What do we know about the Chancellors of Australian Universities?

Dr. Bernard O'Meara

School of Business, University of Ballarat

Email: b.omeara@ballarat.edu.au

Dr. Stanley Petzall

Deakin Business School, Deakin University

Email: petzall@deakin.edu.au

What do we know about the Chancellors of Australian Universities?

ABSTRACT

This research attempts to explore the key social characteristics and demographics of Chancellors to determine who these people are and where they come from.

The Chancellor of an Australian university wields an enormous amount of power, from overseeing the appointment of the Vice-Chancellor (VC) to fulfilling various statutory requirements. Chancellors instil corporate values and they are pivotal to effective university governance and 'owner' representation. Yet few have academic backgrounds.

Chancellors are more than figureheads and ceremonial leaders and as such can have a significant impact on their individual universities and even on the higher education sector overall. The research presented here demonstrates that it is possible to construct a reasonably accurate profile of the typical Chancellor, based on factors such as occupation, age, academic field, gender and the undergraduate university that was attended. This research also mirrors similar research, undertaken by the authors, regarding Australian VCs.

Key words: Chancellor, University, Higher Education

Introduction

The thirty-nine universities in the Australian higher education system have assets in excess of \$30 billion and in 2005 received more than \$7.5 billion or 57% of their funding from the Federal Government. In 2004, there were over 944,977 students enrolled in courses and the universities employed approximately 87,658 staff (DEST, 2005a, 2005d).

In recent times universities have been marketised, unified, privatised and corporatised. Their internal cultures have also changed and education is now considered by some researchers to be a trading commodity. Funding has been reduced, competition has increased and Australian universities now more closely resemble private-sector business organisations (Marginson and Considine, 2001; Maringe, 2005; Winter and Sarros, 2001).

The last ten years has been characterised by government-led change, based on principles of competition, globalisation, an increasing focus on international students and neo-liberal philosophies. Australian universities are under increased pressure to act as platforms for economic growth, environmental sustainability and social stability through intellectual leadership (Pratt and Poole, 1999; Price, 2005; Selvarajah, 2006; Thomas, 2004).

These pressures have caused universities to react to increasing external pressures by redefining their direction, purpose, processes and the way they interact with their communities. Even traditional areas such as research are being revisited as universities face new challenges to produce original research and commercialize it. The expression 'publish or perish' is now a reality as universities adopt a commercial focus on their broadening range of activities. These changes cascade from the top of a university and eventually impact upon all staff. (Pratt and Poole, 1999; Sarros, Gmelch and Tanewski, 1997; Slaughter and Leslie, 1997; Zhao, 2004).

Atop the university hierarchical pyramid is the Vice-Chancellor (VC) or Chief Executive Officer (CEO) who is ultimately responsible for performance, funding and achieving strategic goals. The CEO reports to the Council or Board of Directors which oversees governance, appoints the VC, fulfils legislative requirements and is the ultimate authoritative body (O'Meara and Petzall, 2005).

The Chancellor is the person who chairs Council as well as the selection panel which appoints the VC. While the VC seeks agreement from Council on strategic imperatives and activities, the Chancellor is the key interface between Council and the university senior executive and management. Moodie and Eustace (1994, p92) identify an important role of the Chancellor , as follows “ Should the Vice-Chancellor become unbalanced or some other private scandal occur, the value of a distinguished, disinterested, yet concerned, head in whom to confide could be great, especially to the chief actors who cannot advertise their difficulties.”

An example of this role was demonstrated in 2002 when Jerry Ellis the Chancellor of Monash University met with the Vice-Chancellor David Robinson and the two agreed that, following claims of plagiarism, the VC should step down from his role.

Thus, given the importance of universities to the Australian and global communities, Chancellors are central to, and become key determinants of, successful university performance. This research focuses on the role of the Chancellor and attempts to answer the following questions:

1. What are the backgrounds, qualifications and experience of chancellors?
2. What skill bases do they bring to the role?
3. How are potential chancellors identified?

The research is important because of the pivotal role the Chancellor plays in a university. Yet, despite the importance of the Chancellor, there is surprisingly little known about the people

who undertake these roles. In many cases Chancellors are high profile leaders within the community but we do not know precisely what qualities are sought in potential Chancellors or the skill bases they bring to university governance.

The Chancellor

In Australia the role of Chancellor is created by relevant university legislation. An example of this is the Victoria University of Technology Act 1990 (now Victoria University). Section 7 of the Act creates the role of Chancellor while Section 15 states that the Chancellor shall 'preside over the Council'. While other sections prescribe the tenure of the Chancellor, pecuniary interests and how the incumbent may resign there are no other references to what the incumbent actually does (Victoria University of Technology Act, Section 15, page 9).

Moodie and Eustace (1994) state that the absolute requirement of a Chancellor is public honour. This is seen as critical as the person must be impartial, honest and committed as they continue a high profile public life. It is also useful in times of crisis when the Chancellor needs to be seen as distinguished, honourable, impartial and able to act in the best interests of the institution. This is also reflected in the private sector where wisdom and integrity are considered necessary for board members to be effective. Questions arise as to who these people are, where they come from and what qualities or attributes they need in order to be appointed to the role of Chancellor (Cutting and Kouzmin, 2002).

If one accepts the argument that the modern university now resembles a private sector organisation and the VC is the CEO then it follows that the role of the modern Chancellor is similar to, or the same as, that of a chair of a board in the private sector. Similarly, if universities have indeed been corporatised and the role of the Vice-Chancellor is equivalent to that of a private sector CEO then it is appropriate to include research into private sector board chairs and use this as a source of comparison with the role of Chancellors. The lack of research data on Chancellors means that data relating to private sector chairs of boards is the

only available data that can be used (Marginson and Considine; 2001, Maringe, 2005; O'Meara and Petzall, 2005; Winter and Sarros, 2001).

Chancellors have a variety of backgrounds and they need not be academics but they are expected to provide leadership of Councils and help the university achieve its strategic imperatives and goals. Incumbents at this level tend to be highly internally motivated and gain a degree of satisfaction from leading and achieving as well as being recognised as adding-value to the organisation. Thus, given the size, complexity and direction of Australian universities and the challenges they face, appointees must have a proven performance-based background (Bennis, 1999; Rowsley and Sherman, 2003).

If universities do tend to mirror private-sector organisations it is useful to note that boards and their chairs need to understand the processes and infrastructure associated with the 'core' business as they oversee the strategic direction of the organisation and are responsible for CEO succession. However, as universities seek to access greater amounts of external funding and compete for limited and declining federal funding, they seek high profile leaders who are politically savvy with established networks both within the private sector and governments. If deregulation of the sector continues then future Chancellors may require very different levels of skills, experience, knowledge and networks from those required by current Chancellors (Sharma, 2004; Sinclair, 2003; Wiersema 2002/3).

Those Chancellors with a formal qualification would, in part, understand the 'core' business of a university, the provision of education. However, as formal qualifications tend to be gained early in life much of their knowledge of higher education (HE) may be dated. In this case incumbents would only have knowledge of HE from a student's perspective.

The US National Association of Corporate Directors undertook a survey of members and identified nine areas where it was considered that board performance could be measured. It identified nine areas of common board responsibilities. These were:

1. Board/CEO relations
2. Corporate Governance
3. Regulatory compliance
4. Executive compensation
5. Risk oversight
6. Relations with shareholders/owners
7. Mergers and acquisitions
8. Strategic planning
9. CEO succession

As universities become corporatised the role of the Council takes on more of the functions listed above and therefore the Chancellor requires similar skills to a chair of the board in the private sector (Collier, 2004).

Coulson-Thomas (2004) argues that successful boards are those where the attitudes and approaches of board members positively influence organisational performance. Such boards address strategic and development issues and provide clear direction, achievable goals, measurable objectives and a distinct vision.

More recent research suggests that private sector chairs of boards need to be pro-active, provide moral integrity and balance contrasting internal and external demands. The Chair sets the tone for the board and hence the other board members take their cue from that incumbent. Similarly, university councils have external members who do not have academic backgrounds and therefore rely on the Chancellor for direction and guidance. This also suggests that Chancellors need similar competencies as those of private sector chairs of boards. However, If the Chancellor does not have an academic background either then it is

likely that he or she will rely heavily on the VC for advice (Kakabadse, Kakabadse and Barrett, 2006).

In this context the Chancellor is a leader and must therefore exhibit both personal and professional leadership characteristics. Successful leaders are considerate and in terms of professional leadership they provide direction, implement and manage a systematic process to achieve common goals and coordinate such activities. In terms of personal leadership, leaders have expertise in relevant areas, they have the trust of their colleagues, they share information, are seen to care about the input of others and provide a moral code of conduct. They add-value to their organisation or university (Mastrangelo, Eddy and Lorenzet, 2004).

While a formal qualification is not a requisite for the role of Chancellor, the personal traits and characteristics are of primary importance if the incumbent is to be effective. This is also the case in the private sector where incumbents are expected to solve complex problems, use initiative, be flexible and persuasive and achievement driven. They must also have excellent interpersonal and communication skills, be strategic thinkers and have a vision. In the private sector, board tenure is dependent upon performance as is the tenure of CEO's (Adams, 2004; Boyett, 1996; O'Neal and Thomas, 1996).

The decline in tenure of Chancellors mirrors the decline in tenure of VC's. It can be argued that at least part of the reason for the decline is similar. The decline in the tenure of VC's can in part be explained by the increased level and rate of change in Australian higher education.

This change came about through changes in government policy, increased size, complexity and focus of universities, reduced recurrent funding, competitive bidding processes for limited funding and the introduction of managerialism. However, the increase in the number of universities has created a larger pool of VCs, deputy vice-chancellors and pro vice-chancellors from which to draw potential VCs. This in turns allows universities to more

frequently seek VCs with different skill sets to meet the changing needs of universities (Bradley 1995, North 1994, Trow 1994).

Another factor impacting upon the tenure of Chancellors is the fact that they either have full-time, high profile positions elsewhere or have recently retired from them. The role of Chancellor is not a full-time position and this allows incumbents to take on this role in addition to their usual roles or following retirement (Moodie and Eustace 1994).

Australian universities provide equal employment opportunities for males and females. However, there are few female Chancellors. The Director of the Equal Opportunity for Women in the Workplace Agency stated that the majority of Australia's top 300 companies did not have any female representatives on their boards. She also stated that less than seven percent of the directors of both public and private companies are women (Krautil, 2000). In part this may explain why there are fewer women appointed to the position of Chancellor.

METHODOLOGY

The sample

The sample for this research consisted of the Chancellors of all Australian universities from 1960 to 2005 in five-year increments from 1960 onwards until 2005. This allowed for any longitudinal trends to be identified over that forty-five year period. The sample therefore consisted of ten Chancellors in 1960 and had increased to 39 incumbents by 2005, mirroring the growth in the number of universities.

The year 1960 was chosen as it separated the older group of eight universities from the post war universities. The post 1960 period had the greatest increase in the number and diversity of Australian universities.

In order to be included in the sample, incumbents had to be named as Chancellor of one of the institutions designated by legislation as a university within Australia in the years specified. This requirement excluded institutions such as the Australian Maritime College and the Australian Defence Force Academy.

Data Collection and analysis

Data was gathered using public-domain material only. This included material such as media releases, Who's Who in Australia (1960-2005), university archives and other bibliographic sources. Thus, there was no need for ethics clearance or the use of confidentiality agreements. Data was gathered from multiple sources and was triangulated in order to ensure completeness, accuracy and the validity and reliability of the material.

Previous research, culminating in a Ph.D thesis in 2002 allowed the principal author to survey and interview both current and former Chancellors, Vice-Chancellors, executive recruitment consultants and members of the Australian Vice-Chancellors' Committee (AVCC). In this instance, approval was gained from the Deakin University Ethics Committee to conduct interviews and to distribute questionnaires to all incumbents. The research presented is qualitative rather than quantitative in nature and follows the characteristics outlined by Bogdan and Biklen (1982, page 27):

1. Qualitative research has the natural setting as the direct data source and the researcher as the key instrument.
2. Qualitative research is descriptive. The richness of words and pictures is valued above numerical data.
3. Qualitative researchers are concerned with process rather than simply with outcomes or products.
4. Qualitative researchers tend to analyse their data inductively.
5. 'Meaning' is of essential concern to the qualitative approach. There is focus upon participant perspectives.

FINDINGS and DISCUSSION

Age, tenure and gender

The research outlined earlier suggests that Chancellors would be experienced professionals who have achieved success at senior levels within their respective careers. It also suggests that incumbents would need time to acquire the requisite knowledge, experience and skills for the role and would therefore be appointed at an advanced age. This is supported by Table 1, which shows a mean age of 61.5 for incumbents in 2005 (Cutting and Kouzmin, 2002; Moodie and Eustace, 1994).

A slight decline is most noticeable in the 19th Century group of universities except for 1985. This year was skewed by the appointments of Sir Roy Wright and Dame Roma Mitchell who were in their early 70's when appointed.

By 1965, five new universities had been created but this had little impact on the mean age in that year. However, in 1970 the appointment of a younger generation in the Early 20th Century cluster commenced with the appointment of Sir Lawrence Jackson at age 55. Sir Lawrence was a Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Western Australia and Chancellor of the University of Western Australia from 1968 to 1981.

The appointment of Eric Neal as Chancellor of Flinders University in 2002 at the age of 78 tended to skew the mean age of the New Institutions cluster in 2005, however there were two other Chancellors in their 70's as well. The mean age, which is greater than the VC equivalent, suggests that to be considered for the role incumbents need at least to be in their mid- fifties in order to have the requisite skill, knowledge and competencies.

Table 1.

The mean age when incumbents became Chancellor (years)

Year	19th C	Early 20th	Post War	New	Post 1988	Mean
-------------	--------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------	------------	------------------	-------------

2005	58.6	60.0	62.3	65.2	61.6	61.5
2000	59.5	64.5	62.0	60.6	63.6	62.0
1995	62.0	58	62.0	62.9	63.3	61.6
1990	61.25	62.5	62.75	56.77	63.5	61.3
1985	68.75	56.0	62.75	55.63	-	60.8
1980	63.25	55.5	62.75	60.8	-	60.6
1975	60.75	55.0	62.75	61.0	-	59.8
1970	63.0	59.5	62.75	60.16	-	61.3
1965	64.75	63.0	63.75	-	-	63.8
1960	65.25	63	63.25	-	-	63.8

The mean tenure of VC's declined from 13.3 years in 1960 to 7.2 years in 2000 and Table 2 shows a similar decline in the tenure of Chancellors to 2005. The figures presented for 2005 are cumulative to the end of that year however and it is anticipated that some incumbent Chancellors will continue in their roles beyond that year and so increase the mean. The gradual decline in the tenure of Chancellors may reflect the need of universities to seek incumbents more frequently with a greater range of competencies imposed by both internal and external pressures. These pressures include the need to identify new markets and new ways to deliver educational services in a highly competitive global environment. However the changes recently introduced legislative changes by state governments may also account for some decline in tenure (Bradley, 1995; North, 1994, Trow, 1994).

Further, the increased pressure on the role of Chancellor may be sufficient to cause more frequent turnover. It may also reflect the perspective of universities trying to introduce people with fresh ideas. It is also not uncommon to find that a VC and Chancellor leave a university within a short period of time of each other, which highlights the importance of the relationship between them. An example of this is RMIT where the Chancellor, Don Mercer and Vice-Chancellor, Ruth Duncan, left within a relatively short time of each other. This also occurred at the University of Ballarat where the Chancellor, David Caro, left in late 2004 and the Vice-Chancellor, Kerry Cox moved on in early 2006.

Table 2

Mean tenure of incumbent vice-chancellors (years)						
Year	19 th C	Early 20 th	Post War	New	Post 1988	Mean
2005	4.5	8.5	6.0	6.2	3.5	5.74
2000	7.75	8.5	8.5	10.5	8.5	8.75

1995	9.5	11.0	8.0	10.8	7.7	9.4
1990	13.5	7.5	13.75	9.5	6.75	10.9
1985	10.5	8.0	11.5	8.7	-	9.68
1980	9.75	10.5	11.25	8.25	-	9.94
1975	11.5	13.0	7.25	8.8	-	10.14
1970	10.5	13.0	7.25	7.2	-	9.5
1965	12.0	10.5	8.25	-	-	10.25
1960	13.5	10.5	7.75	-	-	8.03

The first female Chancellor was Dame Roma Mitchell who, at the age of 70, was appointed to the role at the University of Adelaide in 1983. It is significant that Dame Roma was appointed at that age but it is also equally significant that she was appointed to the third oldest university in Australia. The next two female appointments were in 1988 at two of the “New” institutions.

In 2005, there were 10 female VCs and three Chancellors in Australia. This is consistent with the datum provided by Krautil (2000) that illustrates there is an insufficient number of women in senior roles especially in the business sector. This, in turn limits the number of women who can be seen as valid candidates for the role of Chancellor.

Backgrounds of Chancellors

The data presented in Table 3 shows that incumbents need not come from an academic background but they do need to understand the nature of academic work. However, the data does show that incumbents come from high profile positions that require people who can set and achieve high-level results. The significant number of incumbents with backgrounds in Law reflects of the need for Chancellors to fulfill a legislative role (Sharma, 2004; Sinclair, 2003; Wiersema, 2002/3).

The more recent increase in incumbents from a business or industry background reflects the corporatisation of universities from the late 80’s and early 90’s and the need for an incumbent Chancellor to have experience in large, complex organizations. These people can demonstrate they are achievement driven, are highly motivated and have a record of achievement and performance (Bennis, 1999; Rowsley and Sherman, 2003).

Table 3
Role of incumbents immediately prior to current appointment (%).

	2005	2000	1995	1990	1985	1980	1975	1970	1965	1960
Academic	18	20	20	10	5	10	-	6	20	10
Legal	13	16	24	50	65	60	44	38	30	20
Politics	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	6	-	30
Public Service	26	8	12	10	10	5	14	25	20	20
Engineering	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20	20
Industry	43	56	44	25	15	10	18	19	10	-
Pastoralist	-	-	-	5	5	5	-	-	-	-
None Listed	-	-	-	-	-	10	18	6	-	-
N	39	39	39	27	19	19	16	16	10	10

Table 4 shows that the majority of incumbents have been publicly recognized for their outstanding achievements and rewarded accordingly. Interestingly, the table shows that in many cases incumbents have received multiple awards such as an Australian Honour and an Honorary Degree.

This tends to confirm that incumbents are achievement driven, motivated and possess the personal and professional leadership skills required for such high-powered roles. In 2005, 14 incumbents held the role of Chair of the Board, CEO or Director while others had held roles such as Governor, Deputy Premier, Judge and Vice-Chancellor prior to being appointed to the role of Chancellor.

High profile roles similar to these were also common in earlier times. Incumbents need to demonstrate high-level management and leadership competencies to be successful in these roles. This also adds weight to the argument that the role of Chancellor is the equivalent to the chair of the board in the private sector and show that the incumbent requires the same skills (Adams, 2004; Boyett, 1996; Collier, 2004; Coulson-Thomas, 2004; Kakabadese, Kakabadese and Barrett, 2006; Mastrangelo, Eddy and Lorenzet, 2004; O'Neal and Thomas, 1996).

In 2005, 25% of incumbents had undertaken a business degree while 16% had a background in either Law or Science. These three areas have dominated the major academic fields of incumbents from 1960 onwards.

Table 4
Honours and awards of incumbents (%)

	2005	2000	1995	1990	1985	1980	1975	1970	1965	1960
Knighthood	5	15	19	40	70	65	63	82	90	80
Other Imperial award	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10
Australian award	71	67	50	30	-	15	12	12	-	-
Honorary Degree	31	46	41	35	25	45	32	44	30	20
None Listed	-	23	31	30	30	20	25	6	10	10
N=	39	39	39	27	19	19	16	16	10	10

Formal qualifications

While it is not necessary for a Chancellor to have a formal qualification, Table 5 shows that the majority of Chancellors have attended an Australian university. This is consistent with VC patterns. They are more effective if they have local knowledge and experience. The majority of Chancellors have attended one of the 'Group of Eight' universities or the oldest and therefore most prestigious Australian universities. This pattern is also apparent in the universities attended by VCs.

In 2005, 37% of incumbents had a doctoral qualification and 11% had a Masters degree in their chosen field of study. These incumbents would have a stronger grasp of the theoretical underpinnings of their area. It would be expected that those undertaking a higher degree in business would be exposed to higher-level leadership and management theory, which would complement their practical experience and allow them to pursue a career in senior

management. Incumbents with a higher degree would also appreciate academic processes, rigour and university activities.

The perspective adopted by Moodie and Eustace (1994) was that the Chancellor needed to be a person held in high regard with a record of achievement and performance. This view is supported by the data in the tables which show that the majority of incumbents have an award of some type and/or an honorary degree. In some cases Chancellors have both; thus the figures given do not add to 100.

Table 5
Undergraduate University attended (%)

	2005	2000	1995	1990	1985	1980	1975	1970	1965	1960
Sydney	21	13	22	25	15	25	18	25	10	20
Melbourne	8	21	18	20	25	15	24	25	30	20
Adelaide	5	10	5	-	25	10	12	19	30	20
Tasmania	3	-	3	10	-	-	-	-	-	10
QLD	11	18	13	20	10	10	6	6	10	10
W.A	5	3	5	10	5	5	6	6	10	10
Other Aust	13	5	8	-	-	5	-	-	-	-
Total Aust	66	70	74	85	80	70	66	81	90	90
Oxford	3	3	-	5	10	5	-	-	-	-
Cambridge	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	-	-
Other UK	3	10	16	5	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other O/S	3	3	10	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total O/S	9	16	26	10	10	10	-	-	-	-
Not listed	25	14	-	5	10	20	34	19	10	10
N=	39	39	39	27	19	19	16	16	10	10

The need for domestic knowledge, experience and contacts is also apparent in the data presented in Table 6, showing that the overwhelming majority were born in Australia. Further

analysis shows that all Chancellors resided in Australia prior to their appointments (Sharma, 2004; Sinclair, 2003; Wiersema, 2002/3).

It should be noted that it was not uncommon for Chancellors from the 1960's to have attended both an overseas and domestic university. The most common overseas university attended in these instances was Oxford.

Table 6
Country of birth of incumbents (%)

	2005	2000	1995	1990	1985	1980	1975	1970	1965	1960
Aust	79	82	81	90	90	95	100	100	70	60
UK	13	13	3	5	10	5	-	-	30	20
Other Common wealth	5	-	11	5	-	-	-	-	-	20
Non - Common wealth	3	5	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
N	39	39	39	27	19	19	16	16	10	10

Discussion

The tables presented in this research provide an insight into the backgrounds, qualifications and experience of Chancellors. While it would appear that a formal qualification is not essential it would appear that the knowledge, competence and high-level experience gained from other sectors of the community and business is important. It is possible that this knowledge and experience complements and builds upon formal qualifications to provide a well-rounded person. The recognition of this through the award of honours tends to highlight these people and make them readily identifiable within the community.

The recognition of excellence can be used to identify suitable candidates for the role of Chancellor. Many potential candidates are also members of major metropolitan clubs, sporting groups and societies and therefore mix with VCs, senior academics and members of governments. This socialising and networking creates opportunities to determine if particular individuals are interested in taking on this prestigious role.

Typical Chancellors are persons in their late fifties or early sixties, with formal qualifications, and have been recognised by an Australian award and possibly an Honorary Degree. The incumbent would have had a high profile, senior position such as Chairman, CEO, Director, Judge, Governor or Vice-Chancellor. The person would probably be a male, born in Australia, and have studied Business, Law or Science at one of the 'Group of Eight' Australian universities.

The skill bases required by Chancellors are considerable. The typical Chancellor would need a proven record of performance, self motivation, and personal and professional leadership at an executive level. The person would have a vision for the future and the interpersonal and communications skills necessary to effectively communicate that vision to others so that the desired outcomes could be achieved.

By bringing the top achievers into the role of Chancellor, universities ensure they acquire the best contemporary skills and experience that allow them to meet the specific challenges they face. The universities engage in a type of continual improvement, as leaders in the current political, social and economic climates bring new skills to undertake successful strategic approaches. However, the question arises as how effectively universities target potential Chancellors and how well they access and maximise these skills, knowledge, experience and leadership. This question cannot be answered here.

Conclusion:

This research has outlined some of the key demographics and social characteristics of the Chancellors of Australian universities and allows a glimpse into the lives of incumbents.

While the majority of incumbents are high profile individuals little is known about what the job of the Chancellor actually involves. Outside of the ceremonial and figurehead role, one of the few documented functions of Chancellors is their importance in the selection of VCs (O'Meara and Petzall 2005). However, it is possible to create the profile of a typical Chancellor based on the research presented

There is a pathway for suitable individuals to move through their chosen career to a point where they are considered as a candidate for the role. Thus, while there have been changes in the demographics of Chancellors in respect of factors such as the age when they were

appointed, their backgrounds and educational qualifications, it is still possible to identify high profile individuals who may, at some stage, be appointed Chancellors if they wish to serve in this capacity.

This research has given a brief overview of the demographics of Chancellors. However, much more research needs to be undertaken in order to better understand these individuals and the various roles they play in universities. The role of the Chancellor allows incumbents to ascend to a hidden throne, Chair of Council, where they preside over universities, their councils, governance issues and CEO's. As incumbents have so much impact upon Australian higher education, much more research needs to be undertaken into these individuals and their roles. A key question is how well universities match their needs with the skills of potential Chancellors and how well they utilize these capabilities.

References.

Adams, C. (2004) Top firms see churn. *Crain's Chicago Business*, 27(20), p. 13

Bennis, W. (1999) The leadership advantage. *Leader to Leader Institute*, 12, Spring,

Viewed 16th August 2006:

<http://www.pfdf.org/leaderbooks/L2L/spring99/bennis.html>

Bogdan, R.C. and Biklen, S.K. (1982) *Qualitative research for education: an introduction to theory and methods*. Boston, Allyn and Bacon.

Boyett, I. (1996) New leader, new culture, “old” university. *Leadership & Organizational Development Journal*. 17(5), pp 24-30.

Bradley, C. (1995) Managerialism in South Australian universities. *Labour and Industry*, 6(2), March, pp.141-153.

Coaldrake, P. (2000) Reflections on Repositioning of the Governments Approach to Higher Education, or, I’m Dreaming of a White Paper. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 22(1), pp.9-21.

Coles, J. and Hesterly, W. (2000) Independence of the Chairman and Board Composition: Firm Choices and Shareholder value. *Journal of Management*, 26(2), pp.195-214.

Collier, J. (2004) Measuring and evaluating board performance. *Measuring Business Excellence*, 8(3), pp.12-17.

Coulson-Thomas, C. (2005) Creating a winning board: Successful and unsuccessful directorial approaches to competing and winning. *Strategic Direction*, 21(3), pp.3-5.

Cutting, B. and Kouzmin, A. (2002) Evaluating corporate board cultures and decision making. *Corporate Governance*, 2(2), pp.27-45.

Datta, D. K. and Guthrie, J. P. (1994) Executive succession: organizational antecedents of CEO characteristics. *Strategic Management Journal*, 15(7) pp.569-577.

Department of Education, Science and Training (DEST) (2005a) *Building Better Foundations for Higher Education in Australia: A discussion about re-aligning Commonwealth-State responsibilities* (2005). Department of Education, Science and Training, Canberra, viewed 30th August 2006,

http://www.dest.gov.au/NR/rdonlyres/B365C269-534E-4790-BA64-67D7FC728603/4047/ResponsibilitiesPaper_compiled_onlineversion.htm

Department of Education, Science and Training (DEST) (2005b) '*Our Universities: Backing Australia's Future, Ministers Message*', Department of Education, Science and Training, Canberra, viewed 30th August 2006,

http://www.backingaustraliasfuture.gov.au/ministers_message.htm

Department of Education, Science and Training (DEST) (2005c) '*Research Quality Framework: Assessing the quality and impact of research in Australia.*' Department of Education, Science and Training, Canberra.

Department of Education, Science and Training (DEST) (2005d) *Higher Education Report 2004-5*. Department of Education, Science and Training, Canberra, viewed 19th September 2006,

http://www.dest.gov.au/sectors/higher_education/publications_resources/profiles/highered_annual_report_2004_05.htm

Draper, W.J. (ed.) (1968) *Who's who in Australia, 1968*. XIXth ed. Melbourne, The Herald and Weekly Times Limited.

Draper, W.J. (1977) *Who's who in Australia, 1977*. XXIIInd ed. Melbourne, The Herald and Weekly Times Limited.

Draper, W.J. (1980) *Who's who in Australia, 1980*. XXIIIrd ed. Melbourne, The Herald and Weekly Times Limited.

Draper, W.J.(1985) *Who's who in Australia, 1985*. Melbourne, The Herald and Weekly Times Limited.

Draper, W.J.(1988) *Who's who in Australia, 1988*. Melbourne, The Herald and Weekly Times Limited.

Draper, W.J.(1991) *Who's who in Australia, 1991*. Melbourne, The Herald and Weekly Times Limited.

Draper, W.J.(1996) *Who's who in Australia, 1996*. Melbourne, The Herald and Weekly Times Limited.

- Draper, W.J. (1998) *Who's who in Australia, 1998*. Melbourne, Information Australia.
- Fox, M. (2005) Movers: Mary Anne Fox, Chancellor, University of California, San Diego. *Nature*, 435, 5th May, p.126.
- Guthrie, J.P. and Datta, D.K. (1997) Contextual influences on executive selection: firm characteristics and CEO experience. *Journal of Management Studies*. 34(4), July, pp.537-560.
- Helms, M.M., Williams, A.B. and Nixon, J.C. (2001) TQM principles and their relevance to higher education: the question of tenure and post-tenure review. *The International Journal of Educational Management*. 15(7), pp.322-331.
- Kakabadse, A., Kakabadse, N. and Barrett, R. (2006) Chairman and chief executive officer (CEO): that sacred and secret relationship. *Journal of Management Development*, 25(2), pp.134-150.
- Kakabadse, A., Nortier, F. and Abramovice, N-B. (1998) *Success in sight: visioning*. London, International Thomson.
- Krautil, F. (2000) Not enough women in Business. *Equal Opportunity for Women in the Workplace Agency*, media release, March 2000. Dated viewed 9th August 2006: http://www.eowa.gov.au/information_centres/Media_Centre/Media_Releases/240300.a...
- Marginson, S. and Considine, M. (2000) *The Enterprise University: Power, Governance and Reinvention in Australia*. Melbourne, Cambridge University Press.
- Maringe, F. (2005) Interrogating the crisis in higher education marketing: the CORD model. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 19(7), pp.564-578.
- Mastrangelo, A, Eddy, E. and Lorenzet, S. (2004) The importance of personal and professional leadership. *The Leadership and Organization Development Journal*. 25(5), pp.435-451.
- Moodie, G. and Eustace, R. (1994) *Power and Authority in British Universities*. London, Allen & Unwin.

- North, P. (1994) The task of the modern university. In: *The Modern Vice-Chancellor*, pp.72-78, Canberra, AGPS.
- O'Meara, B. (2002) Recruitment and Selection of Vice-Chancellors for Australian Universities. Unpublished Ph.D thesis. Deakin University (2 volumes).
- O'Meara, B. and Petzall, S. (2005) Vice-Chancellors for the 21st Century? A Study of Contemporary Recruitment and Selection Practices in Australian Universities. *Management Research News*, 28(6), pp.18-35.
- O'Neal, D. and Thomas, H. (1996) Developing the strategic board. *Long Range Planning*, 29(3), June, pp.314-327.
- Pratt, G. and Poole, D. (1999) Globalisation and Australian Universities: Policies and Impacts. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*. 12(6), pp 533-544.
- Price, T.J. (2005) Preaching what we practice: experiences from implementing ISO 14001 at the University of Glamorgan. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, 6(2), pp. 161-178.
- Rowsley, D. and Sherman, H. (2003) The Special Challenges of Academic Leadership. *Management Decision*, 48(10), pp 1058-1063.
- Sarros, J.C., Gmelch, W. and Tanewski, G. (1997) The Role of Departmental Head in Australian Universities: Changes and Challenges. *Higher Education Research and Development*. 16(1), pp 9-24.
- Saul, P. (1996) Managing the organization as a community of contributors. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 34(3), pp.19-36.
- Selvarajah, C. (2006) The need to understand the changing educational environment in New Zealand. *Cross Cultural Management: An International Journal*, 13(2), pp.142-155.
- Sharma, R. (2004) Performance-Based Funding in the Entrepreneurial North American and Australian Universities. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*. 26(1), pp 109-118.

- Sinclair, M. (2003) Three Futures for University Provision: the social justice market, state capitalism and private for-profit universities. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*. 25(2), pp 161-172.
- Slaughter, S. and Leslie, L. (1997) *Academic Capitalism: Politics, Policies and the Entrepreneurial University*. London, John Hopkins University Press.
- Thomas, I. (2004) Sustainability in tertiary curricula: What is stopping it happening? *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, 5(1), pp.33-47.
- Trow, M. (1994) *Managerialism and the academic profession: quality and control*. London, Open University.
- Wiersema, M. (2002/3) Hard times in the executive suite. *European Business Forum*, 12, Winter, pp. 43-48.
- Winter, R. and Sarros, J. (2001) Corporate Reforms to Australian Universities: Views from the Academic Heartland. *Journal of Institutional Research*, 11(2), pp 92-104.
- Wolverton, M., Ackerman, R. and Holt, S. (2005) Preparing for leadership: What academic department chairs need to know. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 27(2), pp 227-238.
- Wolverton, M., Gmelch, W.H., Montez, J. and Nies, C.T. (2001) *The changing nature of the academic deanship* (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, 28, n.1). San Francisco, CA, Josey Bass.
- Wolverton, M., Gmelch, W., Wolverton, M.L., Sarros, J. (1999) A Comparison of Chair Tasks in Australia and the United States. *Higher Education*, 38, pp 333-350.
- Yokoyama, K. (2006) Entrepreneurialism in Japanese and UK universities: Governance, management, leadership, and funding. *Higher Education*, 52, pp. 523-555.
- Yukof, M. (2004) What if the Yankees were run like a public university? *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 50(27), March 12, pp. B7, 3p, 3c.

Zhao, F. (2004) Commercialisation of Research: a case study of Australian universities.
Higher Education Research and Development, 23(2), pp 223-236.