct quotations from interviewees are incorporated as a means of revealing the voice of faculty themselves (the study also explored faculty perspectives on the impetus for institutional change at UCD; and the role of, and changing demands on, faculty there). The following sections present the findings of the case study. The findings are particularly significant as the university has been to the fore in implementing large-scale institutional change in Ireland since 2004. The background to the university’s change programme, its overall

aim and the key management and structural changes in the School of Business are outlined. Faculty perspectives on their role in university governance, their role in decision-making prior to and since the change programme will also be presented.

The UCD change programme

From the late 1990s, alongside declining government funding and curriculum policy developments, the university began to experience more intense national and international competition. Furthermore, a number of internal and external reports highlighted weaknesses in the university's governance, management decision-making and resource allocation processes and its overly complex organisational structure. At the time, the university consisted of eleven faculties and eighty-nine departments. This resulted in duplicative functions, an absence of synergy across departments, a lack of accountability and transparency in decision-making, limited opportunities for inter-disciplinary collaboration and a relatively rigid curriculum. A new university President (Vice-Chancellor) was appointed in 2004, following for the first time, an international search and selection process. What followed was a large-scale programme of institutional change that has radically transformed many aspects of the university's operations.

The overall aim of the change programme was to create a research-intensive university and a dynamic academic structure that would support interdisciplinary research, to strive for excellence in teaching and learning and to provide for a high-quality student experience. A strategic planning dialogue was instigated and this highlighted the need to align the structures and activities of the university with its overall strategy. Following this dialogue, a series of changes were implemented,

including the re-structuring of the entire university and the creation of five Colleges and thirty-four Schools. The university also set about implementing management and governance processes that would allow for greater flexibility and efficiency in its response to an increasingly competitive environment. Of particular significance was the appointment of a senior management team, including full-time Vice-Presidents (Pro-Vice-Chancellors). Entirely new processes surrounding both academic policy development and the governance of degree programmes were established. A new resource allocation model was implemented with funding allocated to Schools on the basis of student numbers, research output and the alignment of activities with the university's strategic priorities.

The *Faculty of Commerce* was established in 1908 and during the university re-structuring process it became the *School of Business*. The School comprises six academic subject areas, each led by a Head of Subject Area (sixty-two full-time permanent faculty were employed within the School while the case study was conducted). A number of significant management and organisational changes took place within the School. Firstly, the School became the main unit for research activity, teaching provision, planning and resource allocation and the management of academic staff (the Department had been the main unit prior to the change programme). While line management responsibility for academic staff lay with the Head of Department previously, such responsibility shifted to an Executive Dean following the change programme. Secondly, the re-structuring resulted in the abolition of Departments (with statutory powers) and their replacement with Subject Areas (with no statutory powers). Thirdly, management and decision-making processes within the School changed radically with: (i) the abolition of faculty meetings where all tenured staff participated in decision-making and their

replacement with ‘town-hall’ type School meetings used to disseminate information on recent developments; and (ii) the establishment of a senior management team and an Executive Committee. The Dean had previously been elected by Faculty, however, this changed in 2005 with the appointment of an ‘Executive’ Dean following an international search and selection process. A senior management team and an Executive Committee are now responsible for the School’s direction and management. Two other particularly significant changes were: (i) the development of an academic workload model, the first phase of which set out a standard teaching load of four courses for research and service-active faculty (the workload associated with four courses involves the preparation of course materials, between 24 and 36 hours teaching per course and the grading of all coursework) and (ii) a greater emphasis on the research output of faculty.

Faculty perspectives – the changed university governance and management structure

The first area of significant university-level change reported by faculty related to the governance structures, the development of a more concerted managerial approach, a ‘more hierarchical form of management structure’ (A5) and the re-definition of the role of both President and Dean. It was suggested that ‘the philosophical approach is definitely more managerial within the university’ (H4). In particular, the establishment of a strengthened university management structure, including the appointment of full-time Vice-Presidents, was noted. The change in the process for appointing a President signalled a turning point in providing a stimulus for change and since this appointment, ‘greater clarity around the sense of ambition for the

institution' (D2) and a stronger 'sense of strategy' (H1) has been evident. The President had a clear ambition to 'put in place a plan to create a university that was not only competitive in Ireland, but very much competitive internationally' (A2). The consequence of appointing a President who had experience of the U.S. higher education system, where significant decision-making power is often held by this position holder, quickly became apparent to faculty at UCD. Interestingly, A3 suggested that the President's prior experience in the U.S. 'was not an irrelevant factor in that he was used to a system where Deans and University Heads had a lot of decision-making authority'. The President 'viewed himself as an Executive' (A14), and by regaining power, he facilitated greater centralised autonomy and control with respect to both funds and decision-making. The perception of some faculty was that 'the whole agenda was to pull power back into the Centre for the President to manage and he did that by pulling the teeth out of anything faculty could do' (A12).

Faculty perspectives – their changing influence in university governance

This section presents the perspectives of faculty themselves in respect of their previous dominance in university governance and describes how a significant shift has occurred in their role and influence in governance since the implementation of the change programme. The findings suggest that, previously, faculty had played a central role in university governance and policy-making and there is a general view that faculty had been 'more dominant in previous years in terms of policy, organisation and planning and implementation' (H4). Faculty saw themselves as 'the main decision-makers' (D2) and 'there was a lot more weight attached to what they said' (A6). There was a sense, on the part of some faculty, that the elected nature of

past Presidents, Registrars and Deans meant that ‘they did have to think what the academic’s view was’ (A14). A3 commented that:

I’m not saying that past Presidents never had any initiatives or never tried to get anything through, but they had to do it in a much more discursive fashion, that they would have to have come round to Faculties, explain proposals, but ultimately the Faculties would vote.

Those interviewed reflected on the extent to which faculty remain dominant in university governance and policy-making. D1 noted that all central university decisions are still made by a core group of three academics – the President, Registrar and Vice-President for Research – and, in this sense, ‘the university is still primarily driven by academics’. However, he noted that the key difference now is that ‘they’re driven by academics in a more executive kind of fashion as opposed to a collegial sort of fashion’ (D1). Indeed, the general feeling among faculty is that they are no longer involved to any ‘significant extent’ (A5) and that ‘policy-making is largely now out of the hands of academics’ (H5). However, the reduced input of faculty in university governance was not necessarily seen as a negative development by all those interviewed. Indeed, one faculty member commented that academics ‘lived in a glorious contained, self-contained environment that reality permeated only slightly’ and questioned whether it was always a good idea that faculty should decide on policy matters (A19). Commenting on the reduced influence of faculty in university governance, A9 noted the following:

I wouldn’t necessarily think that’s a bad thing. I think getting consensus

among academics is a very hard thing to do. They're such a diverse group and they can be very narrow-minded and very small-minded about their own little part of the world, so it's probably better to have people at the Centre pushing strategic change who can just impose it on Schools and Colleges, rather than having to negotiate with each and every one.

While these findings suggest a shift in the role of faculty in university governance, it is, perhaps, more useful to consider the perspectives of faculty on their decision-making role in local Faculty/School matters. The next two sections focus on their participation in decision-making before and after the change programme.

Faculty perspectives – participation in Faculty of Commerce decision-making prior to the change programme

Very little mention was made by those interviewed of two of the three decision-making forums in the Faculty – i.e. (i) the Departmental meeting, where academics could voice their views and where they 'called the shots on everything' regarding that Department (D3) and (ii) the Departmental Heads meetings which A14 suggested was 'the major decision-making forum'. The vast majority of those who participated in the research referred only to Faculty meetings that all permanent academics were entitled to attend.

While those interviewed acknowledged that Faculty meetings were the 'main way faculty members could voice an opinion about issues' (D2), a variety of views emerged regarding the extent to which these meetings represented a real forum for participative decision-making. On the positive side, they provided faculty with an

opportunity to ‘have an input by either introducing something or opposing something’ (H5). In the words of A3:

..... there was a feeling that, at the very least, any member of Faculty could say their piece in a Faculty meeting. Perhaps, they would be listened to, perhaps they wouldn’t. But at least they had a voice

Indeed, A16 suggested that a great deal of power resided at these meetings and that it was very much ‘a body deciding its own destiny’. Faculty meetings were attended by the university President and, therefore, there was a feeling that this resulted in more ‘inclusive decision-making’ (A1) and faculty felt they could make their particular views known to the President which could, in turn, shape decisions. Prior to restructuring, Deans were considered ‘secretaries of the Faculty more or less’ (D1). Therefore, ‘if something was really contentious, it went to a vote and then they were bound by it’ (D1). A ‘consensus mood’ (H2) generally existed where academics could raise an issue and ‘it had to be discussed’ (A5). While these meetings allowed academics to block or veto a proposal, decisions were rarely put to a vote and were, instead, made on a more ‘negotiated’ (A4) basis.

While the above acknowledges the positive role of faculty meetings in providing a voice for faculty members, A17 suggested, though, that ‘we have to be careful in terms of idealising the past and I don’t think you ever had this golden age’. Even though the meetings were a forum where academics ‘could stand up and be listened to’ (A13) and where efforts were made to ‘bring people on board’ (A12), there was also a sense that they weren’t ‘particularly democratic’ (A13) and were ‘managed’ (A11) and ‘highly choreographed’ (D2), with many decisions ‘made well

before the Faculty meeting' (D2). In the words of one academic, they 'had a veneer of people having an input' (A19). Another faculty member suggested that 'a small coterie of Professors controlled things under the former Faculty structure' (H5). One faculty member commented that 'there were always nebulous powers in place that had something to say that were never quite visible to the ordinary academic' (A15). Indeed, H4 commented that attendance at Faculty meetings 'had declined consistently in the number of years before the new situation emerged' and that such meetings were not a 'great example' of collegiality. Furthermore, while such meetings engaged faculty, 'it didn't suit a situation of wanting to change rapidly' (A11) and the idea of always reaching a consensus at faculty meetings was a 'medieval' notion (A19). Some faculty suggested that the meetings were 'ineffective' (A10) and were not a 'productive' use of their time, with H3 commenting that they merely resulted in 'points scoring' between 'factions' rather than real decision-making. One relatively junior faculty member was quite 'mindful' (A12) of his place at Faculty meetings, while a second (A18) felt that the meetings 'inhibited many junior colleagues from participating and they really had to build up the courage to stand up'. This faculty member noted that –

..... yes, there was participation, yes, there was consultation, but I think it was the privilege of those who had the *status* to contribute (A18).

Despite the suggestion that Faculty meetings might not always have been seen as 'this madly integrated, collegiate, collective body' (A13), 'the collectiveness was the safety valve that could be stopped and people could ask questions and people could be brought to account' (A13). One academic felt that Faculty meetings were more a

‘forum for collegiate contact’ (A19), rather than a place where policies and strategies were shaped. Another suggested that ‘the actual meeting didn’t matter’ (A4) and, instead, what was important was that a forum existed where the voice of faculty could be heard. Regardless of whatever flaws the Faculty meeting approach appeared to have, decision-making prior to re-structuring could generally be characterised as participative in nature. With respect to the Faculty meeting –

.....there was a sense that it was still an important institution for what it symbolised more than anything else and it symbolised a kind of self-governing community (A17).

Faculty perspectives – participation in School of Business decision-making since the change programme

At the outset of the change programme, Faculty meetings were abolished and replaced by School meetings. While the response of faculty to these new School meetings is mixed, the overwhelming feeling among those interviewed is that these ‘town-hall’ type meetings (A13) are ‘explicitly not decision-making forums’ (H2) and have a ‘terminal function’ in that they are used to disseminate information (A13). While A1 felt that he could put forward an idea at a School meeting, he suggested that ‘that’s not where these things are discussed in detail and decisions taken’. Indeed, faculty appeared to accept that essentially the School meetings are ‘pseudo participative entities’ (H5), with ‘little room for conversation’ (A17). Thus, a forum where the majority of faculty can have some input into decision-making or where they can ‘over-turn’ something ‘has been taken away’ (A19), thereby creating a strong feeling

that faculty have become ‘dis-engaged’ from the decision-making process (A15). The School meetings are no longer seen by many as an effective or useful forum for individual faculty members, with the result that they are ‘badly attended’ (D1). Indeed, one highlighted the absence of a governance remit at such School meetings and the danger that this may lead to an ‘environment where people don’t care’ (D3). Despite these findings, though, faculty interviewed were not entirely negative in relation to the conduct of School meetings. A6 noted that School meetings started out as one-way communication forums, but have since become more ‘interactive’ following feedback from faculty.

While academics may be consulted and have some input at School and Subject Area meetings, ‘there would be no pretence at all that the decision rests fundamentally with the Head of School’ (D2). It was suggested that decisions regarding School direction continue to fall within the remit of ‘a small coterie of people surrounding the Dean’ (H5). Indeed, H2’s view was that ‘your foot soldier academic has no right to be involved in the strategic direction of the School’. Without doubt, the introduction of ‘an executive-style management system’ (A19) played a significant part in an obvious shift away from participative decision-making at School level. However, one faculty member suggested that the removal of the old Faculty meetings has had a positive impact on collegiality because of the lasting legacy that resulted from ‘fights that were remembered for decades’ prior to the change programme (A9). Furthermore, a very small number of faculty suggested that they could still influence decision-making in the School through their Subject Area and that could also contribute in response to an email from the Dean requesting input on an issue. Indeed, A2 commented that, in general, ‘if people want to contribute it is quite easy’.

While faculty may now have less input into School decision-making generally,

A7 noted that this is not necessarily ‘a bad thing’ because of the difficulty of securing agreement among academics. Another suggested that, while he is happy to provide ‘input and feedback’ when asked, he would have no expectation that this input would be followed up on and questioned why there should be any such expectation (A14). Overall, though, a consequence of the move towards an Executive Dean and the subsequent changes made to School management and governance structures is the perception among faculty that their influence in shaping the School’s direction and development has significantly declined. However, one academic suggested that this ‘might be a good thing’ (A8), with another commenting that he was ‘happy with the light level of input’ (A9).

Before concluding this section, it is worth drawing attention to the Programme Boards introduced following the university re-structuring. The Boards are responsible for the design, development, delivery, governance and quality of the degree programmes under their remit. With respect to faculty input into Programme Board decisions, one academic, who was a Programme Director at the time of interview, was positive about presenting programme changes to the Board which are now discussed with fellow Programme Directors present and not with a ‘selection of onlookers’ (A9). However, it was felt that the Programme Boards, which deal with academic issues, are ‘influential, but that this would be more at a technical than at a strategic level’ (H4). It was suggested that Programme Boards deal ‘mainly with teaching structure related matters’ (A4), many of which are not seen as ‘deal-breaking decisions’ (A4) and that ‘it deals with day-to-day issues involving the students’ (A8). While it may be possible for an academic who is not a member of these boards to raise an issue of concern with a Subject Area colleague who is a member, D3 suggested that:

.....you can single out any academic person and you can say if they are not a member of the Programme Board, they have no influence anywhere. And it's a minority of people who are on the Programme Board, so a typical academic has no influence whatsoever – there's no other forum.

Discussion

The nature of many of the university and School changes introduced since 2004 and how they have been achieved could largely be described as 'textbook' type changes. The increasing division between academics and decision-making (Bellamy, Morley & Watty, 2003) and the declining dominance of academics in institutional governance and management (Taylor, 2006) now appears much more evident at the university. The difficulties that a collegial approach to decision-making and governance often present, particularly regarding the slow pace of such decision-making, were acknowledged by faculty themselves. Indeed, the university's decision to move towards an international search and selection process when appointing the President and the School's Executive Dean was seen as a critical turning point aimed, in part, at facilitating speedier decision-making. A decline in direct communication between the top level of the university and other levels (see Middlehurst and Elton, 1992) has become apparent with the removal of Faculty meetings that had previously been attended by the President. While input from academics on various School matters is still occasionally sought, it is evident that the majority of faculty no longer have a formalised and regular opportunity to participate in School decision-making. This shift from participative, collegial decision-making towards a more management or executive approach is very much in keeping with similar changes taking place

internationally.

Faculty involvement in decision-making tends to be seen as a process which creates cohesion among staff in a community (Bennett *et al*, 1992). However, the case study highlights some less well acknowledged difficulties around decision-making processes intended to be collegial in nature – i.e. the potential for factions to exist among faculty and for a lack of transparency to arise where decisions were sometimes ‘choreographed’ and made or negotiated outside of faculty meetings. This potential for a lack of transparency to arise somewhat challenges Middlehurst and Elton’s (1992) notion that collegiality incorporates ideas of transparent flows of information. While there is a danger that we view previous governance and decision-making arrangements in universities through rose-tinted glasses, this research highlights some very clear tensions that existed prior to the abolition of Faculty meetings. Indeed, the potential to present academia in the past as a ‘golden era of collegiate scholarship’ and the present as a ‘vulgar, consumer-led enterprise’ has been noted (Morley, 1997: p. 239) and the case study also reinforces this point.

While the literature noted the positive relationship between high levels of participation in decision-making and the morale of academics (see Johnsrud and Rosser, 2002), it has been suggested that increasing managerialism is resulting in a lowering of morale and a greater sense of disillusionment on the part of faculty (Winter *et al*, 2000). The faculty interviewed for this research expressed relatively strong feelings of disillusionment regarding their current low level of involvement in School decision-making. Yet, interestingly, some faculty were quite satisfied with a light level of input into decision-making and these particular faculty tended to be early-career academics who are primarily focused on their research productivity. There tends to be a predominant view in the literature that participation in decision-

making is seen as a desirable activity by faculty themselves, yet, there has been insufficient debate or theorisation so far on how desirable early-career academics view their role in university and local decision-making processes.

Conclusion

While countless studies have reported on the management, leadership and governance changes being instigated by higher education leaders worldwide, a considerable dearth of research on faculty perspectives of these kinds of changes has been evident in the Irish context. The case study findings have begun to shine some light on the changing institutional decision-making environment being experienced by UCD School of Business faculty and have identified a number of findings that should be particularly useful to higher education leaders as they continue to change and re-shape the management and governance structures of Irish universities. In particular, it could be argued that it is critically important for higher education leaders to understand the long-term impact that a move towards executive-style management may have on the declining involvement of faculty in decision-making and the consequences of this in terms of the willingness of faculty to enthusiastically engage and contribute to the life of the School.

Perhaps, the most significant change that has impacted upon the influence and involvement of academics in the management and governance of the university has been the removal of decision-making power from Subject Areas and the deliberate move away from participatory and collegial approaches to decision-making towards more managerial approaches. The overall outcome of this shift in approach to decision-making has been a feeling of reduced involvement by faculty in the life of

the School. Perhaps the single biggest challenge now facing the leadership of the School is to establish some means of re-engaging those faculty that became disillusioned following the implementation of the change programme and to identify mechanisms to more actively involve faculty in School governance and decision-making processes.

References

Ackroyd, P., & Ackroyd, S. (1999). Problems of university governance in Britain: Is more accountability the solution?. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 12(2), 171-185. Doi: 10.1108/09513559910263480

Amaral, A., Tavares, O., & Santos, C. (2012). 'Higher education reforms in Europe: A comparative perspective of new legal frameworks in Europe', in A. Curaj, P. Scott, L. Vlasceanu and L. Wilson (eds.), *European Higher Education at the Crossroads: Between the Bologna Process and National Reforms* (pp. 655-673), Dordrecht: Springer.

Anderson, D., Johnson, R. and Saha, L. (2002). *Changes in Academic Work: Implications for Universities of the Changing Age Distribution and Work Roles of Academic Staff*. Canberra: Department of Education, Science and Training.

Bargh, C., Scott, P., Smith, D., & Boccock, J. (2000). *University leadership: The role of the chief executive*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Bellamy, S., Morley, C., & Watty, K. (2003). Why business academics remain in Australian universities despite deteriorating working conditions and reduced job satisfaction: an intellectual puzzle. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 25(1), 13-28. Doi: 10.1080/13600800305740

Bennett, N., Crawford, M., & Riches, C. (1992). 'Introduction: Managing Educational Change: Centrality of Values and Meanings', in N. Bennett, M. Crawford and C. Riches (eds.), *Managing Change in Education: Individual and Organizational Perspectives* (pp. 1–16), London: Open University & Paul Chapman.

Clancy, P. (2007). 'Resisting the Evaluative State: Irish Academics Win the Battle and Lose the War' In: J. Enders, & F. van Vught (eds). *Towards a Cartography of Higher Education Policy Change: A Festschrift in Honour of Guy Neave* (pp. 111–118). Enchede: Centre for Higher Education Policy Studies.

Clegg, S. (2003). Learning and teaching policies in higher education: mediations and contradictions of practice. *British Educational Research Journal*, 29(6), 803-819. Doi: 10.1080/0141192032000137312

Cummings, W. K., William, K. & Finkelstein, M. J. (2012). Declining Institutional Loyalty. *Scholars in the Changing American Academy: New Contexts, New Rules and New Roles* (pp. 131-140), Dordrecht: Springer.

Farnham, D. (1999). 'Managing Universities and Regulating Academic Labour Markets', in D. Farnham (ed.), *Managing Academic Staff in Changing University*

Systems (pp. 15–43). Buckingham: Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.

Feller, I. (2009). Performance measurement and the governance of American academic Science. *Minerva*, 47(3), 323-344. Doi. 10.1007/s11024-009-9129-z

Hyde, A., Clarke, M., & Drennan, J. (2013). ‘The Changing Role of Academics and the Rise of Managerialism’, in B. M. Kehm and U. Teichler (eds.), *The Academic Profession in Europe: New Tasks and New Challenges* (pp. 39-52) (Vol. 5), Dordrecht: Springer.

Jones, S., Lefoe, G., Harvey, M., & Ryland, K. (2012). Distributed leadership: a collaborative framework for academics, executives and professionals in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 34(1), 67-78. Doi: 10.1080/1360080X.2012.642334

Johnsrud, L. K., & Rosser, V. J. (2002). Faculty members' morale and their intention to leave: A multilevel explanation. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 73(4), 518-542. Doi: 10.1353/jhe.2002.0039

Lacy, F. J., & Sheehan, B. A. (1997). Job satisfaction among academic staff: An international perspective. *Higher education*, 34(3), 305-322. Doi: 10.1023/A:1003019822147

Larsen, I. M., Maassen, P., & Stensaker, B. (2009). Four basic dilemmas in university governance reform. *Higher Education Management and Policy*, 21(3), 41-58.

Locke, W., Cummings, W. K., & Fisher, D. (2011): 'Introduction', in Locke, W., Cummings, W. K., & Fisher, D. (Eds.). *Changing Governance and Management in Higher Education: The Perspectives of the Academy* (pp. 1-16) (Vol. 2), Dordrecht: Springer.

Martin, E. (1999). *Changing academic work: developing the learning university*. Buckingham: The Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.

Meek, V. L., & Wood, F. Q. (1998). Higher education governance and management: Australia. *Higher Education Policy*, 11(2-3), 2-3. Doi: 10.1057/palgrave.hep.8380102

Middlehurst, R., & Elton, L. (1992). Leadership and management in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education*, 17(3), 251-264. Doi: 10.1080/03075079212331382527

Middlehurst, R. (1993). *Leading Academics*. Buckingham: Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.

Moraru, L., Praisler, M., Marin, S. A., & Bentea, C.C. (2013): The Academic Profession: Quality Assurance, Governance, Relevance and Satisfaction, in Kehm, B., & Teichler, U. (eds.). *The Academic Profession in Europe: New Tasks and New Challenges* (pp. 141–162) (Vol. 5), Dordrecht: Springer.

Morley, L. (1997). Change and equity in higher education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 18(2), 231-242. Doi: 10.1080/0142569970180206

Sanyal, B.C. (1995). *Innovations in university management*. Paris: UNESCO.

Sharma, S. L. (2009). *Educational Management: A Unified Approach of Education*. New Delhi. Global India Publications.

Sporn, B. (1999). Towards more adaptive universities: Trends of institutional reform in Europe. *Higher Education in Europe*, 24(1), 23-33. Doi: 10.1080/0379772990240103

Sterling, S. (2010, June 3). Public conversation on universities is welcome. *The Irish Times*. p. 13.

Taylor, J. (2006). “Big is Beautiful”. Organisational Change in Universities in the United Kingdom: New Models of Institutional Management and the Changing Role of Academic Staff. *Higher Education in Europe*, 31(3), 251-273. Doi: 10.1080/03797720601058724

Waring, M. (2008). ‘HRM in HE: people reform of re-forming people?’, in D. Epstein, R. Boden, R. Deem, F. Rizvi and S. Wright (eds.), *World Yearbook of Education 2008* (pp. 142–160). New York: Routledge.

Winter, R., Taylor, T., & Sarros, J. (2000). Trouble at mill: Quality of academic worklife issues within a comprehensive Australian university. *Studies in Higher Education*, 25(3), 279-294. Doi. 10.1080/713696158

Winter, R. and Sarros, J. (2001). '*Corporate Reforms to Australian Universities: Views from the Academic Heartland*', Paper Presented at the Critical Management Conference, Manchester School of Management, Manchester, 11-13 July.