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The Proposition

The prime function of a satellite head of campus is to manage, balance and deliver upon the expectations of stakeholders within the university, the community and external accreditation and regulatory authorities, while remaining true to their principles and the trust placed in them by the students for their futures.
Satellite Campus Stakeholders

- **University**
  - President (Vice Chancellor)
  - Executive (CFO, VPs)
  - Faculties (business units)
  - Services (facilities, library, IT, student support)
  - Head of Campus

- **Community**
  - Internal
    - Management team
    - Line managed staff
    - Non-line managed staff
    - Students
  - External
    - Government (social objectives)
    - Industry
    - Schools
    - Community

- **External Accreditors**
  - Profession (discretionary and mandatory)
  - Academic accreditation authorities
  - Legislative and governance requirements
Corporate Stakeholder Expectations

- Growth
- Financial return
- Ranking and status
- Internal harmony
- Concentration of effort (resources)
- Community development
Motivations of Individual Stakeholder
(and associated subversive behaviours towards satellite campuses)

- **Power** (disempowerment, micromanagement, centralisation, exclusion bureaucratic stalling, withholding information, deliberately breed mistrust)

- **Career advancement and profile** – fear of ‘limelight’ being shared by satellite campus initiatives (disempowerment, misrepresentation, exclusion)

- **Sense of Superiority** [campus and individual] (belittling staff and students, ‘adjustment’ of results, exclusion, excessive standardisation)

- **Resource accumulation** (centralisation)

- **Parent campus contextualisation** (centralisation)

- **Distrust** (disempowerment, centralisation, misrepresentation, exclusion)
Community Stakeholder Expectations

- **Internal**
  - **Management team:** Inclusion in decision making, ability to exercise authority, respect, ability to innovation
  - **Line managed staff:** Authority, empowerment
  - **Non-line managed staff:** Equitable treatment, clarity of role, respect, professional advancement, ability to use initiative, sense of team, local support
  - **Students:** Equitable treatment, quality education, student experience, value for money, career, safety, professionalism, peer interaction, face to face teaching, facilities, flexibility, understanding, wifi! Etc.

- **External** (Primarily for comprehensive campuses)
  - **Government:** Social and economic outcomes
  - **Industry:** Opportunities, research outcomes, capable employees
  - **Schools:** Education and career pathways, professional development, teaching placements
  - **Community:** Careers, employment, engagement, role modelling, cultural change, social advancement (Sporting teams - USA)
External Accreditor and Regulator Requirements

- **Profession**
  - Discretionary (eg. AACSB, PMI, CPA)
  - Mandatory (eg. Engineering, legal, teaching)
  - More powerful influence for specialist campuses

- **Academic accreditation authorities**
  - Regional (US)/state/interstate
  - National
  - International

- **Legislative and regulatory requirements**
  - International campuses
  - Local contractual arrangements
  - Federal or state legislation eg international students
Authority to Manage Stakeholders is a Function of the Management Model

**Study Centre**
- No HOC.
- Limited control. Key decisions made centrally.

**Administrative**
- HOC.
- Limited control. Key decisions made centrally.

**Matrix**
- Matrix leadership
- Business unit
- Faculties accountable to HOC via an SLA.
- Localised control of:
  - portfolio
  - teaching mode
  - business decisions
  - administration

**Faculty**
- As for Matrix but academic staff line managed by HOC.

**Federal**
- As for Faculty but localised control of research.

**High Autonomy**

**No Autonomy**

NB. Matrix model previously termed Business Unit Model
## The Roles of the Head of Campus

Colour coding represents propensity for subversive challenges to established authorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Administrative</th>
<th>Matrix</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Federal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Nil – High (Persuasion to Matrix)</td>
<td>High (Matrix and line)</td>
<td>High (line)</td>
<td>High (line)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR - Academic Staffing</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil - Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR - Professional Staffing</td>
<td>Nil-Medium</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Control</td>
<td>Nil – low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Experience</td>
<td>Nil - Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management - Operational Control</td>
<td>Medium-high</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budgetary Control</td>
<td>Low- Medium</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Design</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil-Medium</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Community Engagement</td>
<td>Nil-medium</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Engagement</td>
<td>Nil-Low</td>
<td>Nil-Low</td>
<td>Low-Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Sweetspot
Stakeholder expectations balanced with HOC principles
The Dilemma
Stakeholder expectations not balanced and one or more are misaligned with HOC’s ethical position.
(This example represents sudden increase in centralisation)
The Dilemma
Over time, the HOC will naturally establish strong relationships with the community, this can lead to a challenging ethical situations when the university forces these to be reneged on.

![Dilemma Diagram]
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Monash University Gippsland Campus
How sometimes it is impossible to find the balance!

- Low Socio Economic Status (SES) area, coal mining, power generation and farming area
- 1928 Yallourn Technical School
- 1958 Yallourn Technical College
- 1968 Gippsland Technical College
- 1990 Amalgamated with Monash Uni – Administrative model – problems with brand and community, loss making
- 2008 Faculty model adopted (PVC and President)– distinct programs, developed a sub-brand
- 2011 First surplus achieved since amalgamation
- 2013 Loss of distance education income
- 2014 Transferred to Federation University
- Fundamental issue was Gippsland student cohort did not have entry scores required for Go8 (Ivy League) status
The Solutions

- Campus and Federal management models provide greater resistance to subversive behaviour but not executive change.
- Strong support from the VC is required for the Matrix management model to counter subversive behaviour— but is unlikely to survive a change of president.
- Ranking focussed universities are not suited to satellite campuses tailored for aspirational students.
- HOC should actively manage stakeholder expectations to reduce the possibility of misalignment.
- HOC should reflect on what their ethical position, and if in a dilemma, do something about it.
- Sometimes, no matter what is right or logical, the campus is going to lose.
- Community Owned Tertiary Education campus (COTEC) as a means of holding universities to account to the community.